

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY**  
**2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee**

**MINUTES OF MEETING DATE:** October 24, 2018.

**PRESIDING:** Brad Lockerbie

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

Tracy Carpenter-Aeby     , Jonathan Morris   X  , Michael Duffy   X  , Brad Lockerbie   X  ,  
Derek Maher   X  , Jeff Popke   X  , Marianna Walker   X  , David Wilson-Okamura   X  

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

Don Chaney, Rep of the Chair of the Faculty   X  , Jay Golden, VCREDE     , Ron Mitchelson,  
Provost / VCAA     , Donna Roberson, Chancellor's Rep     , Mark Stacy, Interim VCHS   X  ,  
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep   X  

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Lee; Linda Ingalls for the Office of the Provost; and VC for Legal Affairs Donna Gooden-Payne.

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

**II. Minutes**

The minutes of October 10, 2018 were approved.

**IV. Continuing Business**

**A.** Stiller and Popke reported on revisions to the appellate committee structure: faculty fora will be scheduled for December 5 and 6. Additional details forthcoming.

**B.** The committee discussed Maher and Popke's recommendations for college constitutions.

1. Walker asked: must colleges have constitutions? Maher: we think not.
2. Chaney proposed that criteria for tenure and promotion should be stated in only one document, at the department level.
  - a. Wilson-Okamura: college criteria might be useful in some colleges (e.g., Arts and Sciences) and not in others.
  - b. Maher: candidates already have to consult two documents, in unit codes and the Faculty Manual.
  - c. Ingalls: when were Arts and Sciences' criteria last revised? Probably under Keats Sparrow.
  - d. Stacy: I have seen wide variability in the School of Medicine. As dean, I'm reluctant to interfere with department criteria, but low criteria cheapen tenure.
3. Chaney proposed that constitutions should be composed by members elected from units, not just a group of administrators.
  - a. Popke: the faculty needs input, but there are parts of a constitution that faculty members lack the knowledge to write.
  - b. Maher: Arts and Sciences already has documents that a drafting committee could incorporate or revise.

- c. Lockerbie suggested a mixed committee of elected representatives and administrators.
  - d. Popke: unit codes are not required to specify the composition of drafting committees; do college codes need to specify?
  - e. Several: voting on a college constitution presents practical, albeit surmountable, difficulties.
  - f. Ingalls proposed that a college could advance a constitution in pilot form.
    - 1. Lockerbie and Walker: might candidates object if they fared poorly under a constitution with pilot status?
    - 2. Lockerbie: a sunset provision could make the document binding for its term, but also allow for it to lapse if the college found it wasn't working.
  - 4. Ingalls cautioned against overspecifying untested procedures.
  - 5. Stacy added: new leaders need a measure of freedom: e.g., to change the number or character of associate deans without approval from the faculty. Constitutions should emphasize a dean's responsibility rather than power.
  - 6. Walker asked: need college tenure and promotion committees be written into constitutions? Ingalls answered: part IX of the Faculty Manual specifies that college tenure and promotion committees must be enacted through unit codes, college constitutions, or by-laws.
- C. Gooden-Payne reported on the Freedom of Expression Policy**
- 1. Gooden-Payne was inclined to adopt Morris's phrase "imminent lawlessness" in place of "clear and present danger."
  - 2. Wilson-Okamura asked: can't we have both? Gooden-Payne: in practice, "clear and present danger" has not been sufficient alone.
  - 3. Popke and Maher observed that the policy seemed to invite students to grieve.
  - 4. The committee voted to recommend the policy to the faculty senate.

## **V. New Business**

- A. Should guidelines be vetted in exactly the same way as unit codes?**
- 1. Wilson-Okamura argued that guidelines should be reviewed on the same five-year cycle as unit codes, but that new guideline documents should not have to be reviewed by the university until then.
  - 2. The committee agreed that unreviewed guideline documents should not contain criteria for tenure and promotions, though they might contain procedures (e.g., for describing publications in the PAD's cumulative report).
  - 3. Popke asked: could units put criteria for annual evaluations in guideline documents?
  - 4. Chaney: what about college codes?
    - a. Stiller observed that some college and even unit codes are skeletal; actual criteria for tenure and promotion are in guideline documents.
    - b. Wilson-Okamura suggested that the solution is to move criteria out of guidelines and into unit codes when codes are reviewed on the five-year cycle.

- c. Stiller: but some departments have no unit codes.
- d. Wilson-Okamura: then let's invent a third term for criteria in departments that have no unit code.
  - 1. Stiller: or use the third term for procedures.
  - 2. Linda compared S.O.P.s in the trustees' delegation of authority policy.
  - 3. Wilson-Okamura asked: what else is in current guideline documents?
    - a. Ingalls: accreditation standards
    - b. Chaney: forms (e.g., for graduate faculty status)
  - 4. Walker: "procedures" includes things that we *do* want reviewed when they originate. The committee agreed that "procedures" was not the right term.
- e. Ingalls observed that the chancellor is reluctant to review local changes to a unit code without a full review of the whole document.
  - 1. Stiller and Popke: the chancellor needs another cover sheet that distinguishes college codes, not being revised, from departmental guidelines with criteria.
- f. Popke offered: there is no harm in reviewing these non-criteria documents on the five-year cycle, including specifications for annual evaluation. The question, then, is which kinds of documents can wait for the five-year review?
- g. Walker: sometimes the review process takes a long time, for things that units need more quickly.
- h. Duffy: we need more definitions.
- i. Wilson-Okamura: we could call the third category "criteria documents," because that term, "criteria," is already used and understood; "guidelines," then, could be reserved for softer rules, forms, etc.
- j. Ingalls pointed out, however, that annual evaluations are important too. Criteria for those should not go in the softer category, whatever we call it. That said, the unit code screening committee should not prohibit units from doing things that are not impossible and do not conflict with university policy.
- k. Stiller: it is not practical for the unit code screening committee to evaluate all department policy documents; they are already working at capacity.

**VI. Adjourned at 5:00 pm.**

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.