

Annual Report of the Faculty Governance Committee  
1987/88

- I. DATE: March 29, 1988  
TO: Conner Atkeson, Chair of the Faculty  
FROM: Marsha Ironsmith, Secretary  
Bob Hursey, Chair
- II. Membership of the committee (including ex-officio members):  
Chair: Robert Hursey  
Vice Chair: Artemis Kares  
Secretary: Marsha Ironsmith
- Ex-officio: Conner Atkeson (Chair of Faculty), William Bloodworth (Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), William Laupus (Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences), Kenneth Wilson (Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty), Don Sexauer (Chair of Unit Code Screening Committee)
- III. Committee meetings (dates and members absent):
- |                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 9/02/87: Longhill          | 01/20/88: Edwards, Kares    |
| 9/23/87: None              | 01/27/88: Chamness, Edwards |
| 10/07/87: Heckrotte, Kares | 02/11/88: None              |
| 11/04/87: Kares            | 03/17/88: Chamness, Hursey  |
| 12/02/87: None             | 03/28/88: Kares             |
- IV. Date of reports to the Faculty Senate during the year: 11/10/87; 02/23/88; 03/15/88; 4/12/88
- V. Specific instructions, if any, given to the committee by the Faculty Senate, other than those found in the committee's Constitutional charge: None
- VI. A brief statement of committee organization, subcommittees, research activities, etc.: The Committee has usually operated as a Committee of the whole. A subcommittee, consisting of Professors Heckrotte, Kares and Edwards, was formed to propose a clarification of Appendix A to define the status of Senate Parliamentarian. A subcommittee consisting of Professors Hursey, Kares and Wilson were also appointed to review personnel policies in Appendix D, in conference with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences.
- VII. List of committee accomplishments including recommendations made to agencies other than the Faculty Senate:  
In the past year the Committee has:
- reviewed and recommended approval for the Codes of Physics, Nursing and Social Work
  - reviewed the apportionment of Senators.
  - recommended an amendment to Appendix D, altering the charge of the Hearing Committee to review cases in which material procedural irregularities have occurred.
  - recommended that the Vice Chancellors serve as ex-officio without vote on the Committee.
  - reviewed Appendix A and recommended wording changes to clarify the status of the Parliamentarian of the Senate.
  - recommended to the Senate that the representative of the Administrative Council is an ex-officio member of the Senate and therefore without vote in the election of Senate Officers.

VIII. Citation of the resolution numbers of Senate resolutions that originated with the committee. (See Faculty Senate Minutes, academic year 1977/78)  
#87-20 Approval of the Codes of Physics and Nursing; 11/10/87  
#88-19 Revision of Appendix D: Charge of the Hearing Committee; 3/15/88  
#88-28 Amendment to Appendix A; 4/12/88  
#88-29 Code of the School of Social Work; 4/12/88

IX. Proposals and/or business to be carried over to next year:

- A) Formulation and presentation to the Faculty Senate for its approval of Guidelines for Unit Codes. (A copy of the guidelines which were not approved by the Senate but which were forwarded to the Unit Code Screening Committee is attached to this report. See Attachment 1.)  
B) In a memo date 3/28/88, the Committee on Committees requested an amendment to Appendix A to make Appendix A consistent with the revised charge of the Senate Officer Nominating Committee (revised and approved by the Faculty Senate on 10/27/81), to wit:

Insert the following sentence as the final sentence to the fifth paragraph under VII., p. A-4 of the Faculty Manual (1985 ed.):

"Subsequent to the election of the members of the Senate Officer Nominating Committee, the Faculty Senate shall, from among those elected members, elect by majority vote the Chair of the Nominating Committee."

- C) Professor Hursey requests before leaving the Committee that the following Amendment to Appendix D, Section II.D, 2. and 3., p. D-8 of the (1985) Faculty Manual be considered by the Committee next year. (See Attachment 2.)

X. Evaluation of the committee:

The Committee functioned very efficiently during the last year. The newly revised charge of the committee is well defined and the number of members adequate for the work load.

XI. Suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the committee: None

Signed: Chairperson Roland Hursey  
Secretary Marsha Blomsmith

Effective: Spring 1979

## GUIDELINES FOR UNIT CODE REVIEWS

- I. The two major problems found consistently in almost all codes are ambiguity and inconsistency.
- II. Does the code clearly define the unit's faculty? The unit's graduate faculty? The unit's voting faculty?
- III. Who votes on a given issue? Is a necessary condition for voting (on any issue) that one be a voting member of the unit's faculty?
- IV. What sort of vote is demanded to decide a particular issue? A majority vote, a vote of a majority, a 3/4-vote, a vote of 3/4 (of what subset of the faculty?)?
- V. The content of a unit's code is a matter of considerable debate and codes vary in content and style. As a minimum, each unit code shall:
  - (1) Begin with a statement of the Chancellor's Preamble.
  - (2)
    - a. Establish procedures which allow the faculty to participate by making recommendations concerning all decisions affecting promotion, granting of tenure, and dismissals....(Appendix L)
    - b. Address the issue of reappointment. The procedure for dismissal actions is covered in Appendix D...and need not be a concern of the units' codes. Actions regarding salary questions are not included in Appendix L and should not be included in unit codes. Furthermore, Appendix C simply calls for the establishment of criteria for evaluation of faculty for merit salary raises....(memo from Chancellor John M. Howell to the Faculty Governance Committee and all units of the University subject to the ECU Code, dated 8/19/83)
  - (3) Govern, by regulations established in and under the unit's code of operations, evaluation of faculty for purposes of promotion. (Appendix C, p. C-5)
  - (4) Determine the relative weights given to teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and service in personnel decisions. (Appendix C, p. C-5) [The key word here is "determine", which means "to settle conclusively; to fix; to find out exactly." Most unit codes do NOT meet this mandate.]
  - (5) Define the procedure to amend the code.
  - (6) Follow the prescribed procedure given in "Appendix L" (see p. L-2) for the original formulation and approval of the unit's code by the faculty of the unit.
  - (7) The format for revisions should include eleven (11) copies each of
    - a. the current code, along with
    - b. a cover letter identifying revisions, and
    - c. the proposed revised code.

Among other things that might be included in units' codes are criteria for assignment of annual salary increments. (Appendix C, V.B., p. C-6)

The Faculty Governance Committee strongly recommends that each unit code carefully define the administrative organization of the unit, and the duties and responsibilities of the various committees, both administrative and faculty. It should be clear to whom each committee reports.

APPENDIX D, FACULTY MANUAL, SECTION II.D. 2 AND 3, PAGE D-8

Strike the two paragraphs under 2., and replace with:

If both the faculty personnel committee and the departmental chairperson make favorable recommendations, then the chairperson's immediate supervisor will next consider the recommended action. If the supervisor's recommendation is also favorable, the recommendations will be forwarded to the next higher-level administrator, this procedure for favorable recommendations being followed until the recommendation reaches the Chancellor.

However, if an unfavorable recommendation is subsequently made beyond the unit-level by any administrator charged with review of such recommendations, then the recommended action is denied and the negative decision final, except as it may be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Section IV (nonreappointment and denial of tenure) or the grievance provisions of Section VII (denial of promotion). The administrator making the initial unfavorable recommendation shall inform the faculty personnel committee, the departmental chair, all lower-level administrators who had rendered prior, favorable recommendation, and the affected faculty member of the negative decision, providing said faculty member with a simple, unelaborated, written statement of the negative decision.

In the event that both the faculty personnel committee and the departmental chairperson make unfavorable recommendations, the chairperson's immediate supervisor will next consider that recommendation. If the supervisor concurs in the negative recommendation, then the negative decision is final, except as noted in the previous paragraph. The supervisor will, as mandated by the previous paragraph, notify the faculty personnel committee, the departmental chairperson, and the affected faculty member of the negative decision. If, however, the chairperson's immediate supervisor makes a favorable recommendation, the supervisor will inform the committee, chairperson, and the affected faculty member of his favorable recommendation and shall forward that recommendation, together with the concurring negative departmental recommendations, to the next higher level of review, this procedure for subsequent favorable recommendations being repeated until the recommendation reaches the Chancellor. In the event that any administrator beyond the unit-level who is charged with review of such recommendations renders an unfavorable recommendation, the recommended action is denied and the decision final, except as noted in the previous paragraph. The administrator serving beyond the unit level who initially denies the recommended action shall notify the parties specified in the previous paragraph in the manner prescribed by that paragraph of the negative decision.

In all cases when an unfavorable recommendation is made by an administrative official beyond the unit-level, the negative decision shall be communicated as information to the next higher-level administrator charged with review of such recommendations, this procedure being repeated until said information reaches the Chancellor.

If the Chancellor ... final approval (put in last 8 lines of the second paragraph under 2., p. D-8).

Next, strike the paragraph under "3. Procedure for Nonconcurring Recommendations" and replace with:

If the recommendations from the faculty personnel committee and the departmental chairperson disagree, the chairperson's immediate supervisor shall attempt to resolve the disagreement. After such attempt, the supervisor will notify the committee, the chairperson, and the affected faculty member of his or her recommendation. If the supervisor's recommendation is favorable to the faculty member, then that recommendation, together with the recommendations of the faculty personnel committee and the departmental chair, shall be forwarded to the next higher-level administrator charged with review of such recommendations, this

procedure for favorable recommendations (at or beyond the supervisor's level) being repeated until said recommendation reaches the Chancellor. On the other hand, if the supervisor's decision is unfavorable to the affected faculty member, irrespective of the recommendations of the faculty personnel committee or the departmental chairperson, a final negative decision shall have been made, except as it may be reviewed in accordance with Section IV or Section VII of this appendix.

Any administrator charged with review of faculty personnel recommendations who serves beyond the unit-level and who initially makes a recommendation unfavorable to the affected faculty member denies the action being sought; this negative decision is final, except as provided for review by the previous paragraph. Notification of the administrator's initial negative decision shall be given as was specified in Section III, D.2. The negative decision shall be communicated as information to the next higher-level administrator charged with review of faculty personnel recommendations, this procedure being repeated until the information reaches the Chancellor.

Any personnel action endorsed by the Chancellor that is favorable to a faculty member shall be handled in accordance with the procedures provided in Section III, D.2.