MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: 9/14/16

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 Stillier __X__

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (_X_ IN ATTENDANCE):
Patricia Fazzone, Chancellor’s Rep __X__, Ron Mitchelson, Provost / VCAA __X__, Phyllis Horns, VCHS __O__.
Mike Van Scott, Assoc VCRGS __O__, Jeff Popke, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty __X__.
Mary Gilliland, Fac Sen Rep __O__

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

PERSON PRESIDING: Stiller, Morris

ACTIONS OF MEETING

I. Meeting called to order: 3:07pm

II. Professor Stiller provided an overview of the committee’s charge. He opened the floor for nominations for chair of the committee. Professor Morris was elected as chair. Professor Cook was elected vice chair. Professor Dotson-Blake was elected secretary.

III. Approval of minutes of 4/13/2016 – unanimously approved

IV. Faculty Presence Policy

   a. Discussion opened with Morris asking if those present at the Spring Senate meeting would like to share thoughts about the discussion and senators’ perceptions of the presence policy. Professor Popke reported on the discussion held at Faculty Senate and shared that much of the discussion focused on the wording. Faculty also expressed their concerns that approving a policy such as the one presented is a slippery slope moving towards a time clock. Patricia Anderson reached out to Maher and explained that she didn’t want a policy like this to stand in the way of the technological revolution that is transforming the workplace and shared her concerns that a policy such as this could limit the future development that technology might offer. Professor Justiniano expressed that he did not support the policy because he believes the faculty manual enables the unit administrator to administer his or her unit as he or she sees fit. It is not just the right of the chair it is the duty of the unit administrator handle faculty who fail to be sufficiently present on campus. He expressed that he felt the policy was unnecessary. Professor Montgomery explained that she agrees with Professor Justiniano that the administrators must take the steps necessary. Professor Fazzone stated that Quality Improvement should be clearly codified in the job descriptions or established through the evaluation and assessment components. She feels it is important that administrators ask if it is aberrant behavior why are these situations arising? She stated clearly that expectations should be clarified in the job descriptions. Professor Maher pointed to the travel policy and stated that if a faculty goes to Raleigh for a conference he or she must gain approval but if the faculty member moves to Paris for three years there is currently no approval required. Professor Morehead shared that there are also complexities in terms of taxes. Professor Cook shared that search committees are already working to address these concerns and shared that she is currently serving on a search committee and there is language in the ad that says regular, in person presence on campus to contribute to the service needs of the department on campus. The committee agreed that the issue is quite complex and that it is difficult to craft a statement that covers all of the range of concerns.

   Professor Stiller stated that the motion can be amended if we decide we want to put forward alternative language or the committee can bring it back to the Senate as initially written and the Senate can vote it up or down or may choose to respond and send it back to committee with suggested language. Professor Popke stated that presence is important and valued as part of this university – in the interest of the faculty and the institution that if there are
going to be long-term arrangements of individuals working outside of the campus that these be transparent. Professor Popke further stated that at the heart of it, there is a statement that presence is valuable and if there is going to be non-presence and everyone knows it and there is a procedure for that. Professor Morehead suggested that if you are going to take a professional opportunity – extended absence from campus policy – unit code screening committee could have a requirement that a statement like this. Professor Morehead suggested suspending the discussion and he stated that the committee is really asking two questions – is there a gap in our current policies and if you are going to be absent from campus you should have a discussion with unit administrators – are there subtle modifications that we want to make in other parts about scholarship and service that get to what we had hoped with the teaching. Professor Morris stated that a chief concern in the discussion was the clocking in and clocking out and there should be some statement from the faculty that we are not going to evolve to a campus where people are not engaged and present. Professor Justiniano explained that this is likely not a problem exclusively of ECU and he asked Provost Mitchelson what have other universities in the system done? Provost Mitchelson stated that many of the schools have written policies on faculty presence and shared that the point of production is collocated for all of the right reasons. Dotson-Blake suggested following through the steps suggested by Professor Morehead. Mrs. Ingalls shared with the committee that the committee is already slated to review and potentially revise Part VIII and she shared that there are some sections in Part VIII that lend themselves well with enhancing what is there with statements that are along the lines of what you are talking about, including the assignment of teaching responsibilities, criteria of scholarship. Professor Maher agreed and said II.A. Assignment of teaching responsibilities appears to be a very good place to attend to when considering the intentions of the policy. Professor Stiller we could put aside the motion on the Faculty Presence Policy with the Senate and then explore ways to integrate this information into Part VIII. The committee decided to close the discussion for the day and revisit the discussion at the next meeting to determine if Professor Stiller’s suggestion was the correct move for the committee.

V. Revision of Appellate Committee Structure & Process
   a. Discussion tabled to later during the committee’s work

VI. Review and Revise Parts VIII and X of the Faculty Manual to ensure compatibility with the new Part IX
   a. Subcommittee was suggested and it was determined that a subcommittee would be established.
   b. Discussion of timeline – committee decided to have all committee members begin to preview Part VIII and return to committee prepared to discuss the process for revising Part VIII.

VII. Unit Codes
   a. Professor Justiniano brought new business focused on discrepancies with the Part IV, Section II, II. Unit Code Approval Process for New and Revised Unit Codes
   b. He made a motion proposing that the Faculty Governance Committee suggest changes (attached) to the Unit Code Screening Committee to better align the signature page with the procedure outlined in Part IV, Section II, Part II.
   c. Stiller seconded the proposed motion.
   d. The committee engaged in discussion of the motion.
   e. Motion was approved

VIII. Meeting adjourned 5:00 pm