

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
2022-2023 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 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\_X\_, Mark Bowler\_\_X\_, Susie Harris\_X\_\_

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

Crystal Chambers\_X\_, Wendy Sergeant\_X\_\_, Mary Farwell\_\_\_, Purificación Martínez\_\_\_, Fanchin Kung\_X\_\_\_, Mark Hand\_\_\_

Guests in attendance: Linda Ingalls, Rachel Baker

Call to Order, 3:00 pm

This meeting of the spring semester is on Teams. For the link, see <https://facultysenate.ecu.edu/2022/09/07/2022-23-faculty-governance-committee-virtual-links/>

1. Approve previously-circulated minutes of the January 11, 2023, meeting, with corrections as needed.

- The minutes of the 1-11-2023 meeting were approved.

2. Reports

a. Bullying subcommittee

- Mark Bowler (Bowler) reported on the following ideas for the faculty forum:
  - They suggest having a 1 hour to 75-minute session.
  - They recommend having the ombudsman to present, as he is a very good presenter on this topic.
  - They also suggest having data from the THRIVE focus group presented.
    - They note that sharing direct quotes is pretty compelling.
  - They recommend presenting so as to focus on how to resolve the issues.
  - Ideas and can open the floor for questions.
  - They suggest taking straw polls to see if they see a need for changes.
- David Wilson-Okamura (Okamura) suggested gauging the usefulness of a straw poll ahead of time. If the group attending is small, the results of the poll might be misleading.
- Bowler noted that the people there may have a very particular reason for being there so that the sub-committee might not do a straw poll; will figure out before doing one.

- Bowler said that the forum would be in mid to late February. Then the sub-committee will bring it back to the Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) by March and then present it to the faculty senate.
- Crystal Chambers (Chambers) suggested holding the forum online on a Friday at 12 noon.
  - This day/time would minimize other faculty conflicts.
  - She still needs to find the right date.
- Wilson-Okamura noted that the subcommittee has already been authorized to do this at the full committee's last meeting.

b. PAD and process subcommittee

Items from this sub-committee were not presented at this time.

c. Annual report and workload subcommittee

- Bowler noted that the Board of Governors (BOG) is looking at tenure, teaching, faculty teaching workloads, etc. and we can expect big changes in all of these items.
  - He noted that there will be a trickle down to the policy manual and PRR changes, and changes to the faculty manual.
  - He thinks we should table it until we get concrete items.
- Wilson-Okamura asked if anyone disagreed with tabling this item.
  - No one did and the item was considered tabled.
    - As it was noted that it is not constructive unless to strategize.
    - He also noted that the BOG goal is to have it done by summer.

d. If available: report on Budget Committee's discussion of salary increments for fixed-term advancement in title.

There was no news from this subcommittee at this time.

3. Recommendation from the subcommittee on search committee procedures (attached).

- Wilson-Okamura noted that Crystal Chambers and Susie Harris comprise this subcommittee.
- He noted that the FGC can see recommendation in blue in the faculty manual
- Chambers noted that this procedure that adds one search committee from outside your area on a search committee has been used in the college of education
  - It is also a research based strategy because the unit's micro-climate and they get used to doing things in a certain way and introduce bias so it is going to promote asking questions
  - Resistance to it is that it is hard enough to create search committees in a unit or cluster hires
  - The suggestion is that when we present this that we coordinate with Bowler
  - The Search Advocates program is used in some universities.

- However, here we are inserting language rather than an entire program.
- It could be helpful to introduce reciprocity; For example, I need someone now-you need someone later. That can go a long way toward collaboration as we lower the walls of our silos.
- Wilson-Okamura asked for comments and questions.
  - Bowler said that complaints from senators will get everyone riled up and he can picture senators thinking about problems.
  - Chambers believes that will happen too so we have to get out in front of them with research.
  - Susie Harris (Harris) agreed.
  - Bowler thinks it helps that it is already going on.
- Wilson-Okamura noted that we might say that at the beginning there might be disagreement, but we would like to see an up or down vote on the proposal.
  - Bowler likes the guidance as he does do not want to bring it back; he wants a vote on it
  - Chambers noted that we can add the research.
  - Bowler says we can rationalize beforehand and put hyperlinks in there to be compelling pieces and that would be helpful.
  - Ed Gomez (Gomez) noted that his department already uses this strategy for search committees, as in they have an external person.
    - Chambers asked Gomez to confirm if it is in the unit code.
  - Sandy Warren (Warren) suggested reviewing unit codes to see what they are already doing
  - Chambers noted that she knows it is not in College of Education's code, as it is a practice not a policy
  - Fan-chin Kung (Kung) asked how widely it is used.
    - Chambers noted that it is used in many NSF programs.
  - Bowler stated that he had an issue with the wording.
- Wilson-Okamura asked Linda Ingalls (Ingalls) if the language is consistent with what is used elsewhere in our documents.
  - Ingalls believes the language is consistent unless you are saying the person must be a faculty member.
    - She noted that for example that would not be the case at Brody for clinical appointments, and at the dental school it could be an issue as well,
    - She noted that the library tends to have some outside the unit.
    - She thinks the language is okay because we have so many variations.
    - She noted that the language needs to be clear due to questions people might have about this item.
- Wilson-Okamura stated that individual unit codes can and do have further specifications for search committees. Therefore nonacademic personnel will not be appointed over objections of faculty.
- Gomez thinks ROTC might have issues with the wording as well so maybe we just use the term a coded unit

- Chambers noted that other than having an outside person the unit can create a search committee according to their code
  - The FGC voted on the item. The motion carried unanimously.
- Wilson-Okamura asked when we should try to get this on the senate agenda.
- Chambers said that she can send documentation tomorrow; her only concern is that this is part of part IX and we need to coordinate it with that.
  - We need to check with Puri Martinez (Martinez)
  - We have not sent other parts of part IX to the faculty senate.
  - Wilson-Okamura will coordinate with Martinez and Rachel Baker (Baker) to get the entire package. He asked Crystal to coordinate with Bowler and Rachel about what goes to the senate, noting that shorter is better.

#### 4. Changes to Faculty Constitution and By-laws proposed by administration (attached).

- Wilson-Okamura asked Anne Ticknor (Ticknor) to tell us where she is on this item ( see revised version of Article VIII)
- Ticknor received the 2nd version in the late fall. This is an improved version.
  - She shared it with Jeff Popke because he chaired the subcommittee a few years ago and she shared it with others and is getting similar feedback.
  - She has a meeting with the chancellor next week and noted that we are still in the informal stage.
  - There are some logistical things as well.
  - She asked to hear the committee's thoughts.
- Wilson-Okamura said that it sounds like we are not at stage for the FGC to give a formal response.
- Ticknor agreed and noted that leadership is in stage where they'd like to have conversations.
  - Yet, she noted, that maybe not all negotiations
  - She does not think we are ready to present to the faculty senate.
- Wilson-Okamura asked for the FGC committee members' feedback.
  - Chambers noted that she appreciates Ticknor's approach, etc. and thinks we have to play this one by ear.
  - Ticknor noted that she has not shared this with senate committee chairs
  - Gomez stated that we are not in a collective bargaining state so he is wary about giving the president more power over the faculty and he does not want to diminish whatever power the faculty senate has
    - He wants to be an advocate for the faculty senate.
  - Chambers agreed with Gomez, but also thinks there are things we can do; for example, remember that members in AAUP are ready to go
- Wilson-Okamura stated that he wrote draft a response in case it was needed (and he shared it on the screen)
  - He thinks that what is almost intolerable is allowing the chancellor to unilaterally reorganize code units.

- It should be resisted because faculty control over the curriculum is fundamental to academic freedom and accreditation.
- He does not see the need for the chancellor to rewrite our bylaws, etc.
- Chambers noted that these changes are for power centralization.
  - The chancellor wanted a strong provost; he came here with the intention of focusing outward. But these kinds of changes reconnect him to internal debates.
- Wilson-Okamura noted that when the chancellor can amend something in the senate's own bylaws without the approval of senate, that is against principles of shared governance.
  - He indicated that the changes seem to make the faculty senate answerable to the chancellor instead of the faculty. This is unnecessary because the senate has little power, but it reduces the senate's ability to give genuinely independent advice.
- Chambers noted that a conversation with the chancellor would be helpful.
- Wilson-Okamura asked if there were any further ideas about our committee's response.
- Ticknor thinks it will come back to this committee.
  - She noted that maybe we do negotiate it.
  - She also noted that this committee will be a point to present it and then send it to the faculty senate and then a general faculty meeting, such as convocation or a special meeting
  - She indicated that there is a long process involved.
- Wilson-Okamura agreed: he was re-reading provisions for amendments, etc. and there is no way that the FGC can accept changes on its own authority.
- Bowler averred that almost every change was hostile to shared governance.
- Chambers asked what we think of bringing in AAUP to meet with past chairs
- Ticknor thinks it might not be time.
  - She noted that we might need to be separate because that body represents some things we cannot.
  - She also stated that a response from us might be stronger than a collaboration.
- Wilson-Okamura observed that we need to respect Ticknor's sense of the situation and her relationships with chancellor.

## 5. Other.

No new business was brought forward.

- The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.