

**2015/2016 FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

FINAL

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: 11/11/15

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 __O__, Phyllis Horns, VCHS __X__, Mike Van Scott, Assoc VCRGS __X__, Alexandra Shlapentokh, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty __X__, Mary Gilliland, Fac Sen Rep __X__

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 10/28/2015 – unanimously approved
- III. Part II, Section IV: Discussion of draft presented by A. Morehead
Documents relative to this discussion in the SharePoint site:
[Part4Sec2 Suggested Edits](#)
 - Morehead: Concept is that rather than inventing new committees, library and other non-tenure-granting units will have a different definition of voting faculty.
 - Stiller: Need to clarify what it means to incorporate guidelines into the unit code by reference.
- IV. Part IX, Section I, Discussion of subcommittee (Maher, Montgomery, Justiniano, Morehead) work, revisions and approvals as appropriate
Documents relative to this discussion in the SharePoint site:
[Part IX edited November 5 without strikethroughs](#)
[PeerInstitutionInfoGOVcomm](#)
[ProgTenLettClean](#)

Specific changes in document from the subcommittee:

63: addresses Health Sciences concerns
379: adding clinical status as a reason to pause tenure clock.
388: Progress Towards Tenure
702, 766: due process language
1158: College P&T committees

Changes to the draft text from the subcommittee:

381: change from two years to three years
702, 766: add reference (from 970) to professional conduct section of Faculty Manual
1157: Strike “-wide.”
1168: “there shall be a sufficient number alternates to ensure that the committee always at least three members for reviews.”

Progress Toward Tenure Reviews:

Paragraph 1: change to “after the deadline for faculty members to turn in their annual reports”

Paragraph 1: distinguish meeting of chair and Tenure Cmte from meeting with candidate for annual goal setting and weighting.

Paragraph 2: add “The cumulative reviews should not include summative ratings such as ‘very good progress towards tenure’ or ‘unsatisfactory progress towards tenure.’”

Paragraph 2: strike “The committee’s” from the last sentence.

Paragraph 3: add professional conduct reference.

Ingalls: Possible conflict with UNC Code mandated fall meeting in Part IX, Line 116; Montgomery: No problem to have formative spring meeting, then have fall meeting as well. Ingalls will check to see if this fall meeting is indeed also required for fixed-term faculty.

Justiniano: Peer institutions generally don’t do formal progress towards tenure. Proposes not doing this in non-reappointment years.

Montgomery: Could fold PTT more closely into annual evaluation.

Morehead: Should still enable annual communication between unit administrator and tenure committee. Candidate turns in annual report. Unit admin and Tenure Cmte meet. Chair conveys what they hear during the annual evaluation meeting.

Montgomery: motion to table PTT discussion; subcommittee will bring back new language at the next meeting.

V. Part VIII, Section I, Subsection VIII.D presented by J. Stiller

Documents relative to this discussion in the SharePoint site:

[FERPA Buckley Waiver and Consent to Release Complaint \(to be used with SOP\) 11-6-15 \(00030429xD856D\)](#)
[Proposed changes to FM Section I Subsection VIII D](#)

Student complaints Task Force charge

Student complaints SOP

Stiller: How does university address student complaints, given FERPA? Files in which student identity is known to university are would not be “secret” or “anonymous.”

Morehead: Goal of this is to allow faculty members to see student complaints, redacted. Chair can still investigate complaint and may not need student complaint to substantiate sanctions.

Montgomery: How can data be shared by third parties within university in some cases (advising) and not others (student complaints)?

Payne: It depends what the record is used for. OK to share with advisors who need it to perform their job duties. Not ok to share with someone who needs it for personal gain.

Payne: Distinction between serious sanctions and reprimands. In case of serious sanctions in play, university has disclosed identity.

Maher: Sometimes have to talk to the student to figure out what the real issue is and what process he/she should follow.

Payne: Chair needs independent evidence.

Montgomery: In SOP, student gets notice if the complaint is not substantiated but not if it is?

Morehead: If complaint is substantiated, becomes part of personnel file and is protected.

Dotson-Blake: Need to protect due process while being serious about student complaints.

Stiller: Read carefully and we will discuss again at next meeting.

VI. Meeting adjourned, 4:58pm