

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: January 9, 2019.

PRESIDING: Brad Lockerbie

REGULAR MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Tracy Carpenter-Aeby X, 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 X, Donna Roberson, Chancellor's Rep ____, Mark Stacy, Interim VCHS ____,
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep X

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lori Lee; Associate Provost Ying Zhou and Kyle Chapman from Institutional Planning Assessment, and Research (IPAR); and Laura Ingalls, for the Office of the Provost; VC for Legal Affairs Donna Gooden-Payne

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

II. Minutes

The minutes of November 12, 2018 were approved with one correction.

III. Continuing Business

A. Zhou and Chapman solicited feedback on revisions to the annual chair survey.

1. Chapman explained that outsourcing the survey to IDEA has become prohibitively expensive. IPAR is proposing that we conduct the survey in-house, using questions gathered from several sources.
2. Mitchelson clarified that "chair" in this context usually means evaluators of faculty members (e.g., department chairs).
3. Wilson-Okamura proposed radically shrinking the survey to one rating of effectiveness and three qualitative questions: what are the chair's main strengths, what are the chair's main weaknesses, and what issues should the chair focus on next year?
 - a. Zhou, Morris, and Lockerbie responded.
 1. The proposed survey has already been reduced from 80 questions to about 20.
 2. There is concern that one numerical rating cannot capture the nuances of effectiveness, any more than one number can capture a faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom.
4. Maher and Lockerbie urged that deans need to see open-ended comments; this was already approved by the senate for evaluation of deans.
 - a. SGA is already proposing that student comments should go to chairs.
 - b. **Motion from Maher:** the committee recommends that qualitative comments and other open-ended answers on the chair survey be viewable by chairs' supervisors. Carried.

5. Carpenter-Aeby asked how these surveys are used.
 - a. Maher reported that Bill Downs, dean of Arts and Sciences, ignores outliers and looks for trends and patterns that warrant further conversation.
 - b. Mitchelson uses dean reports for annual evaluations.
 - c. Chaney suggested that department chairs use these surveys themselves, when setting priorities.
 - d. Downs, through Maher, proposed that if more detail is wanted, longer surveys could be taken every other year.
 - e. Maher noted that more detailed questions prompt faculty members to consider all aspects of the chair's job.
6. Wilson-Okamura asked how confidentiality of responses would be maintained.
 - a. Zhou: very small departments, where responses can be easily guessed, are not surveyed in this way.
 - b. Chapman, who supervises the survey, does not report logs or raw data to anyone, including his own supervisor.
7. Popke proposed that we discuss each question in turn.
 - a. Wilson-Okamura suggested omitting questions about things that chairs can't control or faculty members are not well-qualified to answer. The committee agreed to strike:
 1. The question about addressing areas that need to be improved, since a more directive question is asked at the end of the survey.
 2. The question about acknowledging and rewarding excellence.
 - b. Morris asked whether chairs have much impact on recruitment.
 1. Chaney, as a chair, suggested that deans have more impact on retention than chairs.
 2. Mitchelson, as provost, observed that a chair's impact on retention varies across the university.
 3. Popke proposed combining two questions: "The chair facilitates recruiting and retention of qualified faculty."
 4. Lockerbie suggested that chairs should not go to the mat to retain all faculty, regardless of publication history or teaching effectiveness.
 5. Mitchelson proposed asking the same question about recruitment and retention of staff. Popke suggested that this question also mention "management": "The chair recruits, retains, and manages qualified staff."
 - c. The committee agreed on several new formulations.
 1. "The department chair actively listens and responds constructively."
 2. "The department chair serves as an effective advocate for the department."
 3. "The department chair communicates priorities, policies, and administrative procedures effectively."
 4. "The department chair is open and transparent."
 5. "The department chair promotes collaboration and collegiality."

6. "Actively promotes" can be shortened to "promotes" throughout.
 7. "The department chair promotes and values service contributions."
 8. "The chair supports faculty and staff professional department."
 9. "The chair assigns workloads fairly."
 10. "The department chair promotes diversity and inclusiveness among faculty, staff, and students," moved to be with collaboration and collegiality.
 11. "The department chair includes faculty in planning and goal setting."
- d. The committee agreed to substitute the following qualitative questions:
 1. What are the chair's main strengths?
 2. What are the chair's main weaknesses?
 3. What issues should the chair focus on next year?
 - e. Chapman asked whether demographic questions should be asked.
 1. Wilson-Okamura pointed out that these questions make respondents more identifiable, and might depress response rate.
 2. Popke noted, however, that if there are big trends in demographics (e.g., there are consistent complaints from female faculty members), deans should know about it.
 - f. **Stiller moved** to recommend the survey as revised. Carried.
- B.** Popke proposed language to address SAACS's requirement that program coordinators be qualified in the program they supervise.
1. Zhou explained that coordinators must (a) be qualified in the field; (b) oversee curriculum development, not just (for example) recruitment, advising, or course assignments; and (c) be a full-time faculty member.
 2. Popke: this proposal does not define "qualification," and does not address minors or concentrations.
 3. **Wilson-Okamura moved** approval. Carried.
- C.** Stiller presented a revised preamble for the "conflict resolution" section of the new appellate structure.
1. Wilson-Okamura asked whether claims should be presented "clearly" (as proposed) or "with specifics"? Stiller explained that we don't want to discourage informal resolutions by overprescribing the format.
 2. Wilson-Okamura suggested that petitions should not be dismissed when undisclosed confidential information "bears on the grievance," but only when such information "has a material bearing."
 3. Gooden-Payne clarified that a harassment victim is not required to meet with a potential respondent in person.
 4. **Maher moved** to recommend the complete text of the revised appellate structure to the senate. Carried.
 5. Ingalls will send editorial suggestions to Stiller.

IV. Adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.

The next meeting of the 2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, January 23**, at 3:00pm in Rawl Annex 142.