COMMITTEE: Faculty Governance

MEETING DATE: April 12, 2006

PERSON PRESIDING: Martinez

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Patricia Anderson, Edson Justiniano, Nanyoung Kim, Bob Morrison, Puri Martinez, and Tinsley Yarbrough

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Catherine Rigsby, Paul Zigas, and Mary Gilliland

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lori Lee and Lisa Sutton

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Approval of the minutes
Action taken: Minutes of the March 8 and March 29, 2006 meetings were approved.

Agenda Item: Annual report.
Discussion: The process for developing the annual report was discussed. Professor Martinez will work on it and bring it to the April 26 meeting.

Agenda Item: Update on Appendix C.
Discussion: Rigsby stated that the deans have expressed opposition to Appendix C and the chancellor may not approve it. They perceive that the new titles don’t have enough flexibility, and this could cause some difficulty in recruiting faculty into fixed-term positions.

Agenda Item: Senate discussion on Appendix D.
Discussion: The committee discussed an amendment on search committees that would be offered by a faculty senator at the April 18 meeting. There was discussion of whether staff should be voting members of search committees for tenure-track faculty. This is an issue in Academic Library Services.

Action Taken: Justiniano moved that the following amendment be taken to the senate. Mark Taggart agreed to present this as an amendment to Appendix D at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Proposed Appendix D. Revisions to Section IV. A.c.10:

“10. The unit Personnel Committee may, at its discretion, appoint a search committee to fulfill the responsibilities of soliciting and screening applicants and recommending to the unit’s Personnel Committee candidates for initial appointments. For initial appointments for tenured and tenure track faculty, at least two-thirds of the membership of the search committee must consist of voting faculty either from the unit conducting the search or from units whose members would provide expertise useful for a successful search. At the discretion of the unit Personnel Committee, additional members may consist of fixed-term faculty, staff and/or students invited to participate on the search committee in an advisory capacity without vote. For initial appointments of fixed-term faculty, a majority of the membership of the search committee must consist of voting faculty. The remaining members of the committee may be fixed-term faculty (with vote) and/or staff and students without vote.”

Replacing:

“10. The personnel committee may elect a search committee as prescribed by the unit’s code to fulfill the responsibilities of soliciting and screening applicants and recommending to the unit’s Personnel Committee candidates for initial appointments. A majority of the search committee must be voting faculty.”

Agenda Item: Quorum on Personnel Committees
Discussion: There have been several objections to the proposed quorum requirements on personnel and tenure committees.

Agenda Item: Interpretation of the Faculty Manual
Discussion: There was discussion about whether the interpretation would go against Robert’s Rules of Order. Morrison moved to not adopt the interpretation. The motion failed. A phrase that implied inconsistencies with Robert’s Rules was deleted
Action Taken: The following interpretation was approved, and will be presented as new business at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

We have been asked to interpret the ECU Faculty Manual requirements regarding sharing with administrators the numbers of faculty votes either yea or nay or abstaining in secret ballot voting. Our view of this, notwithstanding the fact that some committees have in fact shared some numbers, is that the intent in the minds of the authors of these ECU Faculty Manual passages as well as the expectations of a majority of the current faculty at ECU was and is that such numbers not be shared. In small departments and in unanimous votes, secrecy would automatically be, or well could be, compromised. Additionally, to say that retribution could be handled separately if it occurred is not sufficient to address such concerns. Hence, the interpretation is that such numbers not be shared with administrators.

Agenda Item: Interpretation Process
Discussion: The committee discussed the need to clarify the process for approving interpretations. This will be new business when the committee meets in the Fall Semester 2006.

The next meeting will be April 26, 2006.

The committee adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Submitted by Bob Morrison, co-secretary