2014/2015 FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE:

Final

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: 02112015

REGULAR MEMBERS (_X_ IN ATTENDANCE):
Nelson Cooper _X_, Eleanor Cook _X_, Kylie Dotson-Blake _X_, Derek Maher, _O_, Marianne Montgomery _O_, Andrew Morehead _X_, Catherine Rigsby _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_, Qin Ding, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty _X_, Mary Gilliland, Fac Sen Rep _X_

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Linda Ingalls, Donna Payne

PERSON PRESIDING: Cooper

ACTIONS OF MEETING

I. Meeting called to order: 3:05pm

II. Approval of minutes of 1/21/14 – unanimous

III. Part IX, Section II
   a. Discussion within the committee
      i. Ingalls suggested considering the deletion of the sentence that talks about the June 24, 1997 memorandum as it is less relevant except as history. After discussion, the committee determined to retain it in the document as it is currently written.
   b. Morehead moved that Part IX, Section II be moved to Faculty Senate for review and deliberation
      c. Seconded by Stiller
      d. Passed Unanimously

IV. Unit Code Screening Committee
   a. Cooper shared a memo from the Chair of the Unit Code Screening Committee requesting advice from the Faculty Governance Committee regarding the proposed codes from Academic Library Services and from Laupus Library.
   b. Morehead provided additional information about the proposed changes
      i. One issue is the proposal from the libraries to establish a fixed term faculty appointment committee
         1. This issue appears to establish a sub-committee of the personnel committee
      ii. The second issue is the proposed position titles requested by the libraries
      iii. Morehead suggested that a clear way to move forward is to suggest that the Unit Code Committee approve the proposed Code as a provisional code that would allow the Libraries to continue to move forward with hiring and administrative processes
         1. Rigsby stated that this is a practical suggestion that would allow the library faculty to move forward with hiring and other decisions while allowing time for the Faculty Governance committee and Faculty Senate to finalize revisions of the Faculty Manual
         2. Ingalls asked if it would be possible to supplement the Provisional Code idea with an interpretation of the faculty manual provided by the Chair of the Faculty and the Provost
         3. Ingalls also added that a sub-committee is allowed to have members outside of the parent committee so this should allow for the Provisional Code to designate a sub-committee.
         4. Morehead stated that the libraries have followed the process, including having had a Code Unit Proposal Committee and they could operate for up to 18 months under a Provisional Code and this would allow the libraries to move forward while Part VIII and Part IX are being finalized without additional interpretation of the Faculty Manual by the Chair of the Faculty or the Provost
iv. After discussion, the governance committee recommends to the Unit Code Screening Committee that the current codes being considered be forwarded as provisional codes to EPP, this will enable time for Faculty Governance and Faculty Senate to make changes to the faculty manual while also allowing faculty of the libraries to move forward with hiring and other business in the interim.

1. Once Governance and Faculty Senate finalize Parts VIII and IX, the codes from Academic Library Services and from Laupus Library will need to come back through the Unit Code Screening Committee for review and to be finalized.

V. Review of Tenured Faculty 5 year plan
a. Reviewed this at the previous meeting
b. Rigsby shared the history of this process and policy, explaining that it was required by the UNC Board of Governors and that the proposed document was based upon the North Carolina State University version of the five year plan which was highlighted by the Board of Governors as a thoughtful and appropriate plan.

c. Suggested changes
  - Ding noted a typo on Page 2. Currently written as: Hired: August xx, 19xx under the then-current ECU Faculty Manual and the then-current Department of XYZ Unit code. REVISE TO READ: Hired: August xx, 19xx under the then-current ECU Faculty Manual and the then-current Department of XYZ Unit code.
  - Morehead suggested adding a form that is fully blank for faculty to use in addition to the one with the example language included.
  - Ding suggested adding a statement that the percentages must add up to 100% total
  - Mitchelson requested further discussion about the statement This statement should be written as if it was created on your first day of service to the university. Morehead agreed that this statement could be clarified to communicate the intent that the 5 year plan should be crafted from the point of the previous review until the current point of review. Rigsby explained that the point of this component is to clarify that the foundational/basic expectations of faculty do not change every five years, the critical components of what should be expected of each faculty member are consistently focused on scholarship, teaching and service. Morehead asked if the plan should be changed to reflect revisions of faculty role expectations when faculty transition to administration or other efforts in the university. Rigsby further explained that, yes, at the point that faculty roles shift into administration or other duties, yes these changes should be reflected in the five year plan. Morehead suggested that the statement read This statement should be written as if it was created on your first day of service after conferral of tenure.
  - Ding noted a typo in the statement __% Research/Creative Activity. Carryout research on Discipline X. REVISE to read: __% Research/Creative Activity. Carry out research on Discipline X.
  - Engalls requested that revise the opening statements of the five year plan to include a statement about anticipated weights. Responsibilities and Mutual Expectations (Most faculty members will have three of these; others may have more, but in all cases the areas of responsibility must be consistent with those outlined in the department’s unit code) REVISE TO READ: Responsibilities and Mutual Expectations (Most faculty members will have responsibilities in three or more of these, but in all cases the anticipated weights in the areas of responsibility must be consistent with those outlined in the department’s unit code)
  - Rigsby requested additions for the additional areas of service. Suggestions included clinical directorships, clinical coordinators, graduate directorships. This section currently reads as: Use the most general descriptions reasonable for the code unit and ensure that the category is consistent with the unit code. REVISE TO READ: Use the most general descriptions reasonable for the code unit and ensure that the category is consistent with the unit code. For example clinical service directorships may fall under other specific duties.
  - Ingalls requested discussion about the statement: Meet and strive to exceed the performance standards as documented in Part IX, Section I of the ECU Faculty Manual and in the Unit Code of the Department of Discipline XYZ. REVISE TO READ: Following the procedures outlined in Part IX, Section II of the ECU Faculty Manual, meet and strive to exceed the performance standards contained for the Department of Discipline XYZ in the Unit Code.
Cooper noted that a parentheses needed to be added to close the opening statement: *(to be used in conjunction with the Performance Review of Tenured Faculty)* REVISE TO READ: *(to be used in conjunction with the Performance Review of Tenured Faculty)*

Still noted that Hired should be changed to Tenured: Currently reads: Hired: August xx, 19xx under the then-current *ECU Faculty Manual* and the then-current *Department of XYZ Unit code*. REVISE TO READ: HIRED: Tenured: August xx, 19xx under the then-current *ECU Faculty Manual* and the then-current *Department of XYZ Unit code*.

Ingalls suggested that a heading for amendments and dates be added. Form currently reads: Original 5-Year Plan Effective August xx, 20xx REVISE TO READ: Original 5-Year Plan Effective August xx, 20xx, Amended 5-Year Plan Effective August XX, 20XX.

d. Discussion
i. The intent of this document is that expectations for faculty are clear and appropriate. The performance review committee will get a copy of this but will not be involved in helping to develop the plan. If situations occur that necessitate changes in faculty roles and responsibilities, these changes will be noted in amendments to the plan. It is critical that faculty understand that the plan may be amended and that they are encouraged to be proactive about amending plans as appropriate.

e. After discussion, Rigsby moved to approve the form as amended
   1. Seconded by Gilliland
   2. Approved unanimously by committee

VI. Sample Letter of Request for Peer Evaluation

a. Discussion
i. Open by Petition means that if someone requests to review the letters they are granted access
ii. Provost Mitchelson shared that he felt the change would strengthen the letter
iii. Ingalls noted that this change would require a change in the Faculty Manual where the process for External Review is discussed.
iv. As the proposed change to this sample letter is not consistent with the current language of the Faculty Manual, additional changes were suggested. Candidates, it should be added, will have access to the names of all reviewers and their reports. Under current policies of this institution, peer evaluations, such as that being requested from you, are regarded as confidential within limitations imposed by law. They are for limited use within the University. However, North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. As such, they become open by petition to the faculty member about whom they are written. REVISE TO READ: North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. By law, they become open to the faculty member by petition.

b. Rigsby moved and Stiller seconded a motion to approve the amended letter as the Sample Letter of Request for Peer Evaluation

Next time: Strive to finish Part IX, Section I on Feb. 25 and schedule forums (one on central campus and one on Health Sciences during the Week of March 16th), Part IX, Section II will be brought before the Faculty Senate at the March meeting of the Senate.

Meeting adjourned: 4:57 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kylie Dotson-Blake