

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: January 23, 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 ____, Donna Roberson, Chancellor's Rep ____, Mark Stacy, Interim VCHS ____,
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep X

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lori Lee; Linda Ingalls for the Office of the Provost; VC for Legal Affairs
Donna Gooden-Payne; Mike Van Scott for VCREDE Jay Golden; Steve Serck, Attorney with the
University Counsel's Office.

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

II. Minutes

The minutes of Jan 9, 2019 were approved.

III. Continuing Business

A. Popke solicited input on Duffy, Maher, and Popke's recommendations for college constitutions and college promotion and tenure (P&T) committees.

1. Could a college establish a P&T committee without revising its constitution? The Faculty Manual language seems unambiguous: no.
2. Should the university prescribe a procedure for amending college constitutions?
 - a. Stiller suggests such advice be skeletal, a list of required elements.
 - b. Duffy: enabling language for revised constitutions should be consistent with shared governance standards elsewhere in the Faculty Manual.
 - c. Ingalls: new constitutions that are not revisions should specify that the previous version is hereby nullified.
 - d. Walker: constitutions should be clear on the status of P&T committees' "advice."
3. The Faculty Manual enables college constitutions to establish committees that "advise" the dean on P&T matters. What does "advise" really mean? E.g., should the committee's written report become part of the PAD?
 - a. Maher: many issues are best left to the individual colleges.
 - b. Stiller: due process requires that a written report that became part of the PAD would also have to be written into the Faculty Manual, so that the candidate can include a written response.
 - c. Chaney: that sounds more substantial than "advising" the Dean.
 - d. Ingalls observed: we don't want a college-level committee for reappointment decisions.

- e. Walker offered a distinction between college-level P&T committees and committees that advise the dean on P&T.
- f. Walker pointed to a working example in the Brody unit code. Ingalls summarized the Brody process: the advisory committee's findings are binary: the candidate meets the criteria or does not.
- g. Popke suggested that Governance committee should review actual college proposals rather than draft new specifications for what proposals should contain.
 - 1. Chaney asked: should this review occur here, or in unit code screening?
 - 2. Popke confirmed Governance is the appropriate committee for P&T issues.
- h. Wilson-Okamura: if we formalize the process with rights of response, we have to find space for it in the timeline.
- i. Chaney and Lockerbie: what's to prevent deans from conferring informally now?
 - 1. Stiller: nothing, but if that informal conference becomes the basis for a decision, it's a violation of the candidate's due process rights.
 - 2. Stiller asked a larger question is: what qualifies deans to make these P&T decisions?
 - a. Wilson-Okamura: even if deans can't evaluate the specifics of scholarship in every candidate's discipline, they do have a role in maintaining or raising standards, both in scholarship and rigor of procedure.
 - b. Carpenter-Aeby and Stiller: yes, but we need to distinguish procedural oversight from evaluation of specific candidates.
 - c. Van Scott: deans play a larger role when there is disagreement (for example, between unit chairs and tenure committees).
 - d. Ingalls: deans can also help units to make their criteria fair and consistent.
- j. Popke attempted to summarize:
 - 1. College-level advisory committees do need to be enabled through college constitutions; however the Governance committee wants to leave the specifics to each college.
 - 2. Popke, Stiller, Maher: college constitutions need to be reviewed, if not approved, at the university level, by the Governance committee.
 - a. Wilson-Okamura dissented: the Faculty Manual specifies a role for faculty in establishing these committees, but it's at the college level, in approving a revised constitution.
 - b. Maher pointed out that oversight of P&T matters is already part of the Governance committee's charge.
 - c. Walker asked: are college constitutions required to undergo regular review, like unit codes?

- B.** A subcommittee consisting of Duffy, Maher, and Popke recommended that guidelines ancillary to unit codes should be submitted to the Unit Code Screening committee for approval.
1. Popke asked whether evaluation rubrics for fixed-term need to be approved as well?
 - a. Wilson-Okamura thought not. First drafts of these rubrics rarely get it right, and if every change has to be approved at the university level, rubrics won't evolve as fluidly as they need to.
 - b. Ingalls spoke from her experience with the unit code screening committee: if a unit code refers to such a document, it needs to be reviewed with the code, to ensure compliance with the Faculty Manual and other policies.
 - c. Stiller averred that departments shouldn't be able to set criteria that determine the course of a faculty member's career without university-level oversight.
 - d. Popke proposed that guidelines, when they are introduced or revised, do need to be screened, but departments would have discretion in classifying documents such as evaluation rubrics as guidelines.
- C.** Popke asked: should we allow external review letters to be submitted electronically?
1. Popke: on campus, the sentiment in favor seems to be universal.
 2. Serck confirmed that there is no statutory prohibition, but perhaps we should confirm the letter's origin with the sender.
 - a. Van Scott: the university already licenses a couple technologies for this.
 - b. Wilson-Okamura: these technologies are transparent for us, internally, but might be a hassle for external reviewers.
 - c. Popke: most unit chairs seem to want a PDF with a signature, emailed from the referee's institutional email address. Morris moved that this should suffice. Carried.
 - d. In the future, it was suggested that Faculty 180 might be used for submitting external review letters, or the same submission system that the graduate school uses for recommendation letters.
- D.** Popke suggested revising the guidance on summarizing student opinion surveys, to clarify that full reports should be included somewhere in the PAD.
1. Wilson-Okamura argued on the contrary, that including full reports is both tedious and counterproductive, because it buries the PAD reader in an avalanche of data.
 2. Lockerbie proposed that we resume discussion of this meaty issue at our next meeting.

IV. 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, February 13**, at 3:00pm in Rawl 142.