

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2022-2023 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, February 8, 2023, 3-5 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

PRESIDING: David Wilson-Okamura

REGULAR MEMBERS (X_ IN ATTENDANCE):

Sandra Warren__, Cynthia Deale _X_, Edwin Gomez __, 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_X_, Fan-chin Kung_X__, Mark Hand_X_

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 the following:

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

1. Approve previously-distributed minutes of Jan. 25, with corrections if needed.

2. Reports

a. Bullying subcommittee

- Crystal Chambers (Chambers) told the committee that she has set up a faculty forum for Thursday, February 16 at 3 pm on WebEx.
 - They have a Qualtrics form for feedback and follow up.
 - They also have an agenda and a PowerPoint in progress and will have some data available.
 - They will share information about it today via Announce.
 - She has modified the document per George Bailey's feedback.
- David Wilson-Okamura (Wilson-Okamura) noted that the subcommittee will listen to faculty forum feedback and then meet to decide if need to redraft, revise, etc. and bring it to the faculty senate.
- Chambers noted that some language has been added to the draft that the senate tabled.
 - She suggested that a more detailed policy might, at some point, be embodied in a PRR.

- She noted that we need definitions of what bullying is and what it is not.
- Chambers showed the attendees the draft of the PowerPoint for the forum and the SHRM's model policy on bullying: https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-samples/policies/pages/cms_018350.aspx.

b. PAD and process subcommittee

- Puri Martinez (Martinez) said the committee met last week and talked about how Fac 180 could be used.
 - She said that they need one more meeting with fac 180 coordinator (Cara Gohns) to better understand some of the problems that might be encountered; the meeting scheduled for early next week.
 - She does not recommend that a template be created in Faculty 180.
 - Instead, she recommends having a word doc or pdf uploaded; otherwise the process will be cumbersome.
 - She noted that she will have ideas for early next week and she will have a document ready for the Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) to vote on at our next meeting.
- Wilson-Okamura asked if the process would have a way to maintain items from the tenure PAD that might be relevant for promotion to full professor. For example, the tenure PAD would show whether a publication had already been evaluated for tenure.
 -
- Martinez noted that they can ask the question.
- Chambers says it is an interesting question in terms of what counts for a full professor.
 - She observed that tenure allows professors to be part of the guild and then becoming a full professor is the sum total of the package, and you have shown yourself to be a national and/or international scholar.
 - She thinks it is interesting to see what work constitutes that of a full professor.
- Anne Ticknor (Ticknor) said that she is thinking about language in the faculty manual and that weight is given to what has happened since the last personnel action; that it is interesting to see how it is operationalized.
 - For example, she asked --does the committee go back to the PAD? And then how can you get access to a previous PAD?
- Wilson-Okamura noted that in English they don't double count items.
 - When he was preparing for promotion to full professor, the person who was then dean effectively asked: "What have you done for us lately?"
 - A helpful conversation would be one about promotion committees and why they might want to consider tenure PADS and would want to know what materials could carry over from tenure to promotion.
 - For example, would they view records of external reviews and cumulative evaluations?
- Martinez noted that she thinks that if she were to ask to see a PAD from a previous decision that she would be denied access and thinks that maybe we need to have Linda Ingalls or Wendy Sergeant or someone in academic affairs look into this issue.

- Wilson -Okamura noted that the same PAD used to be used for both tenure and then promotion to full professor.
- Chambers said that is not universally true, as she generated a new PAD and we do different things in different units.
- Rachel Baker (Baker) noted that the paper PAD used to go with the faculty member and they would take parts of binder and put it in the unit personnel file and the rest would be given back to the faculty member and a list of publications is on there.
- Linda Ingalls (Ingalls) noted that the if you look at information in part X section I and look at part IX information about what is prioritized the emphasis does appear to be on accomplishments since the last personnel action, so while again part X section I does speak to a candidate putting information in the PAD that the committee and administrators reviewing the PAD can ask to see the evidence.
 - She observed that you can probably get to what Wilson-Okamura's unit is doing in that full cumulative report format that typically has the entire career. It is like a CV—so if it is not in the cumulative report and referenced there then presumably, we have permission for members of the committees to ask to see the evidence or supporting materials for that accomplishment.
- Martinez noted that promotion committees can ask to see the evidence for any claims in the PAD—for example, the article itself.
- Wendy Sergeant (Sergeant)-asked about the records retention policy in part VIII.
- Ticknor and Baker noted that the Part VIII language has not yet been approved.
- Sergeant stated that when a faculty member leaves the institution that the PAD goes with the faculty member and there was a concern that a PAD might still be in the unit when a faculty member left the institution.
- Mark Bowler (Bowler) noted that they look at the totality of one's career in psychology.
- Wilson-Okamura stated that he thinks that we need a way to retain important information, but he is not trying to standardize criteria for promotion across all units.
 - He noted that eventually all PADs will be electronic, and retention of material from paper PADs will stop being an issue.
- Chambers provided the information that the average faculty member retires at age 72 so a lot of us will be around for a while.
- Wilson-Okamura asked the subcommittee members to look at what, if any, material might usefully be carried over from a paper PAD to an electronic one.

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

- Wilson-Okamura asked Ticknor about advancement in title and pay.
- Ticknor thinks it got slowed down a bit and they are looking at things such as supplemental pay for research grant faculty.
- Chambers reminded us that it could be another strategy to raise salaries of professional faculty and do away with tenure-track and tenured faculty altogether.
- Baker noted that it is on the agenda.
- Bowler noted that Martinez is an expert and will be at the meeting.

- Martinez will communicate on Monday with Baker about the document.

d. Faculty officers: discussion with administrators on Faculty Constitution and By-laws

- Ticknor met with previous senate leaders to get their perspectives and advice.
- She had one on one meeting with the chancellor last week and shared a couple points with him.
 - The two points she shared with him were the following:
 - The first point was that perhaps a revision would be putting a statement in the preamble to make clear that the chancellor has the ultimate authority and is responsible for creating it and can also dissolve it, etc.
 - The second point was about how the faculty senate operates. For example-where the authority is and how it operates and adding some of that language in there.
 - Everyone she shared the proposed changes with had a similar response.
 - It was not positive, though they are still in the talking stage.
 - She wants feedback from the FGC.
- Martinez noted that she thinks Ticknor covered it well and that we should put together a draft that is a good compromise.
- Ticknor said that to be clear, the draft would come go back to chancellor and then be presented at the faculty senate and the FGC committee and then it would have to go to a faculty vote, probably at the faculty convocation.
- Chambers ask if this is this something chancellor wants or is it from university counsel on behalf of the chancellor.
- Ticknor indicated that she does not have that answer.
 - Ticknor asked the chancellor how he wants to work with the faculty senate.
- Wilson-Okamura said that we will take our cues from Ticknor and her team and asked how she would like to proceed; he envisions drafting a compromise.
- Ticknor said that she would be happy to do that, but conversations are still ongoing.
- Bowler asked if it has been formally sent back with a memorandum.
- Ticknor has been offered that at this time.
- Bowler thinks we should go through the draft line by line as it is an attack on shared governance and we are presenting our preferred method for interacting with them as this is how we have been doing it for 60 years.
- Wilson-Okamura does not see how the proposed changes enhance the authority of the chancellor, but thinks they have a downside, in creating unnecessary friction with the faculty – and that does harm the chancellor’s ability to guide the institution.
- He is in favor of finessing the changes a bit more so that we can have something we can all live with; if it comes to a simple contest of authority, then the faculty will lose and it will leave a mark on the relationships between the faculty and the administration for a while.

- Chambers indicated that it is fundamentally different than what the chancellor said he wanted to do coming in, as he wanted a strong provost. But underscoring his authority is undermining the relationship between the faculty and the provost.
- Wilson-Okamura noted that in our FGC annual report that we can make recommendations to the committee for next year. One of them might be to shorten the feedback loop for new and revised policies.
 - He noted that direct input from the university counsel was typical 6 years ago when he joined the FGC; they also had regular attendance from at least one member of the academic council. That doesn't happen anymore, which slows down the whole process.
- Ticknor agrees and has shared this with the chancellor and the provost.
 - She says faculty are trying to get input from the administration and OUC. The goal is not bad policy, but to have all voices heard so when putting forth a policy then people are on board and have collaborated.
- Wilson-Okamura suggested that we should follow Ticknor's cues and give help where she needs it.
 - He asked the following question: Do the proposed changes allow the chancellor to reorganize units without the faculty's approval? (See Article II, Section 5.) Wilson-Okamura thought they did, and thereby infringed on the faculty's control over curriculum.
- Ticknor wasn't sure that was the effect, and noted that everything we do is advice.
- Chambers and Ticknor noted the recent Chapel Hill news about creating a program without faculty input-- see the link: <https://www.higheredworks.org/2023/02/chapel-hill-board-antics-catch-accreditors-eye/>

3. UNC Compelled Speech Policy (attached), possible effect on DEI training requirement.

- Wilson-Okamura asked if anyone would like to meet with Vice Chancellor Paul Zigas on Friday about this item.
- Chambers offered to meet with Zigas.
- Ticknor noted that the policy will not be approved until 2-22-2023.
 - She is curious if there is anything new. She observed that if it is approved there will be a scrambling to determine what it really means.
- Ticknor says that the DEI committee is interested in this item.
- Fan-chin Kung (Kung) asked about Chambers' draft resolution.
- Chambers noted that we have a right to compose the faculty of people who can teach our students, as we need faculty to support our students.
 - She said that the point is that DEI sessions do not require faculty to say anything specific, etc.
 - She noted that the faculty assembly will be taking this up as well.

- She stated that there is a Board of Governors (BOG) statement and we need to make sure they are not contradicting themselves, since DEI concerns are also prominent in BOG documents.
- She also noted that, in a study of bias on college campuses, conservative students did report feeling constrained, but the constraint came from their fellow students, not the faculty.
- Wilson-Okamura asked if there is a difference between equity and equality.
- Chambers noted that the terms are different; The term equality means everyone is treated the same, whereas equity is based on needs and is differential.
 - For example, she noted that tuition is based on equality.
 - However, she noted that the effect can be differential even though what is happening seems the same.
- Wilson-Okamura asked what the FGC needs to do with regard to this issue.
- Ticknor stated that we need to be vigilant and we need to consider hiring, advancement, promotion and tenure.
 - She shared a draft of a Statement of the Faculty Executive Committee On the Board of Governors' Proposed Amendments to the Policy on Political Activities by Employees.
- Wilson-Okamura shared Chambers' draft resolution and asked what the FGC thinks the committee's role should be.
- Bowler worries that whatever we say now will not get the attention it might get after the BOG has actually passed the change.
- Chambers noted that we need a document drafted so that we can move more quickly.
 - She sees us partnering with the staff senate.
- Martinez agreed.
- Kung asked about the review panel for UNC leaders and asked if there is another side of the story.
- Wilson-Okamura asked if there is anyone on the committee who thinks that BOG proposal has a point and is uncomfortable with a resolution from the FGC or faculty senate.
 - No one responded.
- Chambers suggested sending the draft resolution to the DEI committee for comments and input.
 - She noted that the more hands in this the better—e.g. share it with Aisha Powell the chair of the staff senate.
- Bowler noted that faculty governance committee will need to wordsmith, proof, and revise the document before we send it out.
- Wilson-Okamura asked Chambers to circulate it to the groups she mentioned and then bring back a draft for consideration at the FGC meeting in 2 weeks.
-

4. Other

- No other items were brought to the committee.
- The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.