MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

ATTENDANCE

PRESIDING: David Wilson-Okamura

REGULAR MEMBERS (X_IN ATTENDANCE):
Edwin Gomez _X_, Anne Ticknor _X_, Cynthia Deale _X_, Mark Bowler _X_, Susie Harris _X_, Purificación Martínez _X_, Sandra Warren _X_

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (_X_IN ATTENDANCE) (with vote):
Crystal Chambers _X_, Wendy Sergeant _X_, Mary Farwell ___, Fan-chin Kung _X_, Mark Hand _X_

Guests in attendance: Linda Ingalls, Rachel Baker

Call to Order at 3:00 PM

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

1. Approved the minutes of October 26, 2022 meeting.
   o Correction: Purificación Martínez is a regular member and not an ex office member.

2. Democracy in unit codes. (Items 2 and 3 agenda were swapped.)
   o Faculty Manual, Part II, Section II: Definition of Unit Code begins, ”Each Code Unit shall develop a Unit Code of Operations that will provide for the conduct of the unit’s affairs according to Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised and the requirements set out below in subsection IV.”
   o “Does this mean a Robert’s democratic structure within the unit or just its meeting procedure? If a democratic structure is not required, can a unit set up a restricted democracy?”
   o Kung, who posed the question, will start the discussion.
     o Fan-chin Kung: Some unit codes assign committee members to standing committee without election. “We should explicitly state the [rules of democracy] in the unit codes.”
     o Mark Bowler: How old is the code? FK: More than a decade old.
     o Linda Ingalls: Unit faculty are given latitude regarding their specific polices and procedures as long as they are not violations of the UNC Policy Manual, PRRs, etc. If that had come to the UCSC now, it would not be questioned if that is how the faculty chose to operate. As long as it is following the other roles of the personnel committee, etc. additional roles of personnel committee would not be questioned. Robert rules allows an organization to establish bylaws – the unit code are the unit
bylaws as long as they do not violate a higher authority. Part IX defines the tenure committee, promotion committee, personnel committee itself. It is a broader discussion when we look at a code. If your code says that your personnel committee appoints them, etc. then she would question if you really want to do that.

- FK: According to Robert’s Rules (RR), the committee should be elected.
- LI: RR allows organizations to establish bylaws. We view codes as bylaws. Need to look at the standing committee section of the code and understand how those members are chosen and selected. We would question if that was the intent. RR can scale based on department size.
- DWO: RR allows for majorities to act without silencing minorities but it allows great freedom to organizations to self-organizations. It is the overarching structure but does not prohibit organizations from self-structure.
- MB: As this code is being revised, look at other codes that are.
- Crystal Chamber: Speak with Rachel Roper as she was instrumental to the Brody code changes.

3. New peer observation forms. (See attachments.)

- From Mary Tucker-McLaughlin (School of Communication): "During our last University Committee Chair meeting, Dr. Ticknor asked that we collaborate on appropriate projects. I am attaching drafts of revised Peer Observation. We welcome your suggestions up until the end of the semester. Our plan is to present these new instruments to Faculty Senate early in the Spring.”
- Martinez, who helped with drafting, will start the discussion.
  - PM: As chair, there were a lot of questions about the different modalities of instruction and how those impact the different ratings of courses. We realized the Senate instruments had not been revised in a long time. Additionally, a lot of departments, particularly in HCAS, created their own instruments a long time ago and never revised them. So, we looked at best practices to see what kind of improvements could be made. This is the first committee that is looking at the proposed updates.
  - DWO: Not sure how this fits into our charge.
  - MB: These forms are used for promotion and tenure decisions as well as
  - FK: What would the best process be? Work it out as a group or as a subcommittee?
  - PM: We can start by looking at the feedback that has already been provided by MB and Sandra Warren.
  - DWO: Let’s have a discussion about this today and give feedback to GEIE. They need to bring it to the senate. That seems to be the proper priority.
  - DWO: Two questions:
    - How specific do we think the form should be?
      - MB: It should be comprehensive to all things we consider to be important:
      - DWO: That doesn’t seem reasonable to expect that we can capture that in a single form. We should back up and better understand what it is we are trying to evaluate.
      - CC: At NCState they will record the class. Then OFE members will go through the video with the faculty member and provide feedback. It would help with
      - FG: What is the document trying to move towards? It the current document not comprehensive enough?
CC: One of the issues that was addressed with us was that when faculty observe flipped classrooms, they don’t see the appropriate dimensions.

DWO: UDL is not currently in the Faculty Manual but we should allow for the diversity of instruction and the students.

CC: Making things accessible to all makes it better for everyone.

FK: Some things are about the entire course and other things are about the lecture. How do we reconcile these?

PM: My research all had scales, they were not open-ended. But what I found was that they had multiple instruments. One for flipped classrooms, labs, etc. The problem might be that we only have two forms.

DWO: You might need to stratify it further. Large classes for example.

PM: Other institutions do a lot more.

MB: Could make a form with sections that are chosen based on the nature of the class. Some sections would be used and others would be ignored.

Those administrators who have used them, how useful do you find the checklist?

CC: The expectation is that you are already a good instructor so

PM: We do a lot of peer observations of FT faculty, we used to have an open-ended form and it did not lend to having a norm about what is consider a good practice. We have since moved to a form with ratings that has made the process a much better process. Everyone has a clearer idea of what is important. It has been well received.

SW: We tend to use the items more as food for thought and discussion starters.

Edwin Gomez: I focus on both. Different items are relevant on different class days based on what is being covered that day. It’s important to know both things so the ratings can be contextualized.

PM: The pre-observation instructions address these issues. In the initial tests, this was the most appreciated component.

4. Other new business.

- DWO: Concern about the conduct of Senate meetings and a breech of regular rules of order by a high-level administrator.
  - Anne Ticknor: Many questions have been raised about what the rules are and what are our general policies have been in the past. It is being discussed and comments and suggestions are welcomed.
    - Brief discussion and suggested improvements.

- Update on progress of subcommittees.

- Addition to Part V, Section II of the Faculty Manual (Academic Freedom, Professional Ethics, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion).
  - 3. As colleagues, faculty will refrain from repeated, unreasonable actions directed towards other members of the university community which are intended to intimidate, degrade, humiliate, or undermine; or which create a risk to the health or safety of others.
- Discussion about the inclusions of the words “repeated” and “intended.” “Repeated” suggests intent.
- AT: Item 2 also states “do not discriminate.” Additionally, where does harassment fit in with all of this? It needs to be unwanted.
- CC: The policy hole is protections associated with aggressive behaviors that are not related to protected status. Additionally, faculty are often exempted out of some HR rules.
- DWO: Including these behaviors in the FM here allows them to be considered as part of the tenure decisions.
- DWO: Suggests that we move into the previous section as it seems like a good fit.
- Further debate over the specific terminology of the proposed language.
  - Moved (CC) and seconded (EG): 2. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or engage in hostile conduct toward members of the university community. Professors refrain from repeated, unreasonable actions directed towards other members of the university community which are intended to intimidate, degrade, humiliate, or undermine; or which create a risk to the health or safety of others. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors give proper acknowledgement to the ideas and data of others and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
    - Approved by all members.

The committee adjourned at 4:41 PM