I. Call to Order, 3:02 pm, Rawl 142

II. Minutes of Sept. 13, 2017 meeting were approved as submitted.

III. Unfinished business
   A. Popke presented wording changes suggested on Sept. 13 to Stiller’s proposed revisions to ECU Faculty Manual, Part II, Section III. These revisions spell out in more detail a process for “Vetting of Administrative PRRs in Matters Relating to Faculty.”
      a. In addition to the process outlined in this document, the committee recommends administrative PRRs not on the agenda for Senate review should appear under a new subcategory in announcements to the Faculty so that Faculty members can request a review if they see a need.
      b. Wilson-Okamura moved adoption of Stiller’s text as revised by Popke. Approved with one change: Regulation to regulation. The final text was uploaded to Governance Committee’s SharePoint and emailed to Stiller.

IV. New Business
   A. Stiller presented an overview of proposed revisions to the Faculty Appellate Committee structure. All appellate materials would be gathered in Part XII of the Faculty Manual. The existing appellate committees would be reconstituted as a large pool, to be drawn on as needed. Members of the pool would receive the same training. Sections of the Faculty Manual that are no longer in compliance with Title IX would be removed.
      a. The form at the end of section two for reporting results should receive further attention.
      b. Past Chairs of the Faculty Morehead and Walker will meet with Stiller to flag potential issues for the committee to discuss at our next meeting.
   B. Stiller seeks the committee’s advice, noting that an important tenure and promotion deadline comes during fall break for the third year in a row.
a. The committee recommends that this year’s deadline should be extended to Fri., Oct. 13.

b. The Faculty Manual should be revised with more flexible language in Part X. Morehead suggests that it’s better to revise the relevant section of the manual than solve this year’s problem with an official interpretation.

c. A consideration for revision: deadlines vary across the university, depending on the term of appointment.

C. Wilson-Okamura asks, Could we move the PAD submission deadline earlier in the semester?

a. By moving the submission date up by two weeks, we could have a week more time for review in the department and a week more time for review in the college.

b. Could we split the two weeks, so that the PAD comes in one week earlier and the chancellor’s review comes one week later?

c. Morehead is already working on the timeline for tenure and promotion and will make a recommendation on the issue to this committee.

D. The academic council will be forming a post-tenure review committee. Given the scope and variety of materials it would be considering, how should it be composed?

a. University-wide election? Nominations by faculty officers or senate? Colleges elect members? Each college has its own committee?

IV. Adjourned at 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.