



2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate will be held on **Tuesday, November 1, 2016**, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
[September 6, 2016](#) and [October 4, 2016](#)
- III. Special Order of the Day
 - A. Roll Call
 - B. Announcements
 - C. Discussion on campus approaches to free speech, peaceful protests, encouraging civil dialog, and the safety of our ECU community.
 - D. Mike Felts, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate
Report on [October 21, 2016](#) UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting
 - E. Hiromi Sanders, Office of Research Integrity and Compliance
Letter on Export Control from the Treasury Department
 - F. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty
 - G. Approval of Fall 2016 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates
 - H. Question Period
- IV. Unfinished Business
- V. Report of Committees
 - A. University Budget Committee, Jeff Popke
Formal faculty advice on revised Reimbursable Travel for Non-State Employees PRR (attachment 1).

- B. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, Jen Scott Mobley
Curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [October 24, 2016](#), removing WI designation from JUST 3200, renumbering WI courses for IDSN 2700 to IDSN 2103 and IDSN 2750 to IDSN 2203 and removing from catalog WI IDSN 4750.
- C. Research/Creative Activities Committee, Richard McCabe
Proposed revisions to the 2017 Research/Creative Activity Awards Guidelines (attachment 2).
- D. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, George Bailey
 1. Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [October 17, 2016](#) including Global Diversity credit for FREN 3443 Special Topics in the Culture of France, FREN 3444 Special Topics in Francophone Cultures of the World and Nursing 4220, Perspectives in International Community Health.
 2. Proposed revision to the title of the East Carolina Peer Observation of Teaching [Instrument](#) for Non Tenured and Fixed Term Faculty (attachment 3).
 3. Recommendation on Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction Instrument (attachment 4).
- E. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Don Chaney
Curriculum and academic program matters contained in the meeting minutes of [October 21, 2016](#) including:
 1. Proposed revision to the BSUS Faculty Oversight Committee Manual and Guidelines (attachment 5)
 2. Proposed new graduate certificate in Dual Language Immersion (DLI) Administration within the Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education; program review revision response for the Certificate Programs in (1) Health Informatics, (2) Health Care Administration, and (3) Health Care Management within the Department of Health Services and Information Management, College of Allied Health Sciences; program review revision response for the Interdisciplinary Program in African and African American Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences; program review revision response for the BA/BS in Multidisciplinary Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences; and program review revision response for the MA in International Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.
(Copies of items listed are available through the Faculty Senate office.)
- F. Committee on Committees, Crystal Chambers
Election of Members to the Appellate Hearing Committee (attachment 6).

VI. New Business

Resolution on Freedom of Speech, Edson Justiniano (attachment 7).

Faculty Senate Agenda
November 1, 2016
Attachment 1.

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

Formal faculty advice on revised Reimbursable Travel for Non-State Employees PRR

The Committee reviewed the revised regulation and recommends no changes.

History: enacted May 3, 1999; revised November 30, 2011 and March 2016.

Related Policies: Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

Additional References: North Carolina Budget Manual, OSBM

ECU Travel Procedures Manual Board of Trustees Expense Reimbursement Guidelines (July 27, 2001) [Scholarship Information Form](#)

1. Non-State Employees [As modified from Section 5.7.1: NC Budget Manual, OSBM]

1.1 The purpose of this regulation is to establish the criteria under which ECU may reimburse or bear all or some of the travel expenses of persons who are not ECU employees.

1.2 Non-State employees who travel on official ECU business are eligible to have their expenses paid by the State and are subject to State and University travel regulations and to the ECU Travel Procedures Manual. These include, but are not limited to, Board of Trustees, research collaborators, prospective professional employees, students on official ECU business including students traveling to fulfill a course requirement for academic credit, and attendants of handicapped ECU employees traveling on official ECU business (provided advance approval is obtained from unit head or designee). Persons who are not ECU employees who are traveling on official ECU business whose expenses are paid or reimbursed by ECU are subject to these regulations, including statutory subsistence allowances, to the same extent as are other ECU employees. No travel advances will be made to persons who are not ECU employees, regardless of funding source (see student exception below).

1.2.1 Student exception: In rare instances, a travel advance may be given to a student from non-state funds only with the approval of the appropriate Vice Chancellor and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Financial Services.

2. Prospective Professional Employees [As modified from Section 5.7.2: NC Budget Manual, OSBM]

2.1 A department head or his or her designee is authorized to approve reimbursement of transportation expenses of prospective professional employees visiting ECU units for employment interviews. These expenses are limited to transportation and subsistence for three days (five days if one is a Saturday) at the In-State rate plus any required taxes. The department head or his or her designee may approve excess lodging expenses.

3. Post-Secondary Students [Modified from Section 5.7.3: NC Budget Manual, OSBM;]

Students who travel on official ECU business, including students traveling to fulfill a course requirement for academic credit, are eligible to have their expenses paid or reimbursed by ECU in compliance with and subject to these regulations, including statutory subsistence allowances, to the same extent as are ECU employees. Student travel expenses incurred while a student is working as an employee of ECU, including but not limited to graduate assistants receiving stipends, are considered expenses for official ECU business when traveling on behalf of the student's position and may be reimbursed pursuant to the regulations regarding employee travel.

ECU students who travel on official ECU business may be reimbursed from State funds consistent with payments for ECU employees if the travel is approved in advance and meets all requirements of this regulation. Student travel for the purpose of presenting at a conference or a meeting **and** officially representing ECU during the travel is considered official State business.

Student travel to fulfill course requirements for academic credit (required projects, papers, theses, or dissertations) to be charged to State funds must have written approval in advance of the travel by the dean of the respective college and by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Financial Services who are the official designees of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

All other student related travel must be paid from Non-State funds supporting that particular organization or activity. Specifically, travel by students for the purpose of participating in athletic contests and activities of student organizations must be paid from funds supporting the particular activity, not State funds. The request for reimbursement must be recommended by a department with authority for administering the budget that will be used to pay the expenses. Furthermore, approval for reimbursement of such expenses must be signed by the head of the department or his or her designee in advance of the travel date.

4. Personal Care Attendants [Modified from Section 5.7.4: NC Budget Manual, OSBM]

4.1 Payment of travel and subsistence expenses (motel and meal costs) for attendants for handicapped employees while traveling on official ECU business may be reimbursed to the same extent as are state employees if advance approval is obtained from the department head or his or her designee.

5. Spouses/Partner/Dependent [Modified from: ECU Travel Procedures Manual,]

5.1 Travel expenses for a prospective employee's spouse/partner/dependent can be paid if funding is available from Non-State funds. If an employee traveling on official ECU business is accompanied by a spouse/partner/dependent who is not an employee but is traveling on official ECU business, his/her expenses may be paid or reimbursed in accordance with the provisions in Section 7 below.

6. Spouse/Partner of the Chancellor and/or Member of the Board of Trustees

6.1 The Chancellor/BOT Members are often required to have extensive and unique contact with the public on behalf of the University. When the Chancellor/BOT Member travels to perform official duties, including attending events in such areas as development, alumni, and governmental relations (and because the spouse/partner makes an important contribution to the success of these events), the University will pay the travel expenses of the spouse/partner if both the following conditions are met.

6.1.1 The spouse/partner travels for the benefit of ECU. This condition will be considered met if the spouse/partner attends and participates in the official function(s) as a service to ECU. This includes, but is not limited to, events at which the spouses/partners of the event participants are expected to be present.

6.1.2 The purpose of the travel and the expenses incurred are fully documented, including receipts for expenses incurred and an outline of the activities of the spouse/partner relating to ECU business.

6.2 These expenses related to the spouse/partner of the Chancellor/BOT Member must be paid by Non-State funds that are allowed under all applicable regulations to be used to pay the type of expenditure involved.

6.3 Reimbursement for travel expenditures incurred for the spouse/partner of the Chancellor/BOT Member must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

7. All Other Non-State Employees - Volunteers

7.1 When any other Non-State employee not previously addressed herein ("Volunteer"), travels on official University business, the University will pay the Volunteer's travel expenses if all three of the following conditions are met:

7.1.1 The Volunteer travels for the benefit of ECU. This condition will be considered met if the Volunteer attends and participates in the official function(s) as a service to ECU. This includes, but is not limited to, events at which such Volunteer is expected to be present.

7.1.2 The purpose of the travel and the expenses incurred are fully documented, including receipts for expenses incurred and an outline of the activities of the volunteer relating to ECU business.

7.2 These expenses related to the Volunteer must be paid by Non-State funds that are allowed, under all applicable regulations, to be used to pay the type of expenditure involved.

8. Internal Revenue Service Requirements

8.1 In order for travel advances and reimbursements of travel expenses to be excluded from a traveler's taxable income, travel expenses must meet the IRS requirements for an Accountable Plan (Employee Reimbursement Plans). As such, travel expenses must be: in line with the University's regulation as indicated above; reasonable in amount; and accompanied by reasonable accounting procedures.

8.1.1 Travelers must submit the required substantiation for travel expenses (including the amount, date, use, business purpose, and names of individuals in attendance), and must return any unused portion of an advance within 30 days after trip completion.

8.1.2 If reimbursements are deemed taxable because they do not meet the IRS requirements for exclusion, the reimbursed amount will be included in the employee's W-2 or traveler's 1099 as taxable income.

Faculty Senate Agenda

November 1, 2016

Attachment 2.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revisions to the 2017 Research/Creative Activity Awards Guidelines are noted in **bold red print**.

The Research/Creative Activities Committee (RCAC) solicits proposals for meritorious research or creative activities from eligible East Carolina University faculty members. The committee has access to a \$25,000 pool of funds from which it will fund roughly 4-8 proposals. The committee strongly recommends a cap of \$6,250 for project requests. Please note that the committee will consider both the quality of the proposal and the budget as part of its deliberations. All dispensed funds will need to be spent during this fiscal year which ends on June 30, 2017. Given the current total pool of funds, the committee reserves the right to exclude from

consideration those proposals which it deems would be better served by another internal grant proposal such as research development awards.

**Proposals are due in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex
by 12:00 noon on Wednesday, January 11, 2017.**

....

Evaluation Criteria:

- That the research/creative activity has the probability of leading to significant contributions in the field, including publication, presentation, performance, exhibition, and to the individual's professional enrichment and growth.
- That the research/creative activity is based on knowledge in the field, and the proposal clearly shows how the proposed effort extends, expands, and/or explores new directions, techniques or processes.
- That the research/creative activity possesses evidence of scholarly importance, consists of more than mere data collection or confirmation of easily anticipated results.
- That the research/creative activity is methodologically sound and within the competency of the applicant.
- That the research/creative activity of this project clearly justifies financial support by this University and would not be more suitably considered under a different funding source such as Research Development Grants, University Start-Up Grants, or Teaching Grants

Proposals will be evaluated by the diverse group of faculty that make up the committee. It is to the applicant's advantage to prepare abstracts and proposals in language that can be understood by individuals who are outside the applicant's discipline. **Feedback will be provided to applicants who are not funded.**

....

Application Process:

Each award proposal MUST include the attached application form signed by the applicant and the chairperson (or dean, as appropriate) of any unit involved. One original paper copy of the proposal should be submitted to the Research/Creative Activities Committee, c/o Faculty Senate Office, 140 Rawl Annex by **12:00 noon on Wednesday, January 11, 2017**. **In addition, the applicant must send an electronic version of the proposal in PDF format to the Faculty Senate office (faculty senate@ecu.edu) by the deadline.** No proposals will be accepted after this deadline.

Applicants have the opportunity to attend any information sessions given by the committee to verify that their proposals are appropriate for consideration. ~~Applicants should also consult proposals that were funded in the past three years that are kept on file in the Faculty Senate office.~~ **Applicants should also consult funded proposals from the past three years that can be accessed at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm>.**

Completing Application Cover Pages:

....

Items 1 through 5: Complete as requested. Please note for item #3: check one of items a, b or c; and if b or c, list the amount of money requested in d. The amount of salary money to be paid will be determined by the office of the Chief Research Officer. **The Research/Creative Activities Committee reserves the right to change the category of proposals, as appropriate.**

Proposal information, pending final approval of these recommended revisions, is available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/rg/proposal.pdf>

**Faculty Senate Agenda
November 1, 2016
Attachment 3.**

GENERAL EDUCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revision to the title of the East Carolina
Peer Observation of Teaching [Instrument](#) for Non Tenured and Fixed Term Faculty

The General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee recommends that the title of ECU's official peer review instrument be changed from:

“East Carolina Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument for Non Tenured and Fixed Term Faculty”

to **“East Carolina Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument”**

The reason for the change is that some units want to use the instrument in conducting peer reviews of tenured faculty.

**Faculty Senate Agenda
November 1, 2016
Attachment 4.**

GENERAL EDUCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Recommendation on Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction Instrument

The General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee recommends the following for approval by the Faculty Senate:

That the Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction instrument, “Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation” used in the pilot study in the summer terms and fall term (for short courses) of 2016 also be given at the end of the fall term.

That for the fall 2016 term only, this instrument, in its current form, be used for the purpose of personnel evaluation in accordance with the Faculty Manual Part VIII, Section III, 1. Teaching.

That the following part of the Faculty Manual, “Part VIII, Section III, 1. Teaching, e. review of data from the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS). The data from SPOTS is qualitative data and is not designed to serve the purpose of a measurement instrument. Therefore, SPOTS data may not be converted into a numerical score to be used in faculty evaluation” be suspended for the purpose of using the fall 2016 results (only) obtained from “Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation” in personnel actions and that the following take its place: “e. review of data from the Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation.”

(The form and pilot report follow below.)

Pilot Course Evaluation Questions
Approved by Faculty Senate April 19, 2016

Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation

Section I. University Core Questions

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Response Options: Strongly Agree – Agree – Neutral – Disagree – Strongly Disagree – N/A

Relevance of Content

1. My instructor has an extensive knowledge of the subject matter.
2. My instructor demonstrates the importance and significance of the subject matter.

Teaching/Learning of Relationships and Concepts

3. My instructor explains new ideas by relating them to familiar concepts.
4. My instructor presents sufficient and relevant examples.

Discussion

5. My instructor provides opportunity for questions during class or in online course modules.
6. My instructor asks questions which challenge me to think.

Exams/Grades/Evaluation

7. My work is evaluated in ways that are helpful to my learning.

Providing Feedback to Students

8. My instructor provides useful feedback throughout the semester.

Providing Help as Needed

9. My instructor provides individual assistance when asked.

Readings and Assignments

10. Course activities/assignments help me learn the subject matter.

Overall Rating

11. Overall, I would rate the quality of instruction in this course as:
Excellent - Good - Fair - Poor - Very Poor

Section II. Student Participation and Effort

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Response Options: Strongly Agree – Agree – Neutral – Disagree – Strongly Disagree – N/A

12. This course has been challenging.
13. I always prepare before class.

Section III. Student Comments

14. What do you feel are the strengths of this course?
15. What would you change to improve this course?

Additional Questions for Distance Education, Lab, and Field-Based Courses

DE Specific Questions

- My instructor encourages interaction among students.
- The course is organized to encourage interaction with the instructor.
- When I contact the instructor Monday to Friday, I receive a response within 24 hours.
- The instructional materials are accessible and easy to use.
- The design of this course is effective for online delivery.

Lab Course Specific Questions

- My instructor demonstrates how to apply concepts and methodologies in the lab.
- Lab procedures are clearly presented to me.
- Assistance is always available throughout lab sessions.
- Lab safety regulations are strictly enforced.

Field-Based Course Specific Question

- This course has challenged me to acquire skills related to my professional and academic ambitions.

Preliminary Findings from the Pilot of the New Student Opinion of Instruction Survey Faculty Senate Report, September 6, 2016

Per the Faculty Senate Resolution #16-34, a new Student Opinion of Instruction Survey form and a new electronic delivery system (i.e., eXplorance Blue) were piloted in all Summer II and 11-Week Summer courses that met ECU's eligibility criteria. The project represented a collaboration of Faculty Senate's General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, ITCS and IPAR. The Faculty Senate designed the new survey form and guided the creation of a reporting template. IPAR and ITCS completed many behind-the-scene tasks to enable single sign-on, Blackboard building blocks, and automated data feeds to Blue. The pilot was successful.

I. Survey Administration

- A total of 548 unique courses/sections that met the survey criteria were included, two thirds of which were distance education courses/sections. The total course enrollment was 11,062.
- Brody clinical departments and School of Dental Medicine were not included in the university-wide pilot because they have their own processes.
- For team-taught sections, all instructors who had more than 20% of the teaching responsibility for the section were included. Thus, a total of 594 instructor reports were generated in the end.
- Survey questions were divided into instructor-specific questions (Q1-9) and course-specific questions (Q10-13). For team-taught sections, instructor-specific questions repeated for each instructor; while course-specific questions were rated only once by each student. Instructor names are visibly displayed in the survey.
- The survey was open for one week, July 22 – 28.

- Students received one survey invitation and two reminders via email. They could complete the survey via the hyperlink embedded in the notification email or on their Blackboard homepage. The survey platform is mobile compatible and easy to use.
- On the first day of the survey, instructors received an email notification with an embedded link for them to monitor the survey response rate.
- A total of 3,870 responses were received, for an overall response rate of 35%. It is one of the highest response rates in recent years.
- No technical issues were reported from students or instructors during the pilot.

II. Response Rates Overview

- As mentioned earlier, the overall response rate was 35%, compared to 13% of the same period last year. It has also surpassed the response rates for Fall 2015 (31%) and Spring 2016 (24%) when the survey was open for two weeks.
- College of Nursing and College of Education had the highest response rates, 46% and 43% respectively. The response rates for College of Allied Health Sciences and College of Arts and Sciences were the lowest, 27% and 29% respectively.
- Response rates varied by course and department. Class size did not have a strong relationship with response rate. One department with an enrollment under 20 students achieved the highest response rate of 71%, while another department with similar enrollment only reached 10%.

Response Rates by College

Note: Figures presented in the table below reflect multiple instructors per course.

College	Response Rate
Brody School of Medicine	36%
College of Fine Arts and Communication	36%
College of Health and Human Performance	32%
College of Allied Health Sciences	27%
Harriot College of Arts and Sciences	29%
College of Business	32%
College of Education	43%
College of Engineering and Technology	37%
College of Nursing	46%
University Studies	38%

III. Instructor Report Template

- Survey results were distributed to individual instructors and their administrators (i.e., department chairs and deans) on August 12. The reporting structure was set by instructors' primary academic home.
- The instructor report includes response rate, frequency distribution, and mean comparison to courses of the same level in the same department. There were four levels of courses: 1000-level courses, 2000-level courses, 3000-4000 level courses, and graduate courses.

- Student comments were for instructor view only.
- No negative feedback on the survey reports was received.
- SPOTS reports from prior semesters are still stored in the old system and new reports are housed in Blue.

IV. Reliability Test Results

- The following statistical methods were used to analyze the reliability of the survey: Spearman's Rank correlation, Split-half Reliability and Factor Analysis, all of which suggested exceptionally high internal consistency of the first 11 questions on the survey.
- Spearman's Rank correlation showed strong relationships between the first 11 questions for both graduate and undergraduate courses. Student participation and effort (Questions 12 and 13) had low correlations with student ratings of instruction. Course grades had even lower correlations with student ratings of instruction.
- The Cronbach's Alpha was exceptionally high (.97), which indicated that the first 11 items on the survey had high internal consistency.
- The Factor Analysis generated one factor out of the first 10 questions. Varimax Rotation further suggested that the first 10 questions measured two dimensions: Q1 and Q2 formed one dimension, relevance of content; Q3-10 formed another dimension, teaching practices. Teaching practices was the predominant factor.

V. Differences in Ratings

- Male vs. Female Students: Responses from female students counted for two thirds of the total responses. T-test and non-parametric analyses didn't show statistically significant difference in course ratings between gender in either UG or GR level courses.
- Tenure Status: when comparing course ratings by tenure status, the difference between groups was statistically significant in UG level courses only. Tenure-track faculty were rated the highest.
- Academic Rank: when comparing course ratings by academic rank, the difference between groups was statistically significant in BOTH UG and GR level courses. Assistant professors were rated the highest in both cases.

VI. Next Steps

- Collect feedback from the Faculty Senate (i.e., survey form, report template, and business processes)
- Communicate pilot results to faculty and administration
- Increase response rates across the board
- Set dynamic survey dates in Blue to automate the evaluation of early-ending courses. The first early-ending course evaluation for Fall 2016 begins on Sept 22.

Appendix One: Mean Comparison Report

University Core Questions (Rated on a 1-5 Likert Scale)	level	N	Mean	Std Dev
1. My instructor has an extensive knowledge of the subject matter.	1000	492	4.50	0.79
	2000	599	4.59	0.68
	3000-4000	1181	4.52	0.78
	Grad	1662	4.61	0.64
2. My instructor demonstrates the importance and significance of the subject matter.	1000	492	4.38	0.91
	2000	600	4.47	0.79
	3000-4000	1179	4.46	0.83
	Grad	1665	4.56	0.74
3. My instructor explains new ideas by relating them to familiar concepts.	1000	488	4.15	1.10
	2000	598	4.28	0.97
	3000-4000	1163	4.27	1.01
	Grad	1635	4.33	0.93
4. My instructor presents sufficient and relevant examples.	1000	486	4.22	1.11
	2000	599	4.33	0.95
	3000-4000	1176	4.31	0.97
	Grad	1644	4.35	0.94
5. My instructor provides opportunity for questions during class or in online course modules.	1000	492	4.35	1.00
	2000	600	4.44	0.91
	3000-4000	1178	4.40	0.96
	Grad	1656	4.51	0.82
6. My instructor asks questions which challenge me to think.	1000	488	4.23	1.05
	2000	596	4.30	0.93
	3000-4000	1171	4.35	0.95
	Grad	1661	4.43	0.88
7. My work is evaluated in ways that are helpful to my learning.	1000	493	4.02	1.24
	2000	598	4.18	1.07
	3000-4000	1182	4.24	1.09
	Grad	1679	4.24	1.06
8. My instructor provides useful feedback throughout the semester.	1000	496	4.02	1.26
	2000	599	4.16	1.13
	3000-4000	1188	4.21	1.12
	Grad	1671	4.23	1.07

9. My instructor provides individual assistance when asked.	1000	478	4.33	1.03
	2000	580	4.40	0.91
	3000-4000	1157	4.40	0.94
	Grad	1603	4.48	0.85
10. Course activities/assignments help me learn the subject matter.	1000	492	4.09	1.08
	2000	601	4.27	0.95
	3000-4000	1173	4.30	0.95
	Grad	1671	4.35	0.89
11. Overall, I would rate the quality of instruction in this course as: Excellent - Good - Fair - Poor - Very Poor	1000	495	4.19	1.13
	2000	607	4.35	0.96
	3000-4000	1180	4.30	1.03
	Grad	1672	4.38	0.92
12. This course has been challenging.	1000	501	3.95	1.10
	2000	618	4.10	0.92
	3000-4000	1192	4.19	0.86
	Grad	1702	4.34	0.83
13. I always prepare before class.	1000	489	4.09	0.87
	2000	595	4.12	0.83
	3000-4000	1129	4.20	0.78
	Grad	1612	4.36	0.72

Distance Education Questions (Rated on a 1-5 Likert Scale)	level	N	Mean	Std Dev
DE1: My instructor demonstrates how to apply concepts and methodologies in the lab.	1000	209	3.90	1.30
	2000	307	4.04	1.12
	3000-4000	922	4.10	1.10
	Grad	1385	4.46	0.82
DE2: The course is organized to encourage interaction with the instructor.	1000	212	3.65	1.31
	2000	317	3.84	1.17
	3000-4000	936	3.99	1.15
	Grad	1402	4.15	1.07
DE3: When I contact the instructor Monday to Friday, I receive a response within 24 hours.	1000	189	4.15	1.16
	2000	295	4.19	1.11
	3000-4000	886	4.30	1.02
	Grad	1313	4.38	0.97

DE4: The instructional materials are accessible and easy to use.	1000	213	4.19	1.09
	2000	325	4.33	0.94
	3000-4000	937	4.30	0.96
	Grad	1399	4.47	0.80
DE5: The design of this course is effective for online delivery.	1000	216	3.93	1.27
	2000	328	4.22	1.08
	3000-4000	942	4.20	1.08
	Grad	1385	4.35	0.93

Lab Course Questions (Rated on a 1-5 Likert Scale)	LEVEL	N	Mean	Std Dev
LB1: My instructor demonstrates how to apply concepts and methodologies in the lab.	GR	28	4.68	0.55
	UG	61	4.44	0.85
LB2: Lab procedures are clearly presented to me.	GR	28	4.64	0.62
	UG	62	4.35	0.96
LB3: Assistance is always available throughout lab sessions.	GR	28	4.79	0.42
	UG	64	4.45	0.92
LB4: Lab safety regulations are strictly enforced.	GR	28	4.71	0.46
	UG	64	4.59	0.77

Field-Based Course Questions (Rated on a 1-5 Likert Scale)	LEVEL	N	Mean	Std Dev
FB: This course has challenged me to acquire skills related to my professional and academic ambitions.	GR	65	4.37	0.94
	UG	129	4.27	0.88

Appendix Two: Selected Statistical Results

Correlation Table*:

0. No linear relationship

+0.30. A weak positive linear relationship

+0.50. A moderate positive relationship

+0.70. A strong positive linear relationship

Exactly +1. A perfect positive linear relationship

The CORR Procedure

14 Variables:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	grade
---------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------

Spearman Correlation Coefficients, N = 2005 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0														
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	grade
Q1	1.00000	0.83153 <.0001	0.73533 <.0001	0.73350 <.0001	0.71481 <.0001	0.70165 <.0001	0.67756 <.0001	0.67046 <.0001	0.67550 <.0001	0.58921 <.0001	0.63933 <.0001	0.20892 <.0001	0.22482 <.0001	0.05398 0.0156
Q2	0.83153 <.0001	1.00000	0.80629 <.0001	0.78869 <.0001	0.75189 <.0001	0.73753 <.0001	0.74778 <.0001	0.71623 <.0001	0.72507 <.0001	0.63697 <.0001	0.66831 <.0001	0.18769 <.0001	0.25475 <.0001	0.09759 <.0001
Q3	0.73533 <.0001	0.80629 <.0001	1.00000	0.85872 <.0001	0.74374 <.0001	0.74521 <.0001	0.77771 <.0001	0.74819 <.0001	0.74040 <.0001	0.64209 <.0001	0.68734 <.0001	0.12737 <.0001	0.23854 <.0001	0.10679 <.0001
Q4	0.73350 <.0001	0.78869 <.0001	0.85872 <.0001	1.00000	0.76349 <.0001	0.73880 <.0001	0.79716 <.0001	0.76804 <.0001	0.74021 <.0001	0.67910 <.0001	0.70340 <.0001	0.13170 <.0001	0.23900 <.0001	0.12240 <.0001
Q5	0.71481 <.0001	0.75189 <.0001	0.74374 <.0001	0.76349 <.0001	1.00000	0.72898 <.0001	0.75134 <.0001	0.75857 <.0001	0.79683 <.0001	0.62959 <.0001	0.66950 <.0001	0.15589 <.0001	0.22872 <.0001	0.11254 <.0001
Q6	0.70165 <.0001	0.73753 <.0001	0.74521 <.0001	0.73880 <.0001	0.72898 <.0001	1.00000	0.76088 <.0001	0.73794 <.0001	0.72083 <.0001	0.62326 <.0001	0.61984 <.0001	0.25061 <.0001	0.28600 <.0001	0.09807 <.0001
Q7	0.67756 <.0001	0.74778 <.0001	0.77771 <.0001	0.79716 <.0001	0.75134 <.0001	0.76088 <.0001	1.00000	0.86259 <.0001	0.78023 <.0001	0.70671 <.0001	0.71635 <.0001	0.11892 <.0001	0.26213 <.0001	0.16621 <.0001
Q8	0.67046 <.0001	0.71623 <.0001	0.74819 <.0001	0.76804 <.0001	0.75857 <.0001	0.73794 <.0001	0.86259 <.0001	1.00000	0.81504 <.0001	0.67526 <.0001	0.70507 <.0001	0.13135 <.0001	0.25689 <.0001	0.14977 <.0001
Q9	0.67550 <.0001	0.72507 <.0001	0.74040 <.0001	0.74021 <.0001	0.79683 <.0001	0.72083 <.0001	0.78023 <.0001	0.81504 <.0001	1.00000	0.64573 <.0001	0.68585 <.0001	0.16716 <.0001	0.24563 <.0001	0.12457 <.0001
Q10	0.58921 <.0001	0.63697 <.0001	0.64209 <.0001	0.67910 <.0001	0.62959 <.0001	0.62326 <.0001	0.70671 <.0001	0.67526 <.0001	0.64573 <.0001	1.00000	0.70730 <.0001	0.14026 <.0001	0.27848 <.0001	0.22188 <.0001
Q11	0.63933 <.0001	0.66831 <.0001	0.68734 <.0001	0.70340 <.0001	0.66950 <.0001	0.61984 <.0001	0.71635 <.0001	0.70507 <.0001	0.68585 <.0001	0.70730 <.0001	1.00000	0.08381 0.0002	0.23265 <.0001	0.18366 <.0001
Q12	0.20892 <.0001	0.18769 <.0001	0.12737 <.0001	0.13170 <.0001	0.15589 <.0001	0.25061 <.0001	0.11892 <.0001	0.13135 <.0001	0.16716 <.0001	0.14026 <.0001	0.08381 0.0002	1.00000	0.30821 <.0001	-0.11810 <.0001
Q13	0.22482 <.0001	0.25475 <.0001	0.23854 <.0001	0.23900 <.0001	0.22872 <.0001	0.28600 <.0001	0.26213 <.0001	0.25689 <.0001	0.24563 <.0001	0.27848 <.0001	0.23265 <.0001	0.30821 <.0001	1.00000	0.17309 <.0001
grade	0.05398 0.0156	0.09759 <.0001	0.10679 <.0001	0.12240 <.0001	0.11254 <.0001	0.09807 <.0001	0.16621 <.0001	0.14977 <.0001	0.12457 <.0001	0.22188 <.0001	0.18366 <.0001	-0.11810 <.0001	0.17309 <.0001	1.00000

Split Half Alpha --- UG*

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha	
Variables	Alpha
Raw	0.966443
Standardized	0.967318

*Note: only UG results are included. GR results are almost identical.

Factor Analysis --- UG*

Eigenvalues

Eigenvalues of the Reduced Correlation Matrix: Total = 8.30107709 Average = 0.75464337				
	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
1	8.05720422	7.74190327	0.9706	0.9706
2	0.31530095	0.14625643	0.0380	1.0086
3	0.16904452	0.07618775	0.0204	1.0290
4	0.09285678	0.03666828	0.0112	1.0402
5	0.05618850	0.07386432	0.0068	1.0469
6	-.01767582	0.04088149	-0.0021	1.0448
7	-.05855731	0.00533400	-0.0071	1.0377
8	-.06389131	0.00996367	-0.0077	1.0300
9	-.07385498	0.01155850	-0.0089	1.0211
10	-.08541348	0.00471151	-0.0103	1.0109
11	-.09012499		-0.0109	1.0000

VARMAX Rotation

Rotated Factor Pattern		
	Factor1	Factor2
Q1	0.40071	0.76320
Q2	0.45620	0.79386
Q3	0.59165	0.67854
Q4	0.63113	0.63119
Q5	0.61182	0.58022
Q6	0.57340	0.61063
Q7	0.78820	0.46236
Q8	0.78942	0.43889
Q9	0.68639	0.49831
Q10	0.67999	0.42742
Q11	0.74010	0.45632

After Rotation

Rotated Factor Pattern (Standardized Regression Coefficients)		
	Factor1	Factor2
Q1	0.07643	0.80328
Q2	0.13365	0.81124
Q3	0.39150	0.56892
Q4	0.47520	0.47937
Q5	0.48033	0.42113
Q6	0.40863	0.48670
Q7	0.79603	0.15006
Q8	0.81229	0.11699
Q9	0.63374	0.26236
Q10	0.66901	0.16873
Q11	0.73366	0.17142

*Note: only UG results are included. GR results are almost identical.

Comparison by Academic Rank*

ANOVA: Total Scores (Sum of Q 1-11) by Academic Rank, Undergraduate Courses

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.				
Waller Grouping		Mean	N	rank
	A	49.217	765	ASST
		0		
B	A	48.910	523	PROF
		1		
B	A	48.384	802	INSTR
		0		
B	A	47.780	41	GTA
		5		
B		47.346	1267	ASSOC
		5		

Chi-Square: Question 11 by Academic Rank, Undergraduate Courses

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	16	30.0743	0.0176
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	16	31.5709	0.0114
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	10.2919	0.0013
Phi Coefficient		0.1225	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1216	
Cramer's V		0.0612	

*Note: only UG results are included. GR results are similar with assistant professors rated the highest. ANOVA and Chi-square results are consistent.

Comparison by Tenure Status**

ANOVA and Chi-square results are somewhat different.

ANOVA: Total Scores (Sum of Q 1-11) by Tenure Status, Undergraduate Courses

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.				
Waller Grouping		Mean	N	INSTRUCTOR_TENURE
	A	49.963	108	On Tenure Track
B	A	48.289	906	Not Eligible for Tenure
B	A	47.780	41	GTA
B		47.140	950	Tenured

** The difference by tenure status is statistically significant in UG level courses only. The difference by tenure status is NOT statistically significant in GR level courses.

Chi-Square: Question 11 by Tenure Status, Undergraduate Courses

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	12	26.1293	0.0103
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	12	28.9970	0.0039
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.0016	0.9679
Phi Coefficient		0.1142	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1134	

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Cramer's V		0.0659	
WARNING: 25% of the cells have expected counts less than 5. Chi-Square may not be a valid test.			

Chi-square test indicates statistically significant difference by tenure status in both UG and GR courses. However, chi-square may not be valid due to small cell counts.

**Faculty Senate Agenda
November 1, 2016
Attachment 5.**

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revisions to the [Bachelor of Science in University Studies Faculty Oversight Committee](#) (FOC) Manual and Guidelines

(Additions are noted in **bold red print** and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.)

First revision - clarifies that although the terms of office for the Chair and Vice Chair are one academic year, the FOC may reelect these officers for a subsequent term. Because the chair must have one year of service on the committee, and terms of service on the FOC are limited to three years, the maximum possible number of terms for a Chair would be two years.

Selection and Terms of FOC Chair and Vice Chair

.....

“The FOC Chair and Vice Chair terms of office are one **year, although the FOC can re-elect either, or both, for a second term**. A Vice Chair may be subsequently elected as Chair ~~for a one-year term~~, but the succession to the Chair position is not automatic or pre-determined.”

Second revision - codifies FOC and program procedures for approving changes to a student’s *Degree Plan and Proposal* after initial approval. The Registrar required this information during the Summer 2016, due to rules and mandated tracking information required by UNC General Administration.

“Changes to the Student Degree Plan and Proposal After FOC Approval

The following procedures apply when a student has an approved degree plan on-file and when changes occur in the “thematic core” section. The Director and/or Assistant Director of University Studies are authorized to change courses within the “free electives” and/or “foundations curriculum” as needed and without explicit FOC approval, as they are not germane to the degree’s focused theme.

- 1. For a maximum of two courses at a time, the FOC delegates change authority for thematic core course changes to the Director or Assistant Director, on behalf of the FOC (and without explicit approval), when the course prefixes are identical (e.g., PSYC for a PSYC course), or the course is in a similar vein and content focus (although not the same prefix) and agrees with the student’s thematic core and the changes do not impact the overall construct of the thematic core’s focus. Some examples of the latter situation would be substituting between HLTH 4001: Stress Management, RCTX 2200: Principles of Stress Management, and RCTX**

4200: Advanced Stress Management, or COMM 2420: Business and Professional Communication for BITE 3220: Business Communications.

- 2. For changes of three or four classes at any one time and/or when the changes are not the same prefix or content focus, the Director/Assistant Director will contact the FOC Chair and Vice Chair for approval. The Chair, or the Vice Chair in the Chair's absence, can approve the changes on behalf of the FOC, select a grouping of appropriate FOC reviewers to approve, or submit the changes to the entire FOC.**
- 3. Other changes to the thematic core must be approved by the FOC Chair or Vice Chair and at least two FOC reviewers (original reviewers, if they remain on the FOC; if not, then the replacement reviewer from the same college/discipline). The FOC Chair/Vice Chair reserves the right to send the altered plan to the entire FOC for approval. These changes may include: altering five or more classes in the thematic core; if the Director, Assistant Director, or Chair/Vice Chair believe the changes significantly alter the construct of the thematic core; or if the student drops a minor/certificate (or classes required to achieve the minor/certificate) and the minor was required to support the student's approved title (e.g., using "Entrepreneur /Entrepreneurship" in the title requires the student to earn the Entrepreneurship Certificate).**
- 4. If the Director or FOC Chair believe the student's requested changes are not an alteration of the existing thematic core, but instead represent a new proposal and direction, the student must resubmit a new *Degree Plan and Proposal* to the entire FOC for review at the next scheduled meeting.**

In all cases, the changes will be noted in the student's *Degree Plan and Proposal* in the administrative/approval section. The change notation will include the authority approving the change, the specific change(s) made, and the date of approval. University Studies advisors will file all emails/correspondences regarding the change and the approvals in the student's files (shared drive student folder), and will make required notifications/file changes to the system of record (e.g., Banner) and in the manner coordinated with the Registrar's office."

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT
 Election of Members to the Appellate Hearing Committee

Nominees

Jason Yao (Engineering and Technology) for regular 2019 term
Joy Karriker (Business) for alternate 2018 term

2016/2017 HEARING COMMITTEE

Regular Members	Academic Unit	Faculty Status	Term	College/School	Office Location	Mail #	Office #
Angela Thompson	History	Asst. Professor	2017	Arts & Sciences	Brewster A203	554	328-1035
John Harer Vice Chair	Education	Assoc. Professor	2017	Education	Ragsdale 126A	172	328-4389
Michael Albers	English	Professor	2018	Arts & Sciences	Bate 210	555	328-6374
Lisa Barricella Chair	Academic Library Services	Assoc. Professor	2019	Academic Library Services	Joyner 1201	516	328-0838
OPEN			2019				
Alternate Members (with vote)							
John Collins Secretary	Philosophy and Religious Studies	Assoc. Professor	2017	Arts & Sciences	Brewster A335	562	328-6112
Ziwei Lin	Physics	Assoc. Professor	2017	Arts & Sciences	Howell	563	328-2941
OPEN			2018				
Margaret Arnd-Caddigan	Social Work	Assoc. Professor	2018	Health & Human Performance	Rivers 236	505	328-5553
Eric Shouse	Communication	Assoc. Professor	2019	Fine Arts & Communication	Joyner East 124	524	328-0433

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution on Freedom of Speech

Whereas, the United States Constitution grants individuals the right of free speech; and

Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed the right to free speech even when some may find it outrageous; and

Whereas, the university is a place dedicated to fostering the free and open exchange of ideas; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University supports the exercise of constitutionally protected free speech in the broadest possible spectrum of time, place, and manner consistent with established jurisprudence; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University opposes any attempt to prevent or inhibit constitutionally guaranteed free speech;

Be it resolved that the Faculty of East Carolina University affirms unambiguously each student's constitutionally guaranteed right to free speech and strongly condemns any acts of violence or intimidation, verbal or otherwise, directed at students or other members of the ECU community in response to the exercise of their constitutionally guaranteed right to free speech.