EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

UNIT CODE SCREENING COMMITTEE

Meeting #4, February 14, 2001, held in Rawl Annex, 3:00-5:00 pm

Regular members present were: Gene Hughes, Ralph Scott, and John Stevens.

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

Also present was Marilyn Sheerer, Dean, School of Education.

Agenda Item I. Approval of Minutes:

Prof. Scott noted the absence of a quorum. The committee agreed to proceed in unofficial fashion, taking notes for discussion at the next meeting. The minutes of the previous meeting were observed to be correct as corrected by prior e-mail from the secretary, but could not be "approved".

Agenda Item II. School of Education Code:

There was brief discussion that, unfortunately for the School of Education, the committee had not yet received authorization to proceed under new proposed guidelines in which amendments can be considered in isolation. Under the previous order, the entire code is to be examined anew. The committee appreciated the argument that the School of Education code had been read only recently this fall and that fairness might weigh on the side of considering only the amendment. But the committee had the following suggestions for revision or further deliberation by the School of Education that it felt required action before proceeding to final passage:

Global changes:
11.269, 398-99, 459-60 Change "search committee" to "nominating committee" at 11.408-9, 428-9 Change "personnel committee" to "personnel action committees" at 1.435 and ?? Refer to "probationary" faculty (delete "term") 1.490 and ?? Change "tenured" to "permanently tenured" and hyphenate "fixed-term".

Typos:
p.11 1.502 Change "a representative" to "representatives"
1.510 Add hyphen after "even-

p.12 1.514 Insert "in"

Particular:
p.2 1.89 Change "General Administration" to
"Office of the President"

p.5  1.192-94   Replace this sentence with the similar but better worded expression at 11.664-5.

11. 204-6, 284-6, 431-3 Review and synchronize? At 204 ff., two methods of appointment are proposed: either direct appointment, or after forming a faculty search committee. At 284-6, the Dean appoints after getting recs. from chairs and other administrators. At 431-3, the chair's recommendation is preceded by faculty vote. The offices are, prima facie, similar, yet the methods of appointment vary considerably. 11.275, 353-5  The Director of Teacher Education seems to be an office "directly concerned with academic matters". Though the traditional procedure of units is for Deans simply to appoint directors, you may wish to consider following the procedure of App. L B for selecting a nominating committee. The same would apply to any Asst. and Assoc. Deans if their "direct concern is with academic matters" as your unit understands it.

11. 275-76, 309-310, 398-99  Review and attempt to synchronize. Can you specify a bit more the procedure for selecting Asst. and Assoc. Deans? How is the search committee composed? At 275-76, the search committee is "appropriate" and the chairs have a say. But at 309-310, the search committee is made up of faculty, and there is no mention of input from the chairs. At 398-99, you claim to follow the procedure of App. L B. If the last is correct, perhaps clarify the earlier two somehow?

11.233-5, 404-5  At 233-5, the Dean determines qualifications based on input from the Faculty Search Committee. At 404-5, the chairs also make such recommendations. Slight conflict. In fact, however, although your procedure may not be illicit per se, the Faculty Manual seems to envision a different process which you may wish to consider. In App. C 1.A, the unit administrator (dean?) recommends to his or her superior "the number and nature of positions needed". When these come to the unit, the unit administrator notifies the unit personnel committee (dept. level) of the number and nature of the positions (App. C 1.B), then App. D kicks in. App. D IV intro states that evaluation of faculty for appointment shall be initiated by the unit personnel committee. The personnel committee should oversee the search, and in fact, the search committee should be constituted by and report to the personnel committee (a point which is not completely clear in your 11. 181-92). The question of "qualifications" is left rather vague in your code. If you mean "criteria" (App. C 1.D) such as Ph.D. and teaching of such and such a quality, these should be fixed parts of your code (not varying from appointment to
appointment). If you mean the specific
description of the post, App. D seems to
suggest that the personnel committee (or the
search committee which acts as a subcommittee
to it) should determine this. The only
administrative decision is over the "nature"
of the position which is determined by the
vice chancellor. And this most likely refers
to e.g., fixed-term, probationary,
permanently tenured, rank, salary etc. So
the FM does not seem to envision the Dean's
direct supervision of the job description,
though in practice many schools operate this
way wholly or in part.
p.10 11.428-9 It would be clearer to replace
"where excluded..." with "personnel action
committees"

11.457-65 At 11.398-99, you state that
chairs are appointed in accordance with App.
L. But here you do not seem to follow L B
exactly here. Review and edit?
p.16 1.705"selected" makes it sound as
if entirely up to the faculty member. Change
to "agreed upon"?

1.707Change "final" to "annual" for
clarity?

11.712, 719, 721 Change "may" to "shall"
for clarity?

1.721Change "this load" to "these
weights"?
p.18 1.824-5 As worded, if an administrator
had teaching and research weights, the max
weight for admin. duties would be 33%. Is
this what you mean, or would you change
"weight of Teaching Effectiveness or" to
"combined weights of Teaching Effectiveness
and" (in which case admin. might be 50%)?

Agenda Item III. New Business:
The committee discussed the ramifications of
the faculty senate debate on the proposed new
guidelines. In the FS minutes, there was
mention that the comprehensive review was
"optional" and that the signature of the dean
might be required. It was the sense of the
committee that although units may not choose
to comply with the comprehensive review, it
would be unfortunate if the committee did not
fulfill its assigned mission of ensuring unit
code compliance with the Faculty Manual. It
was further felt that the unit code is
primarily a document designed to give the
tenured faculty rights to self-government
which supercede the rights of administrators.
App. L C asserts only that Deans shall be
given the right of "advice" not "consent".
The only apparent change to the committee’s
guidelines was Prof. Allred’s request that
the Dean’s signature be solicited after any
subsequent revision requested by our
committee.

Prof. Scott reported that at the prompting of
the Chair of the Faculty, the Chancellor
instructed code units to make self-evaluation of code compliance a part of the quinquennial evaluation. The committee expressed its concern that there is a need for oversight by those with some expertise in the FM. Since the concern of the Chair of the Faculty is that the proposed comprehensive review creates extra work for units, one doubts that units will impose this work upon themselves during the quinquennial when so many other tasks must be done. The committee reaffirmed its desire to treat units more fairly by reading amendments in isolation between comprehensive reviews. In fact the Chair's proposal would leave in place the current system in which the committee reads every line of every code for violations whenever a unit appears before it, and units as a consequence avoid revising their codes and coming to this committee. It would be more efficient for all concerned if unit codes were kept current by the proposed revisions to the Guidelines.

There was discussion of the School of Nursing code and whether professional schools divided into departments must have departmental personnel committees. App. C n.4 and App. D n.3 seem to leave no room for ambiguity: they must. But the definition of units contained in Part VIII III.B may provide additional points for reflection. If their departments do not meet the first two stated criteria of budget and curriculum supervision, they may not be "departments" per se, and my not have the third responsibility in the area of personnel.