

**Faculty Welfare Committee 2015-2016  
Final Report  
Spring 2016**

**Committee Members:** Renée Berry, Kelly Brooksher, Lesley Clack, Nedra Cossa, Pang-Chieh Hsu, Sarah Gray, Lauren McMillan (co-chair), TimMarie Williams, Sarah Zingales (co-chair)

**Charges for 2015-1016**

1. Draft and administer a part-time faculty satisfaction survey to identify potential issues affecting part-time faculty satisfaction and associated retention.
2. Draft a bill to address the lack of pay raise associated with post-tenure review
3. Develop a process to ensure annual calculation of the percentage of lecturer positions among faculty ranks.
4. Review campus climate survey results to identify key faculty concerns
5. Examine summer workload policies for laboratories course (contact hour vs. credit hour)
6. Examine workload policies for low enrollment programs (i.e. teaching classes as independent study)

**Actions taken**

**Charge #1:** No action was taken towards this charge during the past year due to a salary study taking place. The results of the salary study will be used when this charge is addressed during the 2016-2017 year. At this time, the committee has agreed that this charge will take priority once the new academic year begins.

**Charge #2:**

A Town Hall was scheduled by the Faculty Welfare Committee on November 18, 2015 to provide a platform for discussion of the salary study that was completed in February 2016 by the Faculty Salary Study Committee.

Furthermore, the Faculty Welfare Committee collected data from peer institutions to identify their procedures relating to post-tenure review. A bill was drafted, presented, and passed during the Faculty Senate meeting on March 21, 2016. *See appendices A and B for text of resolutions as modified during the Senate meeting.*

**Charge #3:** The Faculty Welfare Committee discussed charge 3 with Institutional Research via email. Institutional Research agreed to collect this data annually to include the rank of lecturer. We are currently waiting for a response with the most recent numbers. Henceforth, the Factbook will be the location in which to find percentages of faculty ranks.

**Charge #4:**

The committee began a review of the campus climate survey and will address identified key faculty concerns at a later date.

**Charge #5:**

Data was collected to determine which departments are affected by workload (contact hour vs. credit hour). It was determined that this issue does not impact the majority of departments and should be addressed within the department(s) rather than through the Faculty Welfare Committee.

**Charge #6:**

Similar to Charge #5, this issue affects only a few departments and will therefore be referred back to those departments to address.

## **Appendix A**

### **Faculty Senate Resolution: Addition of Very Satisfactory to Post-Tenure Review**

We believe that in the post-tenure review process there should be additional incentive and reward for faculty who exceed expectations. We propose that in the future there be a “very satisfactory” category, defined below. We would then propose to add to our above policy: Faculty who are found to be “very satisfactory” at post-tenure review are to be awarded a \$1500 raise to their base salary.

Very Satisfactory: The faculty member is performing effectively as a teacher and is making greater than satisfactory contributions, exceeding those typically appropriate to a senior faculty member, in either scholarship or service. Individual departments/programs may have specific service or scholarship expectations for individual faculty members because of the particular position held by the faculty member. This point should be addressed in the review. If a faculty member is found to be "very satisfactory," the department head may wish to further commend the faculty member.

## **Appendix B**

### **Faculty Senate Resolution (with proposed and approved changes): Addition of Very Satisfactory to Post-Tenure Review**

We believe that in the post-tenure review process there should be additional recognition and reward for faculty who exceed expectations. We propose that in the future there be a “very satisfactory” category, defined below. We would then propose to add to our above policy: Fully promoted faculty who are found to be “very satisfactory” at post-tenure review are to be awarded a \$1500 raise to their base salary, in addition to any merit and/or CUPA-based salary adjustments.

Very Satisfactory: The faculty member is performing effectively as a teacher and is making greater than satisfactory contributions, exceeding those typically appropriate to a senior faculty member, in either scholarship or service. Individual departments/programs may have specific service or scholarship expectations for individual faculty members because of the particular position held by the faculty member. This point should be addressed in the review. If a faculty member is found to be "very satisfactory," the department head may wish to further commend the faculty member.