

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE (Meeting Minutes)

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, April 30th, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, Brown, DeKrey, English, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Landry, Lee, Senbet,
Trask (Dineen)

Zoom: Lunarix

Absent:

Call to Order 3:31pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of April 14, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

1. Revisions to 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 have been sent to the Codification Committee and to the Provost for comments.

Subcommittee Reports

1. None

Special Orders

1. None

Unfinished Business

1. Elections:
 - Chair nominee Jeff Brown
 - Elected by acclamation
 - Vice Chair nominee Jieun Lee
 - Elected by acclamation
2. 2-3-305 Academic Titles – Distinguished Professor
 - Provost comments:
 - What is the goal?
 - What are the biggest priorities here at UNC?
 - President Feinstein proposed this as a base builder for faculty with limits.
 - Senbet is open to the base building approach for professors, since full professors have been underpaid for several years.
 - Potential approaches to the Distinguished Professor Title:
 - The possibility of implementing a university-wide review process was proposed.
 - Some units are not effectively fulfilling evaluation responsibilities and there is concern about fairness and consistency across units.
 - Another approach included using evaluations and including criteria.
 - Criteria can range from general to highly selective.
 - Depending on the approach, compensation may be low.

- Evaluation criteria will have to be changed
 - A regent professorship was proposed where they will be term limited.
 - It can be seen as a prestigious title with little financial impact or a promotional title that impacts salary
- It was stated that if this was used as a base builder, funds would have to come from a separate pool which is concerning.
 - If this is funded through the pool, retention will be impacted.
 - The distinguished professor title can be proposed but instead of using funds from the pool we recommend it being from a donor.
- It was suggested that the committee look into other models and how institutions award this title.
 - The CU system has over 100 distinguished professors.
- It was mentioned that Trustee Jordan thinks faculty who receive good comprehensive reviews should receive a compensation increase, which is separate from distinguished professor status.
- As a tenured professor DeKrey believes it would be nice to award those who are not tenured faculty to receive recognition for their good work.
 - Kyle suggests that the committee propose two parts, an increase for doing well and distinguished professor.
- It was stated that the funds are not available to implement this, and UNC is not in a position to consider this now.
 - A base salary increase is needed across faculty and should be the focus now.
- There is concern of a large influx if everyone can apply during the first year
 - Provost Fleming suggested phasing people in based on seniority
 - If too many professors receive the award, it loses its meaning of distinguished
- Landry suggests scheduling a meeting with the administration to determine a direction.
 - Where the main objective is to continue to reward productive faculty in all areas and recognize excellence.
 - We must determine why/goal?
 - How will this not negatively impact assistant or associate faculty?
- As for the evaluation committee, Senbet understands the need for a university wide committee but prefers keeping it within the unit.
 - There are concerns that a university wide committee could result in some sort of popularity contest.
 - Barkley stated that he does not want a full professor to be penalized for the mistakes the evaluation committees make.
 - Based on Landry's experience on the M. Lucille Harrison award committee he thought the university-wide committee worked very well.
- DeKrey stated that if the goal is not to take money from existing pools for the reward, the funds will have to be raised or reallocated.
- Questions to consider:
 - How do we create incentives or motivate faculty?
 - Will this be temporary or a base builder?
 - What is the purpose?
 - Will there be a term limit?
 - What makes it distinguished if 50 faculty get it every year?

- How do we distribute compensation? Will parity be affected?
 - They won't get a parity raise since their parity increases
 - Would this replace summer raises?
 - No, it'll be an addition.
 - Where would all this money come from?
 - How much money would be needed to be raised and to keep it going?
 - Funding would take a while and be difficult.
 - If we fundraise, we will need someone dedicated to this.
 - When funds are raised others may think it could be used in other areas.
 - How would a university wide committee be used, how would that be set up?
3. 3-3-902 Faculty salary bonus for award of Distinguished Professor title
 4. 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures

New Business

1. Regulatory compliance issues.
1. Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons
2. Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
3. Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
4. Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center
5. Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?

Completed Business

1. Revision of 2-3-801 on 4/14/2025 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.
1. Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.
2. Revision of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.
3. Revision of 2-3-305 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.

Transferred Business

1. Step-back policy – transferred to Salary Equity Committee
2. Amorous Relationship policy – now being considered by APC

Call to the Good of the Order

Thank you, Greg! Thank you, Brian! Thank you, Britney!

Adjournment 4:38pm