

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
2022-2023 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, October 12, 2022, 3-5 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

PRESIDING: David Wilson-Okamura

REGULAR MEMBERS (X\_ IN ATTENDANCE):

Sandra Warren\_X\_, Cynthia Deale \_X\_, Edwin Gomez \_X\_, Anne Ticknor \_\_, Mark Bowler\_\_X\_, Susie Harris \_\_X

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (\_X\_ IN ATTENDANCE) (with vote):

Crystal Chambers\_\_\_, Wendy Sergeant\_X\_\_, Mary Farwell\_\_\_, Purificación Martínez\_X\_, Fan-chin Kung\_X\_.

Guests in attendance: Linda Ingalls, Rachel Baker

Call to Order, 3:00 pm

NOTE: This semester's meetings will be on Teams:

<https://facultysenate.ecu.edu/2022/09/07/2022-23-faculty-governance-committee-virtual-links/>

1. Approve attached minutes of Sept. 28, with corrections as needed.

Note that Fan-chin Kung is an ex-officio member. The change was made.

2. Employee Code of Conduct

(Note: When the FGC is done with it, the proposed revision will go to DEI, back to the FGC, and then to the faculty senate).

○

David Wilson-Okamura (Wilson-Okamura) went over the proposed changes that we couldn't resolve last time.

- We had issues about the statement about transparency. Whistle-blowing is okay, but employees should not do things that would embarrass the university if they became publicly known.

○ Mark Bowler (Bowler) noted that we should specify that this refers to employees performing their duties, not their private behavior.

○ Linda Ingalls (Ingalls) suggested adding the word "respect."

○ Wilson-Okamura noted that part 2.7 was very long. He revised the heading to state that employees should comply with laws and policies, etc.

○ Others suggested some editing and their changes were accepted by the committee.

○ There was some discussion about the part on Vendors, Contractors, and Volunteers.

- It was moved to the bottom of expectations after "employees shall cooperate with inquiries..."

- A motion was made to send the document, as amended, to the DEI committee for suggestions.
  - The motion carried unanimously.

New items from the chair of the faculty:

3. Review Part IX to make sure all interpretations have been incorporated and to consider whether additional language is necessary to authorize virtual meetings for consideration of personnel matters and authorized electronic voting processes for secret ballots.

(NOTE: Rachel Baker comments: would need to be done at some point before Part IX is released by the committee for vote by Faculty Senate. If you prefer to vote on the search committee additions separately from any additions these considerations might warrant, then a different subcommittee might work on it than the one for Search Committees).

- Puri Martinez (Martinez) volunteered to check. The committee agreed.
- Bowler asked if there is anything that notes that online meetings can be held and thinks that Anne Ticknor (Ticknor), Chair of the Faculty Senate, is getting questions about that. He thinks we need to make sure that the meetings can be online.
  - Martinez noted that we can just include language that notes that meetings can take place in-person or online.
  - Rachel Baker (Baker) asked about addressing issues about meeting format informing decisions.
  - Wilson-Okamura proposed that we do not specify the meeting format, since nothing in the existing manual prohibits online meetings.
  - Ed Gomez (Gomez) agreed. He provided examples of how to get a quorum-with some in-person and others online, but thinks voting has to happen one way or the other.
  - Sandra Warren (Warren) noted that she did not think the virtual meetings were allowed pre-pandemic and now people might say we are going back to pre-pandemic procedures.
  - Martinez does not think that was the case, but online meetings were not held pre-pandemic.
- Wilson-Okamura suggested that we could offer advice to the officers of the faculty senate rather than revise the Manual.
  - Bowler thinks we need to be explicit and say that the meetings can be held face-to-face, online, or hybrid.
  - Martinez noted that we need to specify using university-approved technologies.
  - Susie Harris (Harris) agreed.
  - Wilson-Okamura is worried that virtual meetings degrade our decision making.
- Wilson-Okamura called for a vote on the 3 modalities and the committee agreed that it should explicitly say face-to-face, online, or hybrid.
  - He asked people to email possible wording and placement to Martinez.
- Wilson-Okamura noted that we need to make things unambiguous.

- Wilson-Okamura asked about the question of mail ballots.
  - Martinez said that we do not want mail ballots and that electronic would be okay.
- Wilson-Okamura thinks it is okay to remove mail ballots, but if we lose power, then mail ballots work, but they are expensive.
- Questions were asked about how to vote. The committee needs to decide how to vote.
- Ingalls noted that some of the language came from the open forums about the cumulative evaluation and the separate vote about the personnel action (promotion and/or tenure).

4. Fixed-term advancement in title: can a title be skipped? It has been allowed at least once but is not addressed in the Faculty Manual. If it is addressed, where should it be addressed (Part VIII in description of fixed-term titles? In Part IX for advancement in title? Or both?)

- Wilson-Okamura asked if folks could skip a title as a fixed-term faculty member. For example, can you go to a title 2 steps above you or do you need to go through all of the titles?
- Bowler thinks it is fine, but you need 2 votes. So you vote at each rank.
- There was a discussion among committee members about this topic.
  - Wendy Sergeant (Sergeant) noted that things need to be very clear about the votes suggested by Bowler.
  - Martinez noted that maybe we need to advise the chair of the faculty to allow the decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis.
  - Gomez noted that the rank attainment could be part of the unit code.
  - Wilson-Okamura noted that time and service at the previous rank are described as being normal in the Faculty Manual's description of each rank.
  - Bowler asked if the faculty manual is permissive or prohibitive.
    - Ingalls indicated that if it is not expressly prohibited then it is allowed.
  - Wilson-Okamura indicated that the existing text offers normative guidance, but allows for exceptions that can be applied at the unit and college level.
    - The committee agreed with this procedure.

5. Minimal Unit Code Requirements in Part IV.II.IV, #11. There are indications that many units do not actually follow the procedures to allow for voting on the unit's major planning documents, assessment documents, Guidelines for Unit Academic Program Review, and other major reports. Administrators point to deadlines for turnaround that inhibit their ability to solicit votes. There are also questions of the appropriate voting faculty when the unit is coded at the college level. Is it appropriate to have all college voting faculty vote on the assessment documents or an academic program review for a department within that college?

○

- Bowler noted that item #11 said that things such as academic related reports that leave a unit have to be voted on by the faculty. So before they submit end of the year report, the faculty should view it, discuss it, vote on it, and then review it.
- Warren noted that there have been issues connected to specific departments, etc.
- Baker noted that it is especially of concern to units coded at the college level, where those without a lot of knowledge about a unit get a say on something.
- Martinez indicated that we need to follow procedures.
- Ingalls noted that in Part 4, that unit codes define voting faculty, etc. in terms of who can vote on particular items. So voting in part 2, ,4 and 9 is specified. However, any other items to vote on they can then define voting faculty and designate criteria. There is nothing in unit codes to prevent units from defining who are the voting faculty for a particular activity. The Unit Code Screening Committee looks for these things with regard to policies. She noted that units are very different and you have SACS requirements about who controls the curriculum, etc.
- Ingalls and Wilson-Okamura indicated that the Unit Code Screening Committee could add guidance to the format. Ticknor could request this as Chair of the Faculty.
- Wilson-Okamura summarized the committee's advice to the faculty officers: units have to do what is in their unit code. However, units have the latitude to revise their unit codes to be responsive to the expertise of their faculty. The unit code is not specified so closely by the Faculty Manual that you cannot amend your unit code to meet the needs of your unit.
- Martinez agreed as long as the voice of the faculty is protected. For example, if only associate deans vote that would not work. We need to ensure that the faculty votes.
- Bowler indicated that, for example, in Brody, they have a broad code so they need some specific language to the appropriate department.
- Wilson-Okamura noted the following:
  - Administrators are responsible for executing the procedures in their unit code.
  - Codes can be amended to restrict voting on issues that require expertise and responsibility to the faculty members who have that expertise and that responsibility.
- Bowler was asked to communicate this information to Ticknor, the Chair of the Faculty.
- Ingalls noted that units are very understanding of the SACS requirements with regard to academically-qualified faculty, so she does not see controversy over that.

## 6. Other new business.

No other business was brought forth to the committee.  
The committee adjourned at 4:37 p.m.