

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

Remote Meeting - Zoom

December 02, 2020 – 3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Anderson, Applegate, Brown, DeKrey, Doerner, Endres, Leek, Luger, Peterson, Stoody, Zimmerman

**Absent:** Black, Blatt, Schaberl, Wiegand

**Guest:** Feinstein

#### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:31pm.

#### **Approval of the Agenda**

Approved with change of order to discuss the RSCW Misconduct policy first under unfinished business.

#### **Approval of the November 18, 2020 meeting minutes**

Approved without objection.

#### **Chair's Report/Announcements (Luger)**

- The President join us at 4:15pm to discuss term conversion.
- Brown sent along a message concerning the promotion of non-tenure track faculty.
- Codification and Satriana have worked on revisions to the faculty grievance policy; one important change will be specifying who can listen to the audio recording of the hearing.

#### **Special Orders**

#### **Unfinished Business**

- **Contract-Renewable Faculty 3-3-201(1)**
  - Welcome to Andy to discuss term conversion. The committee reviewed the changes made to the proposed policy revision since receiving Andy's memo with questions/items for consideration.
    - The primary issue Andy raised is concern about open positions being placed without a search.
    - Endres expressed strong support of the proposal because it allows qualified contract-renewable faculty the opportunity to move into a tenure-track position without wasting time and money on sham searches.
      - He noted a long-standing issue at UNC of hiring overqualified people for contract-renewable roles when tenure-track roles were not available.

- Leek spoke in support of the proposal as a pathway to escape the ‘adjunctification’ of higher education; it’s a way for the University to honor the commitment of loyal employees.
  - Anderson noted that UNC has many contract-renewable faculty members doing workloads equivalent to tenure-track faculty.
- The term conversion policy is intended for situations where the existing contract-renewable position is converted to a tenure-track position.
  - It is not intended for use to fill new tenure-track lines.
  - It is for qualified UNC contract-renewable faculty who meet the criteria to move into a new – but not additional – tenure-track line.
    - The former contract-renewable role would disappear.
- The major difference between the current policy and the proposed policy is the removal of the requirement that the contract-renewable faculty member must have been initially hired through a national search in order to be eligible for conversion.
- The conversion is not automatic; it is a means through which a contract-renewable faculty member may petition for conversion to tenure-track.
  - As the proposal is currently written, the petition process must involve review/approval of the voting faculty, the Chair/Director, and the Dean.
- Years of credit toward tenure, promotion, and/or sabbatical leave would be negotiated; rank is intentionally left unaddressed in the proposed policy.
- **RSCW Misconduct Policy Revisions**
  - Codification provided a clearer version of the RSCW Misconduct policy revisions based on the current published policy.
  - Fix numbering sequence in 3-8-102(4) – add missing “0”
  - Change remaining instances of “his/her” to “their”

MOTION: DeKrey – It is moved to accept the Codification edits and correct any stylistic mistakes.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- The current 3-8-102(4)(d) specifies who is notified when there is a decision not to initiate an inquiry.
- Revise 3-8-102(4)(d) to read: “The RIO shall inform the Complainant(s), the Respondent(s), and the DO whether or not an inquiry will be initiated.”

MOTION: DeKrey – It is moved to accept the revision to 3-8-102(4)(d).

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- In response to Schuttler’s comment in 3-8-102(6)(k) asking about Registered Mail, the committee decided to keep the Registered Mail requirement as it is currently written.

- Registered mail provides a guaranteed date of receipt, unlike an e-mail notification (for which only the date sent can be confirmed).
- In response to Schuttler's comment in 3-8-102(6)(j)(iii)(D) asking about the timing of identifying the Respondent(s) responsible for the RSCW Misconduct, the committee considered whether this should be done earlier.
  - When there are multiple authors/collaborators, it may not be immediately clear who is responsible for the misconduct.

MOTION: Peterson – It is moved to change the order of the clause from (D) to (A) and renumber the subsection appropriately.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

MOTION: DeKrey – It is moved to approve the policy as amended.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- We will plan to bring the RSCW Misconduct policy revision forward to the next Senate meeting.

## **New Business**

## **Other New Business**

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm.

Stan Luger  
Chair

Betsy Kienitz  
Recording Secretary