

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
2022-2023 Faculty Governance Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: Wednesday, April 26, 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\_\_, Susie Harris\_X\_

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

Crystal Chambers\_X\_, Wendy Sergeant\_X\_\_, Purificacion Martínez\_X\_, Fan-chin 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 the following meeting link:

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

1. Approved *attached* minutes of Apr. 12, 2023.

2. Reports

a. Budget Committee's discussion of salary increments for fixed-term advancement in title (Ticknor).

- Anne Ticknor (Ticknor)--We have not heard any more about this item.

b. Faculty Senate meeting, Apr. 25 (Bowler and Ticknor)

- 
- Ticknor—noted that there is a house bill that is about compelled speech. It has same wording as the amendment put forth in UNC code. Her understanding is that it is the same language as the amendment.
  - See the link
  - <https://www.ncleg.gov/BillLookup/2023/H607>
- Purificacion Martinez (Martinez)—Academic Counsel spoke about PRR that we are discussing today. Basically the idea is that they need to revise the PRR had to do with the fact that the current process is inefficient. Faculty can give advice about any administrative policy at any time.
- David Wilson-Okamura (Wilson-Okamura)—asked for examples of inefficiency.
- Ticknor—the auditor got feedback from ten and got similar feedback from all ten. However, none of the ten was a faculty member. The process was said to be too long,

such as multiple years. Ticknor and others suggested that timelines could be created to alleviate this problem.

- Crystal Chambers (Chambers)---noted that there is a tension between deliberation and inefficiency. Some of the inefficiency is on the administration's side.
- Martinez—the chancellor had not seen the PR yet. His understanding is that there is a draft. The executive committee is getting feedback, but as Ticknor said they are not getting much feedback from faculty.
- Ticknor—does not know if committee will meet again before the end of the year. She believes the process for consulting with faculty should be direct, rather than going through a responsible official.

○

### 3. New business

#### a. New process for PRRs

Baker: "The University Policy Committee met yesterday [Apr. 18] to discuss the attached draft PRR, which governs all PRRS at ECU (this is a biggie). This changes the process for PRR development and approval, and will have impacts to the way that faculty and specifically the Chair of the Faculty and Faculty Senate provide feedback and advice on PRRs. They are planning to collect feedback for approximately four weeks and then put it in place. There are no plans for a public comment period, and the timing it makes it difficult to provide formal faculty advice before it is in place (it would have to come as New Business during an already packed April [25] Faculty Senate agenda, or as part of a report during the election-laden May organizational meeting). Nevertheless, Chair Ticknor is soliciting feedback, and she plans to bring elements of it to the attention of Faculty during the April Faculty Senate meeting."

*Attachments:* Current regulation, Draft regulation, Formal advice from this committee (draft)

- W-O compiled suggestions for a response from Ticknor and Rachel Baker. We have one faculty senate meeting left that we do not usually use for this kind of item, but given its importance and high stakes he suggested that we make a recommendation to the senate at its May organization meeting.
- W-O shared the document with the committee. Martinez and others suggested, to general approval, that we foreground the most important point, that the new regulation removes the existing procedure for consulting the faculty without providing a new one. This point was elaborated with direct quotation from UNC code 502.D2. t from the FG committee.
- Martinez suggested -- Our faculty advice supporting the UNC code and the problem is that it is trying to remove faculty input. We should only say that and nothing else.
- Fun-chin Kung (Kung)—provided asked who the VC for legal affairs is working for...
- Martinez --noted that maybe a timeline is needed so the chair of the faculty can decide what to do with the PRRs. Vetting PRRs is part of the faculty manual.
- At Ticknor's urging, the committee strengthened its final point, about ECU's history of shared governance and the negotiations under Chancellor Ballard that led up to the current regulation. that it is Part II.III.III

- Chambers—reminded us that chancellors, etc. came out of the ranks of faculty. People who have been divorced from higher ed, but are then making decisions about how higher education is run.
  - She shared the following link in the chat:
    - [https://www.jstor.org/stable/40222449?casa\\_token=aYroFJ2aRk0AAAAA%3AJxw9ZGjNGg4ZxN9P2iGWdWx8DkhIUW5FNEKwSd1399DDrIFGVktv\\_rlrGs4iZfJIRzozq8YGYe-5UPXclQsLLlsR3HhUDUkeZraU08uZdd907VAGIBcl](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40222449?casa_token=aYroFJ2aRk0AAAAA%3AJxw9ZGjNGg4ZxN9P2iGWdWx8DkhIUW5FNEKwSd1399DDrIFGVktv_rlrGs4iZfJIRzozq8YGYe-5UPXclQsLLlsR3HhUDUkeZraU08uZdd907VAGIBcl)
- Wilson-Okamura –continued to revise the document with input from the committee.
- Martinez—we are visiting a very turbulent time between faculty and administrators. General Counsel Zigas said the language was coming from the auditor and is language from many years ago. All of this happened when Rogers was the Chief of Staff.
- Kung-suggested that we just add a timeline.
- Sandra Warren (Warren)—asked if there might be a benefit to adding a bit about how we got to this point of shared governance.
- Martinez—said that there was a strong push to follow the policy of NC State and make everything policy. Ballard was chancellor.
- Ticknor shared the following in the chat:
- In 2009, Chancellor Steve Ballard charged the Faculty Senate, through the Chair of the Faculty, to conduct a complete review of the ECU Faculty Manual and revise the manual, as necessary. During 2009-2012, major changes were made to the manual, including reorganization and deletion of outdated information. The ECU Faculty Manual has been redesigned to provide faculty members and administrators with policies and procedures in relation to faculty matters. The ECU Faculty Manual provides links to relevant UNC Board of Governors’ policies and procedures, as well as ECU Administrative Policies, Rules, and Regulations (PRRs).
- Martinez -provided some history about the PRR in ECU.
- Chambers --thinks naming the problem would be helpful. It was agreed to remove any language that might be seen as diminishing the role of staff.
- Ticknor—before the SACS visit, we had to look at a number of PRRs. The faculty looked at these and the feedback is timely and relevant and we do our job. Faculty re not the problem. This was incorporated into the document.
- Martinez ---noted that there were 33 PRRs and nothing happened to make them permanent. IPAR said that this would be a red flag for accreditation and something needed to be done to eliminate these interim PRRs. The solution from GC Zigas was to make them all permanent. She did not agree as she felt that some needed formal faculty advice. She asked for formal faculty advice. They met the deadline given by IPAR. However, none of the other people revised them at all. The only group that did the work was the faculty.
- Chambers provided suggested language for #2 about the quick response. She provided the following:
  - 2. The concern regarding the efficient adoption of PRRs is a matter of concern for the faculty. However, faculty have expeditiously attended
  - She noted that during the pandemic, institutions that leaned into shared governance had better productivity.
- The committee continued to discuss wording, etc. to use in the document and the committee read through the document.

- Several committee members made some further suggestions for revisions to the document.
- Chambers shared the following links:
  - Metrics, Money, and Managerialism: Faculty Experiences of Competing Logics in Higher Education  
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.2019.1615332>
  - Adriana Kezar, scholar and editor of Change
  - <https://www.nationalacademies.org/documents/embed/link/LF2255DA3DD1C41C0A42D3BEF0989ACAECE3053A6A9B/file/DDB111A007E5ADE87759405C54A5EDFFD4B063DFAD6B?noSaveAs=1>
- Wilson-Okamura --noted that we need to be pretty clear about the changes we think need to be made as he does not think we will get a chance to address this document again.
  - He moved that we recommend the document to senate for formal advice.
  - The motion carried unanimously.

b. Committee's annual report (Bowler's draft *attached*, with suggested additions from W-O)

Included among the *attachments* here is the committee's formal advice on the ECU Employee Code of Conduct, which was held back pending new language on bullying. I'm including it here so it doesn't get lost when next year's committee resumes it.

- The committee reviewed the draft of the annual report and made some revisions.
  - Baker confirmed that the ex officio members for health sciences and REDE were not filled.
  - Ticknor --asked the committee chairs to look at member representation. The provost did not see reason for having multiple representatives from the provost's office on all committees. In most cases, she felt that one representative was enough.
  - Baker --noted that it may be helpful to have a separate meeting with a representative. Sometimes in governance it is a broader policy and she suggests that the representative might benefit from having a recurring meeting with her to get her viewpoint about governance.
  - Martinez—it might be worthwhile to suggest to the provost something similar to her that the chair of the faculty has where she meets once a month with her representatives on the committees. To get an idea about the topics being considered, etc.
    - Wilson-Okamura—asked if we should have one representative from provost per committee or do we need a rep from REDE and Health Sciences.
    - Ticknor noted that it depends.
    - Wendy Sergeant –The provost's representative might need to meet with the provost about FGC's agenda in advance of its meetings. Depending on

the agenda then perhaps other representatives could be asked to attend, as needed.

- Linda Ingalls (Ingalls)—suggested refinements.
- Warren noted the following in the chat:
  - in the evaluation section above, Item B (Personnel) should not have Provost capitalized.
  - She noted that the committee could possibly say that the committee could make recommendations about whether ex-officio members from REDE and Health sciences are needed.
- Chambers—noted that Paul Zigas uses the word constituent instead of the word client.
- Wilson-Okamura talked about next year’s business.
  - He put in a reminder about recommendations.
  - Chambers noted that the Provost is in favor of a PRR about bullying.
  - Next year’s agenda will include additional faculty titles by Chambers.
  - Institutional intimidation—next year’s committee should consult directly with former senator Michael Schinasi (FLL)>
  - Ticknor—noted that part IV, V, VIII, IX, X, and XII, will be revised because of changes to the UNC Code.
  - If the new PRR on establishing and revising PRRs goes through, it will affect Part II as well.
  - A motion was made to approve this report. The motion passed unanimously.
- Ticknor –brought up the letter that Mark Bowler drafted to the provost, requesting data on annual evaluations.
- Wilson-Okamura asked the evaluation subcommittee members to take one last look at the letter, and to consult with Sergeant before finalizing the request to the provost.
- Ticknor said that there were questions about getting data about bias in annual evaluations. Sergeant can address some of these issues.
- Chambers said that there is some of this addressed in the Gen Ed committee about bias in evaluations.
- W-O will send the committee’s annual report to Baker and the committee’s recommendation of formal advice to Chair Ticknor for presentation at the senate’s May meeting.
- The meeting adjourned at 4:47 pm.