

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY**  
**2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee**

**MINUTES OF MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2019.

**PRESIDING:** Jeff Popke until 3:55; vice-chair Marianna Walker thereafter

**REGULAR MEMBERS ( X IN ATTENDANCE):**

Tracy Carpenter-Aeby X, Jonathan Morris X, Michael Duffy X, Brad Lockerbie \_\_\_\_\_,  
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, VCHS \_\_\_\_\_,  
John Stiller, Fac Sen Rep X

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Linda Ingalls for the Office of the Provost; Steve Serck, Attorney with the University Counsel's Office; VC for Legal Affairs Donna Gooden-Payne; Mary Farwell for Jay Golden.

**I. Call to Order, 3:05 pm, Rawl 303**

**II. Minutes**

The minutes of Feb. 27, 2019 were approved.

**III. Continuing Business**

**A.** The committee resumed discussion of the Freedom Expression policy that was approved by the Faculty Senate.

1. In order to coordinate this document with a forthcoming revision of the University Property Regulation, Serck suggested changes to several definitions.
2. Serck explained that the previous Property Regulation was withdrawn because of First Amendment concerns. A new regulation is being drafted. In which senate committee should it be reviewed?
3. Popke noted one change that seemed to be material. In 3.2.2.8, restrictions on freedom of expression are allowed when attendance exceeds the venue's capacity. In the proposed revisions, this condition is generalized to "conditions that are likely to lead to injury or harm to persons or property."
  - a. Wilson-Okamura asked whether "property" could be construed as including reputation or financial interests.
  - b. Serck emphasized that content is not regulated under this policy except under the very narrowest conditions of imminent physical harm.
  - c. The committee recommended reverting to the original text.
4. The committee agreed that the remaining proposed changes were editorial.
5. Maher moved that the committee authorize Popke to make further editorial changes as needed in the University Policy Committee. Carried.

**B.** The committee resumed discussion of who should vote on unit codes.

1. Prior to the meeting, Stiller and Ingalls circulated proposals by email.
2. The committee focused on Stiller's second proposal, as amended by Ingalls: that fixed-term faculty members with six years of full-time employment in the

department should be allowed to vote on unit codes; and that the minimum threshold for approval or amendment of unit codes should be at least two thirds. The exception, in tenure-granting units, would be criteria for tenure and promotion: as now, only permanently tenured faculty members would be allowed to vote on these sections of a code.

- a. Ingalls noted that units could specify higher thresholds for approval if they chose.
  - b. Ingalls asked whether FTF employment must be consecutive.
    1. Stiller answered: the existing language does not specify that. However, we should specify that *tenured* faculty who vote must be in at least their twelfth consecutive month of ECU employment.
  - c. Ingalls explained that Unit Code Screening Committee uses the word *appended* in reference only to actual appendices, not guidelines. Some units link to criteria for tenure and promotion rather than including them in the code.
  - d. Popke asked whether we are really calling for two separate votes, in tenure-granting units: one for the tenure and promotion criteria and another for the rest of the code. If so, we should spell that out?
  - e. Chaney asked: if fixed-term faculty members won't be voting on tenure and promotion criteria, should we lower the minimum approval requirement for those sections of the code from two-thirds to a simple majority?
  - f. Gooden-Payne asked: what about faculty members in their terminal year? The committee agreed that it would not make a material difference.
3. Stiller drafted language explaining the two-vote procedure, specifying a lower minimum threshold of a simple majority for votes on tenure and promotion criteria.
  4. The committee amended Stiller's draft as follows and voted to recommend it for Faculty Manual, Part IV, Section II, Part III: "Who May Vote on a Unit's Code of Operation":

"Responsibility for voting on a Unit Code rests with full-time faculty with a commitment to the unit demonstrated as follows. All permanently tenured faculty with at least 12 consecutive months in a greater than 50% assignment in a unit and all full-time faculty with at least six years in a greater than 50% assignment in a unit count towards a quorum and may vote on the unit's new or revised Code. This includes administrators who meet these conditions. An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of faculty voting is required to approve a new or revised Unit Code.

"In tenure-granting units, only permanently tenured, eligible voting faculty may vote on or amend a unit's tenure and promotion criteria. A separate affirmative vote of at least a majority of voting tenured faculty is required to approve new or revised tenure and promotion criteria. Such approved criteria may not be further amended during the approval process of the full new or revised Unit Code by all voting

faculty.”

- C. Morris and Walker circulated proposed changes to the teaching section of the PAD cumulative report, moving documentation of teaching experience out of the cumulative report and into Section D: Supporting Materials.
1. The committee discussed how to specify which materials are required for Section D.
    - a. Should it be a separate numbered item, with minimum requirements listed a, b, c, d?
    - b. Or should this be specified in the checklist for the PAD as a whole?
    - c. Are we going too far in completely stripping out the student surveys from the cumulative report?
      1. Popke suggested moving teaching evaluations (including student surveys) to the end of the cumulative report, rather than Section D: Supporting Materials.
      2. Chaney noted that his unit has been doing this already.
      3. The committee agreed with Popke’s suggestion.
    - d. Farwell expressed caution, citing research that shows teachers with accents, female teachers, and other groups are unfairly disadvantaged in student surveys nationally.
    - e. Wilson-Okamura observed: moving the raw reports is a kludge, but it might be the best we can manage, since we are reluctant to summarize the reports, for the reasons Farwell just gave, and because no one wants to be reduced to a single number.
    - f. Walker: we should remind faculty members to arrange all materials, including surveys, chronologically. We also need to specify that complete survey results should be included in this section of the PAD, not a summary.
  2. Walker and Farwell noted that the “Medical Education” section doesn’t describe our current practices or programs.
    - a. Stiller: fixing this might be left for a larger overhaul of the cumulative report.
    - b. Popke: in the meantime, a culture has grown up around the existing language and faculty members in the relevant units are finding ways to report what they do.
  3. Morris and Walker will circulate a fresh text that reflects the changes discussed here.
- D. The committee will resume discussion of the cumulative report at the next meeting, and review proposed changes to the conflict of interest policy.

**IV. Adjourned at 5:00 pm.**

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.

The next meeting of the 2018-2019 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, March 27**, at 3:00pm in Rawl 142.