

## **COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FACULTY ORGANIZATION (CEFO) MEETING MINUTES Tuesday, April 21st, 2026**

The meeting was called to order at 11:40 AM.

**Location:** EPIC G287

**Attendance** The following individuals were recorded as present via signature on the attendance sheets:

Abhyankar, Rohini, Abu El Ela, Ahmed, Agarwal, Ankit, Aidan Browne, Aivars Vilguts, Alam, Minhaj, Amengonu, Yawo, Arafah, Ahmed, Asis Nasipuri, Benny Rodriguez-Medina, Brett Tempest, Carlos González-Calderon, Christoph Kossack, Christopher Green, Conrad, Jim, Courtney Smith-Orr, Cox, Robert, Demers, Michelle, Dinar, Mahmoud, Dipanker Maity, Edward Morse, El-Ghannam, Ahmed, Falaggis, Kosta, Fan, Wei, Fifield, Austin, Gaitas, Angelo, Gao, Zheming, Glenn Moglen, Hsling, Simon, Jaewon Oh, Jaime Berez, Jeff Raquet, Joshua Dickenson, Joy, Soumitra, Junqiu Wang, Keen, Olya, Keles, Ozgur, Kevin Lawton, Kevin Lindsay, Khan, Safeer, Lim, Churlzu, Lingguang Song, Lisa Lattimore, Loweth, Robert, Lynnora Grant, Ma, Lin, Maria Guimaraes, Meg Harkins, Mei Sun, Mundy, Edgar, Nettles, John, Newell, David, Nicole Braxtan, Pan, Fenglian, Parvinnezhad Hokmabadi, Mohammad, Pulugurtha, Srinivas, Ramaprabhu, Praveen, Rasanen, Ryan, Regina Vrikkis, Rodriguez-Medina, Blivenido, Ron Smelser, Sass, Ron, Sheldon Xie, Sherman Mumford, Shue, Sam, Sid Alvis, Smith, Michael, Stover, Tyler, Valentina Cecchi, Wang, Ke, Westbrook, Matt, Whelan, Matthew, Wu, Artur, Xie, Linda, Yarbrough, David, Yi Cao, Yamilka Baez, Zhang, HaiTao, Zhu, Lei

**Welcome**

**President's Remarks**

**Constitutional Amendment**

**Policy for the Reappointment and Promotion of Special Faculty Lines**

**Announcements**

**Adjourn**

**Welcome and Approval of March 17th meeting minutes**

- There was a change in the agenda, and the amended agenda was adopted.
- The minutes from the March 17th meeting were approved unanimously.

**President's Remarks**

- COFE committee's selection
  1. Executive Leadership Transition: Maciej Noras will become President next year.
  2. Election for CFO & University Committees; All full-time faculty can apply (Teaching, Special Appointment).

**Constitutional Amendment**

- Proposed Constitutional Amendment:
  1. Goal: To update the definition of "Department" in Article 1, Section 3, item (f) of the CEFO Constitution.
- Department Changes:

1. Change: The Department of Systems Engineering and Engineering Management to The Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering
  2. Add: Albert School of Construction.
- Approval Threshold: Adopting the amendment requires a 2/3 majority vote from the faculty.
  - Voting Method: The vote will be conducted electronically via a Google Form managed by the CEFO Executive Committee (ExCom).

### **Policy for the Reappointment and Promotion of Special Faculty Lines**

- Committee Progress & Objective: The committee has completed a 28-page draft report (distributed last week).
- Goal: To design a formal policy for special faculty (representing over 35% of college faculty) that recognizes diverse roles and contributions to the College of Engineering mission.
- The "Growth in Scope" Framework:
  1. Promotions are based on an expanding "scope of impact" rather than just time in rank.
  2. Assistant: Focus on excellence within the classroom and laboratory.
  3. Associate: Impact shifts toward the Department and College levels (mentoring, leading committees).
  4. Full Professor: Achievement of extramural impact (regional, national, or international recognition).
- Key Policy Highlights:
  1. Merit-Based: Promotion is based on achievement; time in rank (e.g., 6 years for Assistant, 5 for Associate) serves as a guideline, not a fixed requirement.
  2. Job Security: Reappointment is independent of promotion; faculty can be reappointed indefinitely at their current rank per Provost guidelines.
  3. 5-Year Work Plans: Highly recommended for special faculty to document multi-year efforts in research or professional development.
- Proposed Review Process & Committees:
  1. Two College-Level Committees- Research Committee: Reviews Research Professors and Research-focused Professors of Practice.
  2. Two College-Level Committees- Teaching Committee: Reviews Lecturers, Teaching Professors, and Teaching-focused Professors of Practice.
- Committee Membership: Must be populated by senior-ranking faculty (Senior Lecturers, Associate, or Full Professors) via faculty elections, with a priority on special faculty.
- Review Levels: Includes Department/Unit head review, College-level peer review, and final administrative review by the Dean's Office.
- External Letters: Required only for promotion from Associate to Full Professor; not required for the Assistant-to-Associate level.
- Next Steps:
  1. Feedback Phase: The committee is currently seeking high-level and line-item feedback from faculty.
  2. Qualtrics: Feedback will be collected via survey for those unable to attend the meeting.

3. Revision: The committee will incorporate feedback into an updated version for the next faculty meeting.

## **Q&A about Policy**

- Olya Keen:  
Q: Will these promotions be handled by the regular RPT (Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure) committee?  
A: No. Since special faculty are generally not permitted to serve on the tenure-track RPT committees, the college is proposing two new elected College-Level committees (one for Research and one for Teaching). This allows special faculty to be evaluated by a committee of their peers who understand their specific workload.
- Asis Nasipuri:  
Q: Is it fair to require "national or international recognition" for a teaching professor who focuses on internal foundational courses?  
A: This is a point of ongoing debate. The committee's framework suggests that while "Assistant" focuses on the classroom and "Associate" focuses on the College, a "Full Professor" should eventually have an extramural impact (e.g., professional organizations like ASEE). However, the committee clarified that the Lecturer series (Lecturer to Senior Lecturer) does not require this external impact, whereas the Professor series does.  
  
Q: Can the College add its own "scholarship" or "external" criteria that aren't in the University's general rank definitions?  
A: Faculty cautioned against "redefining" roles. The committee noted that while the University provides broad definitions, the Provost explicitly tasks colleges with defining the progression requirements and "competencies" necessary for advancement within their specific disciplines.
- Austin Fifield:
  1. Excellence in the classroom and positive student impact should be the baseline requirement for reappointment, not the primary justification for promotion.
  2. Promotion should require faculty to look beyond the classroom and engage at the department, college, or university levels.
  3. There are many avenues for lecturers to expand their influence, such as advising student organizations, attending conferences, handling administrative duties, or developing new programs (e.g., first-year initiatives).
  4. Removing the requirement for service/extra-classroom impact lowers the bar for promotion and is viewed as "not very collegiate." Promotion should be reserved for those whose scope of influence grows over time.
- Aidan Browne:
  1. Q: How do we avoid the policy becoming outdated if University rules change?  
A: Faculty recommended that the committee reference or link to the University and Charlotte Academic Handbooks rather than duplicating the text. This ensures the college policy stays in sync with university-level changes automatically.
  2. Q: How will committee members be selected?  
A: Per the Provost's recent direction, these committees can no longer be "ad-hoc" groups

appointed by a Chair. They must be constituted through faculty elections. Priority will be given to special faculty of the appropriate rank, but tenured faculty are eligible to serve if no suitable special faculty are available.

3. Q: Is "classroom excellence" enough for a promotion?

A: Some faculty argued strongly that being good in the classroom is simply the requirement for reappointment. To be promoted, a faculty member should be required to demonstrate growth in their scope of influence (e.g., service, mentoring, or program development), as anything less would not be "collegiate."

- **Robert Loweth:**

1. Q: Do I have to be doing all the Associate-level work to get promoted from Assistant? A: No. The design is that you excel in your current "column" (Assistant) and demonstrate emerging capabilities at the next level. The promotion itself is what officially shifts your job description to the higher requirements.

2. Q: When exactly does my job change? A: At the time of promotion. The promotion acts as a "new appointment" at a higher rank with a corresponding increase in the scope of expectations.

3. Q: Who decides which specific tasks I should be doing at the higher rank? A: These are determined by the Workload Policy agreed upon by the faculty member and their unit lead (Chair). This ensures the promotion remains tied to the actual needs and roles of the department.

- **Maciej Noras**

1. Q: How will the external review process function, and who will serve as the reviewers for candidates seeking promotion?

A: The list of external reviewers will be compiled collaboratively by the Unit Lead (Chair) and the Candidate. For teaching faculty, potential reviewers will be identified through the candidate's extramural impacts.

A: The committee noted that this requirement is not unique; other colleges, such as CCI (College of Computing and Informatics), already require external letters.

### **Adjournment**

- A motion to adjourn was made and adopted.
- The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 PM.