

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
2021-2022 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, April 27, 2022, 3-5 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

PRESIDING: David Wilson-Okamura

REGULAR MEMBERS (\_X\_ IN ATTENDANCE):

Stacey Altman \_X\_, Cynthia Deale \_\_, Edwin Gomez \_X\_, Jay Newhard \_X\_, Anne Ticknor \_X\_, Mark Bowler \_X\_, Susie Harris \_X\_

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

Crystal Chambers \_X\_, Wendy Sergeant \_X\_, Mary Farwell \_X\_, Purificación Martínez \_X\_, Dave Thomson \_\_, Lisa Hudson, \_X\_

Guests in attendance: Linda Ingalls, Rachel Baker

Call to Order, 3:00 PM

1. Approved minutes of the 4/13/2022 meeting that were disseminated on 4/18/2022.
  - Minutes stood as approved.
2. Acknowledgement of Rachel Baker's contribution to the committee.
  - Has helped us to avoid material errors.
3. Report on Tuesday's Faculty Senate meeting (Bowler, Martínez).
  - Martinez: Nothing to report.
  - Bowler: Nothing to report.
4. Report on fixed-term contract language negotiation with Academic Council (Martínez, Wilson-Okamura).
  - Martinez: Having problems scheduling meeting among Wilson-Okamura, Martinez, and the Academic Council (AC).
  - Martinez: AC was asked if they had made any progress on this item.
  - Martinez: AC shared the current language that was going to be shared with the Chancellor.
  - Martinez: Met with Wilson-Okamura to review new language and did not find them to be appropriate; subsequently prepared a counter proposal to the AC that would then be sent to Chancellor/Office of Legal Counsel.
  - Martinez: Meet with Provost and VC or REDE and they expressed support.

- Martinez: Met with Chancellor and presented a series of documentation; the arguments resonated and he noted that they would be shared.
- Hudson: Encouraging that leadership is understanding; it is deterring recruitment.
- Martinez: Other institutions have requested copies of the contract language that is being promoted.
- Wilson-Okamura: The language that was being forwarded by the AC to Chancellor was not what Faculty Governance (FG) had developed.
- Wilson-Okamura: This will be included as business for next year.

5. Committee's annual report: procedure for drafting and approving.

[See the "Faculty Senate Resolutions February 2022 Memo" and "FSR 22-14 - Faculty Grievance Procedures and Appeals of Non-Conferral of Early Tenure (MIK review)."]

- Wilson-Okamura: Are there any objections about circulating it by email and approving it by email?
- Nope.

6. Proposed revisions to Faculty Manual, Part IX from the fixed-term subcommittee (Chambers, Farwell, Martínez, Wilson-Okamura).

- The following information was provided in the agenda:

See attachment "FGC edits, Part IX, Section 1 proposal from FT subcommittee."

At our last meeting, we got to the bottom of p. 19.

However, Ingalls pointed out that there is an opportunity to incorporate a recent interpretation in the opening paragraphs. See attachments: "Ingalls et al., Interpretation," "Interpret Fac Man Part IX Prologue memo," "FGC minutes February 2020."

Let's start there and then return to the bottom of p. 19.

Related: Should we add minimum requirements for fixed-term portfolios in Part X? For example:

- All annual evaluations since last appointment
- For teaching faculty members, all student evaluations since last appointment
- For teaching faculty members, all peer observations since last appointment. Should we also require a minimum number of observations? If so, key it to years of service? E.g., at least 1 observation since your last contract until you reach 10 years of service?

- Wilson-Okamura: Linda Ingalls noted that there was an interpretation on May 6, 2020 that was relevant and this was used to update the language. We need to examine a particular portion of Part IX regarding the definition of academic units.
- Ingalls: To me the sense of what was decided was that unit code should address who is the unit administrator.

- Martinez: In the School of Dental Medicine (SODM), when hiring a new faculty member, the search committee reports to the chair of the department, who reports to the Personnel Committee (PC), who reports to the Dean. That is a convoluted structure that seems to undermine the role of PC.
  - Wilson-Okamura: The Unit Code Screening Committee (UCSC) is a safe-guard for that kind of issue.
  - Martinez: Need to clarify that to UCSC. They will follow the rules that are created so we need to make sure that the rules are what we want them to be.
  - Ingalls: SODM utilizes a process that they think is best for ensuring a successful support package for the faculty member – academically and clinically. They followed the faculty manual. The chair undertook that negating of the package.
  - Martinez: Putting together a package is synonymous to putting together an offer and that should come after PC.
  - Chambers: The language differentiate between the structure of units and the process that is undertaken.
  - Wilson-Okamura: Do we need to incorporate the interpretation in the new language?
  - Martinez: No, we can decide if it is necessary.
  - Wilson-Okamura: Are there specific universal procedures that we want followed? If so, we should add that to new business for next year.
  - Ingalls: The interpretation was intended to allow unit to generate their own organizational structure but not engender their own processes that disregard the processes of the Faculty Manual (FM).
  - Ingalls: Clarify was a statement about structure then a statement about processes and that they should be congruent with the FM.
  - Chamber: It does need to be more consistent.
  - Bowler: Clarify what is being discussed at the beginning. Who is included in professional colleges and schools?
  - Ingalls: Having Part IX too specific is typically problematic. For example, some codes don't define departments. Letting Part IV provide the specificity is better. The specificity of the beginning of the paragraph is what required SODM to request the interpretation.
  - Martinez: Shared the processes for hiring in the SODM code that was noted above.
  - Wilson-Okamura: The later parts of the FM suggest that the SODM code is not compliant with the FM.
  - Chambers: Raises the issue of language construction. We define what a unit is and what is a unit administrator. We need to make sure that we have consistency in the use of the language for consistency.
  - Martinez: When we describe PC, we should allow for at the department level or at the unit level.
  - Ingalls: For example, in the College of Nursing (CON), PC is at the unit level despite having departments and department chairs. Faculty teach across programs in the college.
  - Hudson: But they are assigned to a department.

- Chambers: An additional concern is interdisciplinarity which plays a big role in structure. The role clarity flows from the wording of these section and should probably be changes to Part IV.
- Wilson-Okamura: We will have a subcommittee look at the procedures in Part IV for revising a unit code.
- Altman: Agreed on the Part IV.
- Ingalls: We had always understood that if units have departments, then you have both PC and Tenure and Promotion (TP) Committee at the departmental level. Library and Nursing wanted to have PC at the college level and not the department level. Might not have enough tenured faculty in a department. Personnel and Tenure and Promotion Committees might only have 1-2 people from inside a department. As this was written, we
  - Wilson-Okamura: More consideration on this item is necessary.
- Wilson-Okamura: Resuming on Page 19 from the past meeting. There is concern about the voting for membership on a PC. Should this be done via secret ballot?
  - Newhard: Asked for clarification.
  - Wilson-Okamura: Fixed-term faculty are concerned that voting will be different if not anonymous.
  - Martinez: That that is how FLL functions – elections.
  - Ingalls: This particular additional is just regarding adding members.
  - Bowler: If it makes fixed-term uncomfortable then we should protect them even if it is additional effort.
  - Newhard: Unneeded protection is always better than needed protection.
  - Hudson: In BSOM, when the Dean want to hire a Department Chair, he will ask the faculty to elect faculty representation. Important to have faculty input.
  - Bowler: Faculty are represented via the electing of member on Personnel Committee.
  - Ingalls: Use the term “establish” rather than “appoint” or “elect.”
  - Bowler: “Establish.”
  - Chambers: It can get contentious. Elections work well in my department to ensure representation of smaller disciplines. The term “Create” would be more appropriate.
  - Wilson-Okamura: This was written so that tenure track (TT) faculty who are not going to be reviewed for tenure and promotion can no longer serve.
  - Ticknor: Need to consider the role of retiring faculty on PC and TP. Causes issues with quorum as they often don’t attend meetings.
  - Newhard: Although problematic, it is probably something to live with.
  - Wilson-Okamura: Reluctant to remove people from committees just due to their status.
- Wilson-Okamura: What is the appropriate documentation for FT faculty subsequent appointment and advancement in title?
  - Chambers: It is important to have as much documentation as possible. Keeping a record protects everyone.
  - Ticknor: Without a portfolio it would be their reviews and a current CV.
  - Wilson-Okamura: There are currently zero guidelines about what a portfolio should include.

- Hudson: BSOM has so many fixed-term faculty – the majority – we do not require portfolio or a CV for subsequent reappointment. It is based on the chair sending the request to the PC and they make a recommendation. A portfolio is necessary for advancement in title.
- Bowler: It is important to give fixed-term faculty clarity about what is expected. The ambiguity makes the processes unnecessarily difficult. Unit codes should specify what is required (and nothing isn't acceptable).
- Wilson-Okamura: ENGL aligned the Portfolio with the Annual Evaluations.
- Wilson-Okamura: Regarding quorum, has this happened?
  - Ingalls: There have been a few instances when it three attempts were necessary to reach a quorum. They can petition the Chancellor for an extension due to a compelling circumstance.
  - Gomez: Add Oxford commas. If the committee fails to meet for three times, why does that count against the faculty member?
  - Bowler: Should it be a "null" recommendation?
  - Newhard: There are two incredibly different outcomes, yes or no. Abstaining is different. That is choosing to not participate. Not meeting is on the department, not the candidate. Thus, it should be neutral. Null is too negative.

#### 7. Other business

- Nothing additional was discussed.

#### 8. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

*The meeting minutes are respectfully submitted by Mark Bowler*