

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2020-2021 Faculty Governance Committee

The next meeting of the 2020-2021 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **Wednesday, Sept. 23**, at 3:00pm via video conference.

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Sept. 9, 2020

PRESIDING: Michael Duffy (vice-chair)

REGULAR MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Tracy Carpenter-Aeby __, Stacey Altman X, Michael Duffy X, Edwin Gomez X, Jay Newhard X, Jeff Popke __, Anne Ticknor X, David Wilson-Okamura X

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

Crystal Chambers, Rep. of Chancellor X; Grant Hayes, Acting Provost / VCAA __;
Purificación Martínez, Chair of the Faculty X;
Aundrea Oliver, Rep of Faculty Senate X; Mark Stacy, VCHS __;
Mike Van Scott, Interim VCREDE X

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Rachel Baker; Linda Ingalls for Office of the Provost; Lisa Hudson, Associate VCHS and Human Resources Administration Director.

I. **Call to Order, 3:00 pm.**

II. **Minutes**

The minutes of Apr. 8 and Aug. 26 were approved.

III. Continuing Business

A. Gender question on administrator surveys

1. Duffy provided background: Last year's committee recommended changes to the annual survey of administrative performance that would make the gender identity question more inclusive. The senate referred the matter back to the committee for further study.
2. Altman commented: the discourse on this subject is evolving and fluid; the line between social and biological identity is blurring.
3. Chambers added: while we don't want to constrain people's identity, we do need to define the survey choices, so that trends in the data will not be obscured.
4. Gomez suggested three choices: male, female, "prefer not to say."
5. Chambers proposed four choices, based on those used by the Canadian government.
 - a. The committee accepted this suggestion and debated the wording.
 - b. Chambers moved that question 19 of the annual survey of administrators be revised as follows:

19. I identify as:

- a. A woman
- b. A man
- c. Gender fluid, non-binary, and/or Two-spirit
- d. Prefer not to answer

c. The motion CARRIED.

B. Adjunct faculty appointments

1. At its last meeting, the committee agreed that appointment of adjunct faculty should continue to require a memo from the appointing unit's personnel committee.
2. In advance of today's meeting, which he could not attend, Popke suggested an insertion to Faculty Manual (FM), Part VIII: Personnel Policies and Procedures, Section I:

I. Selection and Appointment of New Faculty

A. Determination of Number and Nature of Positions

Since faculty members of each academic unit are responsible for the curriculum, they shall make recommendations on the personnel needs of the unit. All faculty appointments shall be initiated by a recommendation of the Unit Personnel Committee unless otherwise specified in the Unit Code.

3. Chambers moved adoption of Popke's suggested insertion. CARRIED.

IV. New Business

A. Role of the senate in academic calendar

1. Wilson-Okamura outlined some concerns and raised some questions:
 - a. Last year the interim chancellor imposed block scheduling for academic year 2020–21 without consulting the faculty or the senate's calendar committee.
 - b. Under UNC Standards of Shared Governance, curriculum – what is taught and how – is the responsibility of the faculty. The academic calendar conditions what is taught and how.
 - c. The same Standards document also specifies that changes to academic policy must be approved by the faculty.
 - d. Is the academic calendar an academic policy?
 - e. Were the interim chancellor's actions a material breach of shared governance?
 - f. If so, how should the faculty respond?
 - g. Wilson-Okamura suggested that discussion should focus on the question of shared governance rather than the merits or demerits of block scheduling per se.
2. Van Scott asked: what faculty involvement was there?
3. Martínez, current chair of the faculty, and Chambers, who was vice-chair last spring, recounted:
 - a. The interim chancellor apprised the faculty officers of the options he was considering, then announced his decision to the senate.
 - b. The interim chancellor acknowledges that the faculty's role was limited to implementation, not deliberation.
 - c. The senate's calendar committee was involved at the level of setting the exam schedule but no further.
4. Newhard asked: how much leeway should be granted for emergency?
 - a. Chambers answered: at the time, there was concern that disappointed students might sue. However, no other UNC campuses adopted block scheduling in response to this concern; and a few days after the interim chancellor announced his decision, the Board of Governors announced that universities moving to online instruction would be held harmless.
 - b. Oliver asked: is this an opportunity to define shared governance in an emergency?
 - c. Martínez: there was regular consultation with the officers during the emergency, but not on this subject.
 - d. Chambers reflected: genuine academic emergencies are, in fact, extremely rare. In this case, there was time to deliberate and refine.
 - e. Gomez added: the interim chancellor has continued to make calendar changes this fall, again without consulting the faculty.
5. Chambers moved adoption of Popke's proposal, distributed in advance of the meeting, to expand FM, Part VI: Teaching and Curriculum Regulations, Procedures and Academic Program Development to include in Section VII the academic calendar as a third category and

require approval by the calendar committee and the faculty senate for any changes.

- a. Ingalls drew on her long experience: a chancellor's authority in these matters is defined by two documents, the UNC Code and the ECU Policy Rules and Regulations. Although UNC Code, chapter 5 provides for faculty *consultation* on the calendar, the interim chancellor might not be able to delimit his successor's authority to the extent proposed here.
 - 1) Newhard and Van Scott amplified: would a chancellor have to obtain the senate's *approval* to close the university in an emergency?
 - 1) Chambers suggested that Popke's proposal be amended to require *consultation* instead of *approval*.
- b. Thus amended, Popke's proposal was ADOPTED. The committee recommends the following changes to FM, Part VI, Section VII:
 - 1) Retitle Section VII: "Curriculum Procedures, and Academic Program Development, and the Academic Calendar."
 - 2) Make an insertion, underlined below, in the fourth paragraph: "Academic committees of the Faculty Senate and the Graduate School review course and program proposals, as well as proposed changes to the academic calendar, in accordance with their stated charges. Faculty Senate committees also approve requests for special course designations, such as service learning, writing intensive, and diversity.
 - 3) Add a new subsection after "C. Academic Program Review":

D. Academic Calendar

Because the Academic Calendar is fundamental to the "content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum" (SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation), no changes to the Academic Calendar shall be made without consultation of the Calendar Committee and Faculty Senate.

- B. Martínez reported on recent conversations with the university counsel's office.
 1. Counsel is reviewing the senate's recommended overhaul of the appellate system.
 2. Counsel is renewing an earlier proposal to move academic integrity from the faculty manual to the university policy manual.
 - a. Wilson-Okamura objected: academic integrity is an academic policy and, as such, must be approved by the faculty, according to the UNC Standards of Shared Governance.
 - b. Chambers suggested: identical language could appear in both manuals.

- c. Altman proposed: if the issue is visibility/transparency to students and parents, the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities could simply link to the FM policy on its academic integrity web page.
- d. Newhard and Martínez commented: counsel's proposal is consistent with a larger pattern.

V. Adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.