

1) Welcome, approval of minutes, intro of new faculty

- Welcome and call to order:
 - Meeting called to order by CEFO President - Elect Aidan Browne. A. Browne/Glenda Mayo, the President, since she is ill.
 - Jim Conrad served as Parliamentarian.
 - There were 52 people in attendance.
 - Regina Vrikkis
 - Jim Conrad
 - Aidan Browne
 - Brett Tempest
 - Don Chen
 - Erika Weber
 - Jeff Raquet
 - Nicole Braxton
 - Thomas Nicholas
 - Erica Weber
 - Terry Xu
 - Asis Nasipuri
 - Harish Cherukuri
 - Ke Wang
 - Claudia Garrido
 - Arun Vishnu Suresh Babu
 - Valentina Cecchi
 - Mesbah Uddin
 - Ron Smelser
 - Terence Fagan
 - John L. Daniels
 - Olya Keen
 - Ed Morse
 - Kamia Smith
 - Ahmed El-Ghannam
 - Haitao Zhang
 - Abasifreke Ebong
 - Erina Joyee
 - Yamilka Baez-Rivera
 - Ed Morse
 - Courtney Smith Orr
 - Dipankar Maity
 - Linda Xie
 - Madhav Manjrekar
 - Simon Hsaing
 - Cathy Blat

- John Nettles
- Michelle Demers
- Ron Sass
- Sam Shu
- William Saunders
- Austin Fifield
- Nicole Barclay
- Maciej Noras
- Rob Keynton
- Yuting Chen
- Dan Latta
- Ke Wang
- Claudia Garrido
- Arun Vishnu Suresh Babu
- Sid Elvis
- Approval of minutes
- **Motion** made by Aidan Browne to approve the meeting minutes from December 2021 (presented by RVrikkis). The motion was carried unanimously.
- Introduction of new faculty
 - Ke Wang (ECE)
 - Claudia Garrido (ECTM)
 - Arun Vishnu Suresh Babu (ME)
 - Ugo Adewumi (Business Services Specialist)
 - Sid Elvis - Director of Leadership Academy

2) Dean's Report

- Report given by Dean Rob Keynton
- Update on Provost search (Dean is co chair of search)
 - Had about 80 applications
 - Narrowed to 13. One withdrew, so interviewed 12 via Zoom.
 - Now narrowed down to 4 candidates. Will be invited to campus (will be sometime in March - faculty encouraged to come to their seminars).
 - Pay Raises - 5% over two years was approved last December (faculty should have already seen the first 2.5%, with the next 2.5% to be reflected in July 2022). Also small discretionary funds for up to 5% maximum raises.
 - Staff letters going out today about any raises from the discretionary funds.

3) Committee reports

- CEAPCC (UG Curriculum) - all proposals have been reviewed by committee members quickly and decisions (all positive) forwarded through the Curriculog system

4) Campus Mask Policy

- This is an opportunity for the College of Engineering Faculty to weigh-in on this policy. In short:
 - Mecklenburg County has eliminated a mask mandate.
 - UNC Charlotte instituted their own mask mandate.

- It was claimed the faculty want a classroom mask mandate, but as of today, no faculty we have talked to were consulted/asked. (The student body president was in the meeting and expressed concern that faculty were being claimed to have been represented)
- The resolution offered today says:
 - We do not want a mask mandate for classrooms
 - We support the Mecklenburg County Guidelines (certain populations are urged to continue wearing masks)
- We still have to abide to University Policy, but we wish to make our voices heard (and the decision not be made for us)

- Resolution:

Whereas Mecklenburg County commissioners voted on February 16 to end the requirement for indoor face coverings effective February 26 [1]; and

Whereas on February 17 UNC Charlotte announced via NinerNotice that effective February 26 “The University will continue requiring masks in specific, limited areas — classrooms, Atkins Library, the Student Health Center, on NinerTransit and at indoor gatherings” [2]; and

Whereas UNC Charlotte Faculty President said at the February 16 UNC Charlotte Board of Trustees Meeting “... I want to make sure the board knew that the faculty support the continued use of masks in the classroom for the remainder of the semester ...” [3]; and

Whereas the UNC Charlotte Faculty Council has not yet discussed and voted on the faculty’s desire to support the continued use of masks in the classroom;

Therefore, be it resolved that the UNC Charlotte College of Engineering Faculty Organization hereby formally notifies the UNC Charlotte Faculty Council, the UNC Charlotte Administration, and the UNC Charlotte Board of Trustees that the College of Engineering faculty DO NOT support the requirement for wearing masks in classroom and urges the University to eliminate the requirement for wearing masks in classroom effective immediately.

Further, be it resolved that the UNC Charlotte College of Engineering Faculty Organization supports the Mecklenburg County guidelines for mask usage as described on their webpage [3].

[1] Mecklenburg County Website,

<https://www.mecknc.gov/news/Pages/COVID-19-Response-2.0-Public-Health-Rule-for-Indoor-Face-Coverings-Ends-Feb.-26.aspx>

[2] NinerNotice email, February 17, 9:02 am, Subject: NinerNotice: Update on Campus COVID-19 Safety Protocols.

[3] YouTube Recording, UNC Charlotte Board of Trustees Meeting, February 16, 2022, Timestamp appx 1:09:30 to 1:10:00

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q64sFRdql6E&t=4178s>).

- **Move** made by Jim Conrad to adopt this. Seconded it.
- Asis Nasipuri clarified that it says (1) it has not been discussed with us *and* (2) masks are not required.
- Harish Cherukuri voiced strong concern that we shouldn't adopt it due to (i) mixed messages and (2) immunocompromised faculty members. He also wanted to make sure that, upon sharing the results of a vote with the university administration, that the numbers of yays and nays are also shared.
- Jeff Daniels personally supports the resolution to be consistent with the county resolutions to avoid sending mixed messages.
- Ed Morse - We have a fair amount of autonomy in the classroom, but many of us feel like the effectiveness is decreased. He suggested that the faculty, if they do not feel comfortable, ask students to mask, and if they do not want to mask, that they sit in the back.
- Olya Keen asked if we make it a *classroom policy* even if the university gets rid of the mandate.

- Vote:
 - Yes - 21, we do support this
 - No - 18, we do not support this
 - Abstain - 4
 - Will not pass.....

5) Policy document review

- Document currently contains original (i.e. existing in 2019) College policies as well as those developed by some of the Policy Committees during 2020-21 year
- Where holes exist, document being backfilled with existing policies in Colleges of Business, Computing and Informatics, Education and Health and Human Services
- Final Draft will be released to College Faculty March 7th for 3-week review.
 - This includes Standing Committee and individual review
- Feedback will be processed by Excom with assistance from Policy Committee members
- Updated Draft will be presented to Faculty at April 19th CEFO meeting for consideration of recommendation to the Dean (along with unresolved feedback, if necessary)

6) Discussion - Tenure requirements

- Presented by Jim Conrad

Category	Per year target	Reappt target	Tenure target
Research \$			
Proposals			
Conf papers			
Journal papers			
H-score			
MS students			
PhD students			
Teaching			
Service - Dept			
Service - College			
Service - Univ			
Service - Outside			
Collegiality			

- As we think about modifying policy, what feels right to the Faculty?

- Should we have specific guidelines for promotion across the college? Is it worth it to set specific criteria at the college level? Septic evaluations of teaching and service? Number of promotions? Number of articles published?
- There are advantages and disadvantages to putting metrics targets against performance criteria - which way do we want to go?
- Ed Morse - Understand how it can be useful, but worry, especially about collegiality. Putting numbers on things is how we ended up with ABET. Relying too heavily on bean counting.
- BTempest thinks it would be helpful in terms of career guidance, but thinks it might hinder faculty ability to argue their case in other ways.
- Ed Morse also thought it would have been helpful in terms of career guidance as a junior faculty. Might be better to give *examples* of what other faculty have done to get promotion
- Wesley Williams agreed it would have been helpful for career guidance.
- It was suggested to have Legal dept look at it
- Harish Cherukuri did not think the number of conference/journal requirements will not be helpful...
- Mesbah Uddin noticed *mentoring* of senior design projects and undergraduates is not on the list. Also expressed concern that there are ways to 'game' the systems as far as H scores go.
- Dean likes the *list* of items and *suggestions* about range of performance for each of those topics. But allowing quite a bit of flexibility, and would like to leave it in the hands of the chair.

7) Discussion - Non-tenure requirements

- Presented by RVrikkis
- Currently, the criteria for promotion between associate and full teaching professor are relatively vague, with the exception of the time requirement.
- One thing that is not laid out in writing officially across the board for all NTT faculty is the realms of responsibility.
- At present, NTT contracts are relatively vague, with only the wording "mutually agreed upon realms of responsibility". Our committee would like to see the addition of a template form with the contract to specifically define responsibilities for non-tenured track faculty and the time dedicated to each.
- This would be particularly good to have for Annual Reviews to show whether the faculty member has distinction in or has outstanding performance in those realms of responsibility.
- It also clarifies expectations for more nebulous things like service. Is serving on one committee expected, or three? Is there a distinction made between leading on a committee and just serving on one?
- Having clearly defined expectations gives us some qualitative metric to work towards, and shows when we exceed those expectations. In that way would help faculty show how responsibilities have grown over time, and make the argument for promotion more clearly.

8) Closing

- Watch for CEFO Excom and Committee nominations coming in March
- Excom and some standing committees held College-wide
- Some standing committees elect a representative at the Department level