

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE
CC Room 2200
Wednesday, August 23rd, 2023 | 3:30-5:00PM
Minutes

Present: Barkley, Brown, DeKrey, Garrett, Landry, Pullen, Senbet, Wieben
Present via Zoom: du Bray, Iannacchione, Sileo, Wiegand

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:42 pm.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved without objection.

Approval of April 26th 2023, meeting minutes

The minutes were approved without objection.

Chair's Report/Announcements:

- **Welcome back!**
- **Introductions of members.**
- This is an important committee that reviews policies affecting faculty and makes recommendations to revise said policies.
 - Today we will prioritize our committee goals for the year.
 - I would like to focus on issues that will bring faculty together.
 - Jeri Lyons will be our guest at our meeting on September 6th to talk about the policy related to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members conducting research at UNC.
 - Jeri (purportedly) said, “This applies to faculty applying for research grants,” stating the situation was urgent; a policy had to be implemented by the end of July to retain ORSP grant funds.
 - One of the conditions of the policy is “termination of employment” if the faculty does not comply with the policy.
 - Chair Brown would like to prioritize this issue.

Special Orders

- None

Unfinished Business

- **Continued discussion of tenure-track contract language revision of 2-3-202(3):**
 - DeKrey suggested “suspending” the issue until later.
 - MOTION: There is a motion to suspend the tenure-track contract language revision discussion.
 - Landry firsts, Pullen seconds. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

- Pullen stated NIH grant-funded research without a data management sharing plan will not be accepted, and there is no guidance provided by UNC's Office of Research.
 - Pullen was unable to locate the policy on the UNC website.
 - Consider a future motion looking at UNC's federal research policy issues.
 - It was suggested to consider suspending sections of the policy.
- **The setting of the semester's agenda and priority rankings (see handout on possible topics)**
 - Iannacchione suggested looking at the academic calendar vs. calendar year and faculty review periods within the first year of teaching.
 - A suggestion was made to change the timing of first review.
- **Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research (RECP) Policy (Policy Documents attached)**
 - ~~MOTION: There is a motion to suspend the RECP policy.~~
 - ~~DeKrey firsts, Senbet seconds. The motion passed unanimously. (Note – this was a mistake in the record. There was no motion to suspend any ORSP policy. The only motion concerned our work on the tenure track policy. Fixed by Jeff Brown after our Sept 6th meeting when this mistake was made.).~~
 - The language is overbroad and extremely vague: Does this policy pertain to all federal grants? What about state and private grants?
 - The policy must comply with the Board Policy Manual (BPM), especially regarding taking disciplinary action.
 - Training is always required to conduct research.
 - UNC paid for an audit with OSRP; the report would be helpful for this committee.
 - Consider generating a list of questions for Jeri, to be given in advance.
 - Landry asked what happens when a policy is written by an area of UNC that does not go through the Faculty Senate approval process.
 - This instance will be the exception!
 - Consider amending BPM to include the necessity of the faculty governance process and making policies available to faculty.
 - Chair Brown to create a list of questions for Jeri and circulate to committee members.
 - A suggestion was made to “educate” faculty about the faculty governance process.
- Landry suggested looking at **the Director of a School**.
- Pullen suggested looking at the **Consistency of Grading Policies** (+, -, etc.), but this may be a policy more appropriate for the Academic Policies Committee.
- Landry suggested looking at 2-3-801(3) **Comprehensive Review Procedures**, the size of comprehensive evaluation committees for small departments and programs.
 - There is a history of concern over faculty conducting the evaluation, being in your discipline.

- DeKrey offered Biology as an example of many different disciplines within the School of Biology, but faculty can still conduct effective and fair faculty evaluations.
 - Consider forming one or more multi-program coalitions.
 - It was suggested to offer faculty multiple options of who or what body would evaluate them.
 - Could identify an outside faculty rep (from R2 institution) to get involved but concerns were raised over funding outside faculty.
 - If serving on a grant with someone in another area, could they be a coalition member?
 - Consider Emeritus Faculty members for faculty evaluations (BPM would need revision).
- Could student evaluations be advisory opinions? How much weight should they have?
 - Consider Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) in faculty, but need to balance this with student DEI.
 - What are best practices in faculty evaluations?
 - Look closely at evaluation instruments.
 - BPM states all evaluations shall be included; should we amend?
 - What are individual departments doing?
 - Some units may have already developed a way... For example, using 25% of student evaluations in faculty evaluations.
 - Some faculty may prefer to keep their student evaluations of instruction in their own teaching evaluation.
 - Who actually has the authority to generate questions on course evaluations?
- Barkley suggested looking at the issue of **Chair pay** (SEC).
- Garrett suggested a **Code of Conduct Policy Short of Dismissal**.
 - Concerns were raised about overwriting bad policy just for the sake of having a policy in place vs. having no policy at all.
 - Offer a way to make a “course correction” before getting to the termination level.

Comments to the Good of the Order: None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.