

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: November 28, 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 _____, Jay Golden, VCREDE X, Ron Mitchelson,
Provost / VCAA _____, Donna Roberson, Chancellor's Rep _____, Mark Stacy, Interim VCHS _____,
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep X

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Linda Ingalls for the Office of the Provost; and Steve Serck, Attorney with the University Counsel's Office.

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

II. Minutes

The minutes of November 14, 2018 were approved.

III. Continuing Business

A. Maher and Popke reported that they are still working on specifications for undergraduate degree coordinators/directors/advisors.

B. Morris and Maher proposed revisions to Faculty Manual, Part VIII, Section I.III: Annual Evaluation, 1. Teaching (#18-32), drawing on suggestions from the General Education committee chaired by George Bailey.

1. Serck asked: what about units where the code is unclear?

- a. Walker: the document need to specify clinical work; Ingalls: studio too.
- b. Wilson-Okamura: the problem Serck alludes to can be addressed through the regular process of code review.
- c. Ingalls: in some cases, the criteria for evaluating teaching are in guideline documents..
- d. Stiller suggested that the document mention *discipline-specific* criteria in the introduction.

2. Wilson-Okamura: as written, the document's preamble seems to allow a candidate to provide documentation in any one category, avoiding "instruction" and "Review."

3. Stiller asked whether it is useful to break "instruction" down into separate categories: materials, workload, and reviews?

- a. Wilson-Okamura: it depends on your tolerance for long, miscellaneous lists.
- b. Stiller suggested, to the satisfaction of all, renaming "Instruction" to "Instructional Materials."

4. Ingalls pointed out that some unit codes are using program assessment to evaluate individual candidates.

- a. The consensus of the committee was that this practice should not be generally encouraged, although units should be allowed to do it in their unit codes.
 - b. Maher pointed out that *participation* in unit assessment is a valid criterion for evaluating teaching.
 - c. Stiller suggested: “Results of assessment” instead of program review; this enables (for example) candidates to include, as documentation of teaching, the results of their own assessment instruments.
5. Walker suggested that we order each list so that high-priority items come first.
 6. Stiller: under “written communications...from students,” we should specify that complaints evaluated for tenure and promotion must be conducted with due process, according to the policy on student complaints.
 7. Walker questioned whether attending workshops should be a criterion.
 - a. The committee agreed to delete it.
 - b. Popke, though, suggested adding efforts to improve teaching in response to feedback, or to promote student success, under “Instructional Materials.” This would include syllabus changes, as well as workshops.
 8. Golden asked: what about client evaluations of faculty work? Stiller: that’s something that can go in the unit code.
 9. Ingalls asked whether units should be able to develop their own evaluation instruments.
 - a. Stiller: yes, but they need to be approved by the university.
 - b. Popke: what about instruments designed by an individual faculty member?
 - c. Ingalls: that might be helpful in a PAD, but it needs to be clearly identified as such, to distinguish it from instruments that have been approved by the university.
 10. Maher asked whether candidates do, in practice, submit examples of student work. Ingalls: yes, especially in fine arts.
 11. Maher: should we include course grade distributions?
 - a. Popke: if students are always failing, something is probably wrong.
 - b. Maher: the College of Arts and Sciences has learned that D/F/Withdraw rates are sometimes more correlated with time of day than an individual instructor.
 - c. Stiller: a lot of As and Bs could mean great instruction, not just grade inflation.
 - d. Stiller: perhaps we should not ask for *course* distributions.
 1. Wilson-Okamura: different rates are normal for different course levels.
 2. Popke: perhaps we should specify “trends”; Morris: or “overall” distributions.
 - e. Wilson-Okamura observed: the sense of the table seems to be that grade distributions are problematic, but should be allowable.
 - f. Stiller: maybe we need a policy for evaluating grade distribution.

- g. Popke: whatever we decide, grade distributions should move from “Instructional materials” to “Reviews.
- 12. Under “Impact,” Maher queried “Programs at other institutions.”
 - a. Stiller suggested that we specify evidence of success.
 - b. Maher will seek clarification from the “General Education” committee.
- 13. Stiller: We need to clarify, under each section, that we do not expect every item in every candidate’s PAD.
- 14. Wilson-Okamura: “Publication of scholarly articles addressing pedagogy” counts as scholarship, not teaching, in some units.
 - a. Lockerbie: it varies by discipline.
 - b. Ingalls: should we say here that unit codes must choose?
 - c. Stiller: it might vary even within a single unit. We could specify “as appropriate to the candidate’s discipline.”
 - d. Maher and Morris will work on this. Popke suggests that we might add pedagogical scholarship to the Scholarship section, so that its inclusion here does not classify such publications for all disciplines and units.

IV. New Business

A. Popke asked: must external review letters be submitted on paper?

- 1. Donna Gooden-Payne, University Counsel and VC for Legal Affairs, communicated beforehand to Popke that there was no legal impediment.
- 2. The committee agreed that we routinely submit other items with electronic signatures.
- 3. Popke will submit a memo allowing electronic submission of external review letters.

V. Adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.

The next meeting of the 2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, December 12**, at 3:00pm in Rawl 142.