

2015/2016 FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Final

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: 10/14/15

REGULAR MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Eleanor Cook X, Kylie Dotson-Blake X, Edson Justiniano X, Derek Maher X, Marianne Montgomery X, Andrew Morehead X, Jonathan Morris X, John Stiller X

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Doriann Dennison, Chancellor's Rep X, Ron Mitchelson, Provost / VCAA X, Phyllis Horns, VCHS X, Mike Van Scott, Assoc VCRGS O, Alexandra Shlapentokh, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty X, Mary Gilliland, Fac Sen Rep O

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: *Linda Ingalls, Lori Lee, Donna Payne*

PERSON PRESIDING: Dotson-Blake

ACTIONS OF MEETING

- I. Meeting called to order: 3:05pm
- II. Approval of minutes of 9/22/2015 – unanimously approved
- III. Part IX, Section II, Memo related to post-tenure review
 - GA required revision: added sentence about provost responsibility for certifying review process compliance. Ingalls: University attorney authorized to update policy for UNC policy compliance and report change to Board of Trustees without additional vetting.
Motion: Take to Senate for informational purposes and discussion. Chancellor's final acceptance of resolution should note mandatory changes from GA after it passed through Senate. Motion by Morehead, seconded Maher. Unanimously approved.
 - Policy implementation strategy discussion – memo from Mitchelson and Stiller (PTR revised policy implementation strategy 10_8_2015)
Add sentence: "Faculty should use the attached guidelines and form."
 - Additional information that might be helpful: Performance Review Standards ~ <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/uc/performanceview.pdf>
 - Issue of whether PTR criteria need to be in unit codes. Needs to be addressed in "use of guidelines" section on unit codes to include criteria. Morehead: Criteria need to be vetted. Units should not be able to change tenure or PTR criteria without vetting.
Morehead will draft language that FGC can send to UCSC.
- IV. Subcommittee Report Part IX Section I (Marianne, Derek, Nelson, Andrew)
Documents relative to this discussion in the SharePoint site:
 - [Part IX edited September 23 2015](#)
 - [Part IX edited April 8 2015](#)

Key topics relative to the revision of Part IX:

- **Electronic voting:** person has to have been present for meeting and reviewed PAD. Would need tool for secure electronic voting.

- **Should votes be disclosed?** – tabled, look at best practices (Dotson-Blake’s GA will compile data)
- **George Bailey’s concern about having progress towards tenure every year;** should we just have them every two years, through considering the reappointment process; what sort of evaluation can we have during non-reappointment years; could we have the P&T chair involved in end of year meeting to provide feedback to the candidate from the committee that will be voting on tenure.
 - Morehead: suggests calling them “mentoring letters,” describing what the candidate is doing well and what they’re not doing so well. Evaluative language, formative, giving advice.
 - Stiller: Doing this well is effectively a reappointment decision every year; add chair of personnel to annual eval process.
 - Montgomery: This could lead to inconsistent annual evals across department.
 - Justiniano: favors PTT only in reappointment years.
 - Morehead: Is there value (worth the effort) to annual feedback? How do we construct such a document to avoid property right issue? Is it still coupled with annual evaluations?
 - Maher: Mentorship meeting yearly.
 - Ingalls: Could incorporate this feedback into section on unit administrator meeting with candidate or into Part VIII as another form of evaluation.
 - Straw poll: majority of the committee wants formalized annual feedback.
 - Justiniano: Mandate candidate presentation to the tenure committee and unit administrator.
 - Morehead: Off-year candidate turns in cumulative report and self-evaluation, evaluated by tenure committee, chair or designated representative of tenure committee and unit admin meet with candidate in April, meeting documented with points addressed.
- College-wide P&T committee
 - Justiniano: Just enabling language, usually followed by unit code specifications, but how does this apply to school/college that is not constituted as code unit?
 - Horns: College-wide advisory committee works well in Brody to give dean needed advice.
 - Straw poll: majority supports.
 - Need to think about rank, P&T in various small departments
 - Morris: if college committee is just advisory, why shouldn’t someone vote twice (in department and in college)?
 - Mitchelson: it’s all advisory up to chancellor/BoT

V. Meeting adjourned, 4:58pm