

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY**  
**2020-2021 Faculty Governance Committee**

The next meeting of the 2020-2021 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on **April 28**, at 3:00pm via video conference.

**MINUTES OF MEETING DATE:** Apr. 14, 2021

**PRESIDING:** Jeff Popke

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

Stacey Altman X, Cynthia Deale \_\_, Michael Duffy X, Edwin Gomez X, Jay Newhard X, Jeff Popke X, 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 \_\_; Mark Stacy, VCHS X; Mike Van Scott, Interim VCREDE \_\_

**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, 3:02 pm**

**II. Minutes**

The minutes of Mar. 24, 2021 were approved.

**III. Continuing Business**

Proposal from Martínez et al. to amend Faculty Manual (FM), Part VIII with recommendations on contract length for each fixed-term (FT) rank.

The text under discussion incorporated suggestions from committee members during and after the committee's Mar. 24 meeting.

Chambers suggested that multi-year contracts should be "strongly encouraged" instead of "considered" for FT positions where this is ongoing need,

Wilson-Okamura commented: the university's composition program has a lot of ongoing need, but sometimes people who are qualified on paper don't work out after the first year; we should keep this flexible.

Under the new rank of Master Teaching Instructor, Wilson-Okamura suggested that mentoring should be of "students" rather than "graduate students"; Ticknor suggested mentoring of "instructors" instead of "teaching instructors."

Gomez queried which designated a higher achievement in teaching, “excellent” or “superior.”

Chambers suggested we should use whichever sequence is used for annual evaluations.

To general agreement, Popke and Gomez suggested the following wording for the second tier in each rank: “consistently demonstrated effective teaching and/or other instructional responsibilities.”

The committee agreed that “a minimum of three consecutive years” (rather than more) was appropriate for the title of Senior Teaching Instructor, since conditions vary between units.

Ingalls pondered the use, throughout, of “equivalent professional qualifications”: our credentialing agency prefers the term “alternate” for teaching qualifications, but hasn’t objected to “equivalent” in the past.

Altman noted that we use both terms elsewhere.

Wilson-Okamura argued in favor of “equivalent” as being the higher standard.

The committee agreed not to make changes at this time.

Chambers noted that many librarians have their own research agendas; the qualifications should not suggest that we only count their service to other academics.

Ingalls noted that the existing qualification language was proposed by the librarians themselves.

Popke: we should also ask the librarians about collegiality, which we are no longer using to describe the qualifications of other, non-library ranks.

Emeritus status

Ingalls clarified: emeritus status cannot be used to pay retired employees for special projects.

The committee added “faculty member who...chooses separation in lieu of retirement” to the list of qualifying conditions in Part VIII.

In Part XI, the committee agreed to simplify the qualifications for emeritus faculty privileges to being “eligible,” as defined in Part VIII.

Popke noted: in the revised text, all faculty members will be annually evaluated on their “assigned duties and responsibilities,” not just FT faculty members.

Popke noted further: in the revised text, most language describing the process of promotion will now be grouped with other process descriptions in Part IX.

Ingalls clarified that probationary faculty members must now apply for promotion with tenure.

Chambers suggested that we make this explicit. Martínez suggested appropriate language.

Ticknor asked: why, in the revised text, FT salary reviews would be “regular” instead of “annual”?

Popke: to do these fairly, we need IPAR’s help; it’s impractical to perform this analysis every year.

Chambers suggested, to general approval: “The salary and benefits for fixed-term faculty members should be periodically reviewed for equity.”

Popke noted that equity review did not seem to be required for anyone *except* FT faculty members.

Chambers suggested, to general approval, moving the review statement so that it applies to all faculty members: “The salary and benefits for faculty members should be periodically reviewed for equity.”

Popke suggested, to general approval, making this its own section: “Salary Review.”

Wilson-Okamura moved to approve the package of proposed revisions as amended. Carried.

Wilson-Okamura proposed adding “some or all” of a unit’s FT faculty members to unit personnel committees, as defined in FM, Part IX. Rationale: many FT faculty members have more teaching experience than the probationary faculty members we currently allow on personnel committees.

Popke and Chambers suggested that the existing formula, “some or all of the permanently tenured and probationary term voting faculty members,” was ambiguous. Apparently some units have never included probationary members on personnel committees.

Chambers and Martínez noted: unit code screening instructions do not currently require at least one probationary member.

Newhard added: some departments only have tenured faculty.

Popke and Chambers favored, to general agreement, *opening* personnel membership to FT faculty members, but not *requiring* FT membership for all units that have FT faculty members.

Wilson-Okamura requested that Martínez’s group, which is looking at Part IX now, revise the make-up of personnel committees accordingly.

In the package of Part VIII revisions just passed, Altman queried the term “master teaching instructor” as possibly connotating slavery.

Chambers noted that tenure is historically modeled on the master/apprentice relationship.

The committee debated various substitutions, but none seemed immediately satisfactory. Members were encouraged to forward suggestions to the faculty officers or the senate.

Martínez reported that she has met with several members of the academic council about the fixed-term contract language recently adopted.

At its next meeting, the committee expects to review proposed changes to the faculty constitution and by-laws.

**IV. Adjourned at 4:56 pm.**

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura