

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: February 27, 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, VCHS ____,
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep X

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Linda 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 Feb. 13, 2019 were approved.

III. Continuing Business

A. The committee resumed its discussion of how teaching effectiveness should be documented in the PAD.

1. Popke summarized the immediate issue.
 - a. The cumulative report calls for a "summary" of student opinion surveys.
 - b. Subsequently, a 2017 memo from Provost Mitchelson and Stiller (who was faculty chair at the time) clarified that survey data should not be condensed or summarized.
 - c. Where in the PAD should the uncondensed data go: in the cumulative report, or a separate section? Should we require uncondensed data at all?
2. Carpenter-Aeby suggested a compromise between a single number and uncondensed data.
3. Stiller and Walker: we could eliminate all reference to summary and simply direct readers of the PAD to a separate section.
4. Ingalls and Stiller suggested that we form a subcommittee to revise the cumulative report form to take into account January's senate recommendations (which passed through this committee last year) on evaluating teaching for tenure and promotion.
[See minutes for Nov. 28 and Dec. 12, 2018.]
 - a. Wilson-Okamura asked the committee to consider: what information do we really care about? As things stand now, PADs contain so much data that it's hard to sift important from unimportant. The cumulative report is an index to what we think is important.
 - b. Stiller posed an informational question: how soon will we move to all-electronic PADs? Popke responded that we haven't chosen a vendor yet.

- c. Lockerbie asked: in the short term, should we clarify this particular issue, of where to place student survey data? Popke: the consequences of inaction are relatively small. This is an opportunity to deal with larger issues.
 - d. Walker suggested that this section of the report might begin with a list of courses taught.
 - e. Wilson-Okamura suggested: given how crude the instrument is to begin with, what's wrong with a table tracking a single summary question over the candidate's six years of teaching? Morris offered: at best, this summary only tell us when something is grossly wrong -- and in those cases, we do want to look at the raw data.
 - f. Morris, Popke, and Walker volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.
5. What about SGA's recent recommendation that student comments be included in reports to unit administrators?
- a. Popke: last year's General Education and Instructional Effectiveness (GEID) didn't agree on a solution to the known problems. This is an opportunity for the whole senate to discuss the larger issues with these surveys. We might, for example, prohibit direct quotation to avoid cherry-picking of unrepresentative comments.
 - b. Stiller: smart software is available to remove outliers.
 - 1. Mitchelson offered to set up a vendor demonstration.
 - 2. Wilson-Okamura: how confident are we in the software?
 - 3. Morris: qualitative comments are more valuable than numbers. Software would get some of them into the record, even if it wasn't perfect.
 - c. Walker: a larger problem is response rate. Are the samples we get representative? Stiller: we can get higher response rates if we give time in class and explain that we want the data for ourselves, to get better as teachers.
 - d. Wilson-Okamura asked: are groups more conscientious than individuals about not cherry-picking? Lockerbie, Carpenter-Aeby, and Walker pointed out that groups can turn into mobs.
 - e. Maher: there must be existing models at other schools that do use comments. Walker asked what other instruments are in use at ECU.
 - f. Stiller: the larger issue is that comments are seen as punitive rather than formative.
 - g. Carpenter-Aeby: getting a PhD doesn't mean you're a fair or effective evaluator.
 - h. Lockerbie: these surveys are narrowly evaluating pedagogy, not expertise in a field.
 - i. Gooden-Payne and Chaney: students are under the mistaken impression that these comments can be used to report serious problems (such as sexual harassment) to a supervisor. Stiller responded: the problem is serious, but due process requires that we discourage students from using

the survey to report problems like this, and direct them to the proper avenues.

- j. Popke summarized: we need to reengage with GEID, investigate software solutions, and respond to student government that we are dealing with the issue in a larger context.
 1. Popke proposed a mixed working group, with some members from Governance and some from GEID.
 - a. Popke: GEID has the charge for issues like this.
 - b. Walker: But it's also a tenure and promotion issue, which is Governance's province.
 - c. Carpenter-Aeby, Maher, Morris, Popke, and Stiller volunteered to meet with GEID.
 2. Wilson-Okamura: is there anything we can do in the short term that would show students we are taking this seriously?
 - a. Popke: let's invite students to participate in the conversation between GEID and Governance.
 - b. Mitchelson: might one task for the working group be a faculty referendum?
 3. Popke: while we're at it, we can also put in place guidance or safeguards for using quantitative data.
- B.** The committee resumed discussion of voting on unit codes. The current language specifies that only tenured members can vote, but some code units don't have tenure or are phasing it out (e.g., the libraries).
1. Stiller: given our dependence (approximately 40% of instruction) on fixed-term faculty (FFT) members, some of whom serve here for a lifetime, should we replace the tenure requirement for voting with "six years of full-time service"?
 - a. Maher: since some come here from elsewhere with tenure, perhaps we could say "permanently-tenured or x years."
 2. Stiller: the sticking point is matters of tenure and promotion, which FFT members might not be qualified to vote on.
 - a. Ingalls: a workaround is to specify a higher threshold (say, two-thirds instead of a simple majority) for amending codes.
 - b. Walker: would that require amending existing codes?
 - c. Stiller and Ingalls: eventually all codes would be amended. In the meantime, the Faculty Manual would supersede unit codes.
 3. Stiller will draft language for discussion at the next meeting. One version will be minimal and address the immediate issue of non-tenure-granting departments. The second will recommend extending the franchise to FTF members with six years of full-time service and specify a two-thirds majority for amending a code.
- C.** Popke suggested a couple of priorities for our next meeting.
1. Conflicts of Interest (COIs)
 - a. The Faculty Manual's section on COIs needs to be integrated or reconciled with the PRR on COIs.

- b. Mike Van Scott has made some preliminary suggestions. Mitchelson, Walker, and Ingalls reviewed previous work.
 - c. Gooden-Payne emphasized the urgency of clarifying the issue for members of the university community.
2. Policy on responding to allegations of discrimination: the existing PRR has never been formally vetted by this committee.
- D.** Lockerbie asked about sexual harassment policy. Gooden-Payne explained: this is still a moving target at the federal level; there will probably be something concrete to discuss next academic year.

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