

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

**Campus Commons 2200**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM**

Present: Brown, English, Landry, Lee, Levin, Lunaris, Newman, Senbet, Sileo, Wieben

Zoom: Morse

Absent: Alcantar, Kang

**Call to Order 3:34pm**

**Approval of Agenda approved without objection**

**Approval of August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection**

### **Chair's Report/Announcements**

- Comments from the Provost Office on 1-1-307 and 2-3-801.
- 2-3-801
  - Accept strikethrough
- 2-3-801(1)(d)
  - It is important to be specific with the type of review a faculty member will undergo.
    - Depending on the type of review, certain faculty can or cannot serve on the evaluation committee, which should be clarified.
    - It was suggested to have subpoints under the actual definition.
  - It was suggested inserting “eligible faculty” that can serve on these committees,
    - Eligible faculty will then have to be defined.
    - Brown will review other parts of the Board Policy Manual (BPM) to determine the composition of the committees and reference it where needed.
  - Contract renewable faculty are restricted on which type of evaluation committee they serve on.
  - It was suggested to insert two separate sections about the composition of a) subperiod review committee and b) comprehensive review committee.
  - Is there a reason that non-tenure track faculty should ever be on a program level evaluation committee?
    - They can provide input.
  - It was stated that in some cases units are very small and have more contract renewable faculty than tenure/tenure track, so they won't have enough people on the committee.
    - However, the committee for someone applying for tenure would have to be comprised of tenure faculty outside if the unit

- 2-3-801(1)(e)
  - To address the provost's comment, "the provides reasons, evidence, and impacts that align with the units/program area's approved evaluation criteria" was added to part (1) of the Dossier definition.
    - Revised section, "... Dossier shall include (1) a narrative of accomplishments during the review period that provides reasons, evidence, and impacts that align with the unit's/program area's approved evaluation criteria;"
  - Since Sileo evaluates the dossiers for evaluations, she thinks this is a critical piece for Senate to share with incoming faculty to help them understand that the narrative of accomplishments adds to their portfolio.
- 2-3-801(1)(h)
  - Move 2-3-801(1)(h), Program Area definition above the definition of School.
- 2-3-801(1)(i)
  - It is important to know that there are departments that have multiple programs.
  - It'll be nice to see the difference between department and schools but that can complicate things.
  - I response to the provost questions, a department, by definitions, has only one program area, which can be multidisciplinary.
  - It was suggested to switch the order of g, h, and i.
    - Based on the definitions it looked like department and school are defined around program area, program area should go first
    - Move 2-3-801(1)(h), Program Area definition above the definition of School.
  - English stated that generally definitions are organized alphabetically
    - It was clarified that the definitions were organized this way in current language and FWC kept it that same.
- It was suggested that the committee review and address common issues that the Tenure Appeals Committee faces, along with the Grievance committee
- 2-3-801(1)(n)
  - Insert ", service" after "Teaching"
  - Questions to consider:
    - Is there an example of how service can be multidisciplinary?
    - Would there be a problem excluding "service"?
  - Clarification on the use of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary is needed
    - It was suggested to delete (n)
      - Flag for deletion, unless it clarifies something later
      - It was shared that before codification was working on this section before FWC asked them to pause their review.
        - Lee will share the revisions that codification made.
  - It was noted that (n) should be removed, unless it clarifies something later in the policy.
    - This will be flagged for deletion.
- 2-3-801(1)(p)
  - The concern in this part is that there is scoring done by the unit chair, dean, and CAO in addition to the score given by the program level committee.

- In this part clarification is needed.
  - “unit leader” covers chairs and directors
    - Remove “chair”
  - For clarification, does the dean assign a score if they agree with the program area?
    - It was clarified that if the faculty evaluation committee gives one score that is matched by the unit lead and adheres to the criteria deans do not score.
    - If there is disagreement between the two or one or both do not adhere to criteria regardless of scores matching, deans score.
    - This is mentioned on page 8, however it’s not a score but an opinion.
      - The system makes deans assign a score.
    - Regardless of any disagreement or not, scores move forward to the provost’s office.
  - Replace “and” with “or” since (p) is only defining evaluation score and not indicating who can and cannot assign scores.
- 2-3-801(2)
  - Brown clarified that language must be clear on who is able to receive a comprehensive review or subperiod review.
    - Currently it is saying any faculty member can receive a comprehensive review.
  - Brown shared an example of a faculty member with a one-year contract that will not be renewed. They are entitled to a subperiod review, not comprehensive.
    - It was clarified that subperiod reviews are done prior to comprehensive reviews, meaning that they must be eligible for the comprehensive review.
  - Paragraph 3
    - The concern is that the result of comprehensive review is the sole basis of promotion or satisfactory performance when it is really a recommendation.
      - It was suggested to change “decisions” to “recommendations”
      - It was argued that it is in fact a decision about the pre-tenure review or promotion, not the decision about employment.
    - Since this paragraph does not mention anything about employment, there is no need for any changes.
      - Once cleaned up Sileo will convey the reason for not changing this paragraph.
  - Paragraph 4
    - Brown suggests removing the last sentence of the paragraph and strengthen the “collegiality” sentence.
    - It was clarified that collegiality cannot serve as its own evidence.
    - If it was proposed to remove the last sentence, why not remove the last two sentences?
      - There were a few grievances and violations that occurred before.
    - Collegiality may not be used as its own category within the evaluation criteria but could be considered.

- If UNC is adhering to what the AAUP states, then that is what needs to be written.
  - Brown can share the most current AAUP language.
- It was shared negative collegiality is usually not under instruction.

## Special Orders

1. None

## New Business

1. OSRP meeting?
2. New Business from last year:
  - Regulatory compliance issues.
  - Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons (status?)
  - Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
  - Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
  - Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center!?!
  - Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?

## Unfinished Business (from last year)

1. Revisions to 2-3-801 and 1-1-307
2. 3-3-902 Faculty salary bonus for award of Distinguished Professor title
3. 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures

## Completed Business (as of last academic year)

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

## Transferred Business (as of last academic year)

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

## Call for the Good of the Order

Adjournment 4:58pm