

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: December 12, 2018.

PRESIDING: Brad Lockerbie

REGULAR MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Tracy Carpenter-Aeby X , Jonathan Morris _____, 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 _____, 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

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

II. Minutes

The minutes of November 28, 2018 were approved.

III. Continuing Business

A. Stiller reviewed queries and suggestions from the faculty fora that were conducted to discuss reform of the appellate structure.

1. Should fixed-term faculty members be eligible for the pool?
 - a. The committee agreed with Stiller's observation, that restricting membership to tenured faculty members protects the process from panelists' potential concerns about rehiring.
2. Should there be a word limit on complaints or time limit on testimony?
 - a. Such limits might give rise to legal challenges: "I had more evidence, but they wouldn't let me give it."
3. Should witnesses be introduced with an explanation of their relevance?
 - a. The committee authorized Stiller to insert such language everywhere witnesses come up in the document.
4. Should there be a general description of the hearing procedure?
 - a. The committee agreed that keeping instructions where they are, with individual procedures, would be less confusing.
5. Should the Faculty Manual specify procedures for dealing with conflicts of interest?
 - a. Stiller observed that panels are already empowered to deal with this, and other disqualifications.
6. Should pool members who have served on a panel be moved to the bottom of the list for the next panel, in order to distribute the pool's workload?
 - a. Stiller cautioned of an unintended side-effect, that many panels would be composed entirely of inexperienced members.

- b. The committee agreed to use the existing structure. Workload issues for panelists can be addressed on an individual basis.
 - 7. Should the pool's annual report be more specific?
 - a. The report's parameters were fine-tuned over the course of two Governance meetings. The committee decided to see how the proposed parameters work in practice before instituting further changes.
 - 8. Should panel chairs be required to distribute an agenda beforehand?
 - a. Stiller observed the general process for a hearing is already described.
 - b. Walker cautioned that delivery, storage would need to be confidential.
 - c. The committee declined to add this requirement.
 - 9. Should "serious sanctions" be defined?
 - a. With concurrence of university counsel, the committee declined to specify.
 - 10. What is the difference between "complaining faculty member" and "grievant"?
 - a. Stiller explained that "grievant" only applies after a formal grievance has been filed; some complaints can be resolved before that step is taking.
 - b. Carpenter-Aeby: "complaining faculty member" sounds pejorative.
 - c. Stiller will substitute "objecting" for "complaining" where appropriate, and define "objecting faculty member" on its first appearance as "potential grievant."
 - 11. Stiller: should we distinguish between summer months and the regular school year, since a large pool will make sufficient panelists available during the summer?
 - a. Wilson-Okamura objected to normalizing faculty business at a time when many east-campus faculty members are not under contract.
 - 12. The committee agreed that new grievances must be filed separately, and could not be appended to an existing grievance.
 - 13. "Record of the appeal" should be changed to "record of the grievance" for consistency.
- B.** Carpenter-Aeby will report on conflict of interests at our next meeting.
- C.** Maher and Popke will report on specifications for program directors at our next meeting.
- D.** Maher presented revisions to the Faculty Manual's instructions for evaluating teaching.
- 1. Maher conferred with George Bailey, who last worked on this section, to discern the meaning of "Programs at other institutions or other end-users." Its referent being forgotten or redundant, the item was deleted by general consent.
 - 2. The committee voted to forward the text as revised to the senate.
- E.** Lockerbie opened the floor to discussion of IPAR's proposed revisions to the department chair survey.
- 1. The existing survey, conducted by IDEA, has gone up in price again, so IPAR is proposing to conduct the survey itself.
 - 2. Wilson-Okamura brought up a problem of credibility: if the survey is conducted by an ECU unit, instead of an outside vendor like IDEA, will faculty members believe that their responses are confidential, and respond frankly?
 - 3. Wilson-Okamura proposed that we eliminate the twenty-plus "bubble questions" (rating agreement or disagreement with statements like "The unit administrator shows concern for faculty welfare") and shorten the survey to four questions: (1) a

single numerical rating of overall effectiveness; (2) “What are the unit administrator’s strengths?”; (3) “What are the unit administrator’s weaknesses?”; and (4) “What should the unit administrator focus on next year?”

- a. Most of those present were of the opinion that comments in all surveys, including comments on student evaluations, should be reported to the evaluand’s immediate supervisor. At present, reporting of comments is only mandatory for evaluation of deans and higher.
- b. Stiller suggested that we consolidate the “bubble questions” rather than do away with them altogether.
- c. Carpenter-Aeby asked: how do administrators use these surveys now?
 1. Stacy, who evaluates nineteen chairs, would prefer a shorter survey with a summative rating. Comments carry more weight than numbers.
 2. Maher will seek input from the dean of art and sciences.
- d. The author of IPAR’s current proposal will attend our next meeting to answer questions.

IV. Adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.

The next meeting of the 2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, January 9**, at 3:00pm in Rawl 142.