COMMITTEE: Unit Code Screening Committee

MEETING DATE: September 21, 2011

PERSON PRESIDING: Patricia Anderson

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Salman Abdulali, Patricia (Tricia) Anderson, Yan-Hua Chen, Linc Conn, Michael Duffy, Melissa Nasea (secretary)

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Linda Ingalls, Kathy Misulis, Lisa W. Sutton, Ashley Howell (SGA rep.), Brittney Williamson (SGA rep.)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lori Lee

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Chair T. Anderson brought copies of last meeting’s packet, today’s agenda, and a November 15, 1996 article in Pieces of Eight on Unit Codes by then Chair of the Faculty Don Sexauer. She said it was very important that unit codes not violate ECU regulations. The code is the responsibility of all faculty members, especially the tenured faculty and administrators in the unit.

She will send a Doodle poll to determine the best dates for the next Committee meeting.

The minutes were accepted as written.

Near the end of attachment 2 is the “Draft Faculty Governance Committee Report … relating to Unit Codes of Operation.” At the top it lists four items from the 4-7-11 review by the UCSC. They include allowing unit heads to vote on changes to the code, giving unit heads 30 days to comment, noting that unit heads can only act once on code revisions (not vote as both a faculty member and a unit head), and clarifying how minor code changes are defined and handled. The UCSC was concerned that these were not well addressed in this report. The Committee was also concerned that this report sometimes mixes changes to units with changes to unit codes.

Other concerns about this report:

In most places “Dean” should be replaced by unit code administrator

A. Last (retained) paragraph: delete phrase on “quadrennial evaluations” as they no longer exist

B.2 The new (bold) section is confusing and seems to conflict with the draft cover page example.

The order of the actions is confusing. It states that the code goes to the dean and then the UCSC. It then says the dean will send it to the next higher administrator. This suggests that the code goes to the dean, then the UCSC, then the dean, then the next higher administrator. Is this correct?

Also, Faculty Senate action is included in the beginning of B.2 but deleted from the later part. This adds to the confusion in chronology.
If the code follows two paths at the same time (one path from unit code administrator/chair Unit Code Committee, to Unit Code Screening Committee, to Faculty Senate, to Chancellor/designee AND one path from unit code administrator, to next higher administrator, etc., to Chancellor/designee), then this should be specifically stated. If the code follows only one path, then that path should be specifically stated.

The dean/unit code administrator can submit his/her concurrence to the next higher administrator in B.2 but can only acknowledge on the draft cover page example that the code was submitted to him/her for advice. This seems inconsistent.

**B.2 New (bold) section: The type and order of actions is confusing. Faculty Senate action is deleted from the later part of the section. It is unclear whether the code follows two paths or one (one path to UCSC and Faculty Senate; one through next higher administrators) before reaching the Chancellor. Also, the unit code administrator submits concurrence in B2 but only advice in the cover page example**

B.3.e. lower right section of the diagram: Both Allied Health Sciences and Nursing are Colleges; Medicine is a School

B. 3.e last sentence and D. 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence – delete “autonomous” as it was deleted elsewhere (such as in B.2)

B.4.b. the name of the “Graduate School Administrative Board (GSAB)” will be changed soon

C.3 never includes the UCSC although code unit changes usually require changes to at least one code

Also, SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) requires that tenure and promotion guidelines be available. Available to everyone or just to those in the unit? Must they be in the code or can they just be on the unit website? Must the UCSC review them all? What about the BSOM which has one unit code and ca. 20 departmental tenure/promotion guidelines of ca. 15 pages each?

The Committee approved a motion to compile the changes and send them to Chair Anderson who will send them to the Faculty Governance Committee for their September 28 meeting. The report is expected to be on the November 1 Faculty Senate agenda.

Once the Faculty Governance report is approved, the UCSC needs to quickly finish the “Revised General Guidelines for Writing and Revising a Unit Code of Operation”. The committee goal is to have the Guidelines included in the January 24 Faculty Senate agenda.

Changes to the Guidelines:

2. Delete last sentence and add: The entire code must be reviewed and approved by the Unit Code Screening Committee, Faculty Senate, and Chancellor.

I.B. Delete last sentence and add: The entire code must be reviewed and approved by the Unit Code Screening Committee, Faculty Senate, and Chancellor.
III. 3. Change “New or amended …” to “All new or amended …”

**NEXT MEETING:** To be announced, probably soon after November 1

**ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED:** Revised General Guidelines for Writing and Revising a Unit Code of Operation and the associated memorandum