

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY**  
**2016-2017 Faculty Governance Committee**

The next meeting of the 2016-2017 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, December 14, 2016**, at 3:00pm in the Rawl 142.

**MINUTES OF MEETING DATE:** 11/9/16

**REGULAR MEMBERS ( X IN ATTENDANCE):**

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

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ( X IN ATTENDANCE):**

Patricia Fazzone, Chancellor's Rep X, Ron Mitchelson, Provost / VCAA O, Phyllis Horns, VCHS X,  
Mike Van Scott, Assoc VCRGS O, Jeff Popke, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty X,  
Mary Gilliland, Fac Sen Rep X

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

**I. Call to Order, 3:00 pm, Rawl 142**

**II. Approval of Minutes**  
**10/26/16 – Motion Eleanor Cook, Second Andrew Morehead**

**III. Special Order of the Day**

- A. Roll Call
- B. Announcements – No announcements at this time.

**IV. Unfinished Business**

- A. Update from the writing group on *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VIII, Section I. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of East Carolina University.
  - 1. The writing group has been working through Part VIII and they will bring a revised version to the committee at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - 2. Update from Writing Group
    - i. The Writing Group has made it to the section focused on “ranks” right now and has discerned that there is already detailed language related to many different ranks. At this time, the team is trying to figure out where to put the ranks specific to the library. Eleanor has forwarded some questions generated by the writing group to the Ad-Hoc Code Committee of the Libraries. The writing group will get back together next week.

**V. New Business**

- A. Discussion of the proposed changes to ECU’s PRR review process.
  - a. Distributed proposed changes to ECU’s PRR review process through the committee’s SharePoint site.

b. Background regarding this piece of new business was provided by John Stiller. Erin Eatman is the shepherd of the PRR review process and she is working to determine the most efficient, appropriate process. The version provided to the committee now is not coming for formal advice. This version is under consideration/review by legal and is currently only coming to the committee for consideration and initial, informal information. The current process sends all PRRs to the Chair of the Faculty, who determines if the PRR is routed to a committee or not. Currently, the Chair of the Faculty makes the determination if the PRR is relative to faculty or if the faculty does not need to consider it. John Stiller shared that he takes the approach of passing all of these through to the appropriate committees for consideration and formal advice giving. In considering revisions to this process, John would like to formalize the process to allow the faculty officers as a team review the PRRs and determine if they should be forwarded to a faculty committee. Another potential change would be to allow the process to conclude/end if the faculty committee determines that it doesn't need to go through to the Senate. If the faculty committee determined that the PRR needed no further action from faculty, it would be offered only as an informational item on the Senate agenda rather than a separate action item. The change to the process allowing PRRs which need no additional faculty response to move directly from committee review to the closing/finishing process instead of having to progress further is intended to increase the efficiency of the overall process.

i. The committee engaged in brief discussion of the proposed PRR process. It was clarified that the faculty committee to which a PRR is forwarded is determined based upon the needs of the particular PRR under consideration. Andrew Morehead shared his perspective that having the university attorney attend meetings when these PRRs are considered would likely reduce response time by making the feedback loop more efficient. John Stiller addressed this possibility, explaining that the intention is that most of the legal issues relative to any PRR would be taken care of prior to the PRR coming to the committee. Committee members discussed a potential process for incorporating feedback raised by the Senate for PRRs approved by committees and offered only for information, rather than as action items. The discussion concluded with the request for any suggestions or feedback concerning the proposed process that could be taken back before the process is finalized.

B. Office of Equity and Diversity: Regulation on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence

a. Summary of changes:

i. There are multiple revisions to the interim regulation in efforts to comply with applicable regulatory obligations, including, but not limited to: amendment of the definition of "offensive touching" (formerly referred to as "sexual battery"); revision of the review process for faculty and staff in Appendix B with regard to an investigator's conclusion (appeals of sanctions, if any,

continue to be addressed through applicable processes stated in the Faculty Manual, SHRA regulations, or student disciplinary process); additional clarification regarding termination of consent previously given if a person becomes incapacitated during activity requiring continuing consent; and a statement of the related training requirement for employees that the university must have in place.

- b. John Stiller offered the recommendation that all committee members read these pieces of information carefully and come prepared to discuss this business item at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. He noted that the PRR can be posted as interim at anytime that the university requires it to be done and the Chancellor approves it.
- c. Jay Morris closed the discussion explaining that no action from the committee is required at this time and that this item will be on the committee's agenda for December 14<sup>th</sup>.