UNIT CODE SCREENING COMMITTEE

Meeting #3, November 15, 2000, held in Rawl 106, 3:00-4:00 pm

Regular members present were: Greg Lapicki, Ralph Scott, John Stevens, and Kyle Summers.

Ex officio members present were: Bill Grossnickle, Linda Ingalls and Ben Irons.

Also present were Buddy Zincone, Associate Dean, Fred Schadler, Unit Code Committee Chair, and Mark McCarthy from the School of Business.

Agenda Item I. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of the previous meeting were approved without amendment.

Agenda Item II. School of Business Code:
After discussion of the proposed amendment, the code was approved. Prof. Schadler was asked to provide Prof. Scott with 3 copies of the complete code and it was agreed that the code would be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Agenda Item III. Revision of the Committee's Guidelines:
Prof. Scott presented the committee with the latest draft amendment to the committee's "Guidelines for Writing and Revising a Unit Code of Operations". There was discussion of the advantages and disadvantages: against the new procedure (in which the committee would process amendments expeditiously and review codes completely only every 7 years), the committee would be obliged to allow units to process only the amendments they desired, rather than all those the committee might recommend, and between "comprehensive" reviews, a code might contain items out of compliance with the Faculty Manual. In favor of the new procedure, units which might otherwise avoid the code revision process will be obliged to do so.

Prof. Scott also read the proposed revision to the committee's charge, now in revision by the Committee on Committees before a pending second reading by the Faculty Senate. The Committee suggested revisions to the draft which would change "conformity" to "compliance" and "opportunity for units to comply" with "ensure that units comply" and "ECU Code" (= App.L) to "Faculty Manual" (= all appendices). It was decided to recommend to the Committee on Committees that the 7 year comprehensive review cycle be added to the committee's charge.

The draft Guidelines were then amended so that:
* the second sentence of the introductory paragraph reads: "Units should include descriptions of procedures followed in the
unit that are not covered in Appendix L, and procedures should be in compliance with Appendix L and other Appendices of the ECU Faculty Manual."

* Item 3 Comprehensive Code Review was altered to begin a year later and with the oldest codes first:
2002/03  Geography (83), Chemistry (85), Physics (88), Industry & Tech (89)
2003/04  Nursing (92), Economics (95), Art (96), Business (96)
2004/05  Allied Health Sciences (96), Anthropology (97), English (97), Geology (97), Mathematics (97)
2005/06  Human Environmental Sciences (97), Medicine (97), Sociology (97), Social Work (98)
2006/07  Health Sciences Library (98), History (98), Philosophy (99), Political Science (99)
2007/08  Foreign Languages (99), Psychology (99), Health & Human Performance (99), Education (00)
2008/09  Music (00), Biology (00), Theatre and Dance (00), Academic Library Services (00)

* Section IX. Add the following language:
"Appendix L establishes that at a minimum the code must be approved by a majority of the permanently tenured faculty members of the unit."

Subject to these changes, the draft Guidelines were approved and recommended by the committee to be submitted to the Faculty Senate.

Prof. Scott announced that a revised School of Education code might be forthcoming very soon. There being no further business, the committee adjourned.

Communication with the School of Business after the meeting via e-mail:

After the committee voted on your unit code, Linda Ingalls arrived. She is the eyes and the brain of the committee and, as usual, she spotted a number of typos and one point of substance that ought to have been considered. These items are not in the minutes of the meeting, so they do not have any standing. I send them to you for your consideration in the hope that you will adopt them as editorial and necessary changes. Should you choose to do so, I am fully confident that the Chair, Prof. Scott (whom I cc: by this memo) will consider the changes as approved
by the committee and forward your code as promised to the Faculty Senate without further delay or meeting. Linda and I would let these things slide were it not that all but one are typos that you would wish to fix in any event as a matter of proofreading.

The one serious item is as follows:
Selection of the Dean, p.11 line 52 must follow the procedure in Appendix L-3 B, unless you wish to maintain that the "Dean for Academic Programs" does not "have a direct concern with academic matters". We would recommend something such as "The Selection of the Dean for Academic Programs will follow the procedure described in Appendix L." Then in a separate paragraph, outline your procedure for the selection of the Associate Dean with the language you have, deleting reference to the dean. We realize that you may not wish to make this change, or may be hesitant to do so without consulting your faculty, but we urge you strongly to make it, since failure to do so would, in our opinion, put you out of compliance with the Manual, and leave you open to disputes on procedural grounds the next time you select a dean. Please consider the issue seriously and either make the change as on our authority that it is necessary for code compliance, or discuss the matter with your faculty if you think it better to do so.

The typos Linda found were:
p.4 1.10 Change "with" to "within"
p.5 1.54 Change "Section III" to "Section IV"
p.6 1.8 Change ")f" to "of"
p.6 1.49, p.9 1.6, 16, 17, 23 and wherever else it appears, change "Graduate Council" to "Administrative Board of the Graduate School"
p.9 1.22 Make "faculty" plural: "faculties"
p.10 1.31 Change e"Section IV.7" to "Section IV.F.2"
p.11 1.12 Change "tray" to "may"
p.11 1.6, 32 Fix relative weights in parentheses

We apologize for not doing our job more thoroughly at the meeting and hope you will consider these editorial changes (and one necessary code compliance change). We thank you for your patience in this matter.

Sincerely,

John Stevens
Secretary, Unit Code Screening Committee