

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2015**

The second regular meeting of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 6, 2015, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**

John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of [September 8, 2015](#) were approved as presented.

**Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day**

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Campbell (Allied Health Sciences), Tierno and Zoller (Art and Design), Sorensen (Criminal Justice), Robinson (Mathematics) and Apetz and Levine (Medicine).

Alternates present were: Professors Hopkins for Morin (Communication), Pagliari for Frank (Engineering and Technology), Cortright for Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance), Pearce for Powers (Sociology) and Keil for Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance).

**B. Announcements**

An editorial revision to the Spring 2017 University Calendar is noted below:

<del>October 17, Monday</del> October 28, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
---	---

The Teaching Grants Committee is pleased to announce a call for 2016/17 Teaching Grant proposals. The submission deadline is 12:00 noon on Monday, November 9, 2015. Proposal guidelines are available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/tg/teachinggrants.cfm>. The purpose of these grants is to provide funding to improve teaching instruction at the University. Full time tenured, tenure-track, and fixed term faculty members are eligible to apply for these grants with preference given to projects that are creative and innovative or meet demonstrated needs. The total limited funding set aside for these grants is \$100,000. Summer stipends will be limited to no more than \$10,000 and total budgets for project expenses (materials, equipment, etc.) will need to be minimal. All monetary expenditures are tied to the current fiscal year and, all monies must be spent by June 30, 2016. Questions may be directed to Professor Donna Roberson, Chair of the Teaching Grants Committee at [robersondo@ecu.edu](mailto:robersondo@ecu.edu).

The Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee will host their annual ECU Scholarship Awarding Workshop on Monday, December 7, 2015, from 11 -12 noon in room 244 of the Mendenhall Student Center. This workshop is for all faculty and staff interested in the annual awarding of student scholarships. No registration is required to participate in this event. Questions may be directed to Professor Stephanie Richards, Chair of the Committee at [richardss@ecu.edu](mailto:richardss@ecu.edu).

The Chancellor has approved/accepted the following resolutions from the September 2015 Faculty Senate meeting:

- 15-75 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [April 13, 2015](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes (GC#15-16) to include editorial revision to the Graduate Catalog to include last day to drop/withdraw without grades and Thesis Dissertation Oversight (TDO) Committee Best Practices.
- 15-76 Curriculum matters included in the [April 20, 2015](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional

Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including approval of domestic diversity credit for KINE 3301 Physical Education and Sport in Modern Society and NUTR 1010 Cultural Foods; global diversity credit for KINE 4301 Comparative Sport and Physical Education: International Aspects; and both foundations social science designation and global diversity credit for HIST 2150 Shop Till You Drop: Consumerism.

15-77 Curriculum matters included in the [April 16, 2015](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including curriculum actions within the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, College of Health and Human Performance and College of Engineering and Technology.

15-78 Revised [College of Engineering and Technology Unit Code of Operations](#).

15-79 [Commendation](#) for Professor Andrew Morehead, Chair of the Faculty.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Steve Ballard commented about several issues. The Chancellor discussed the State Bond Package that includes ECU's science building. The Chancellor stated that the news is good, given the climate in terms of higher education expenditures. The science building has been our first priority since 2008. The initial request was for more money; the amount allocated has been reduced. Chancellor Ballard highlighted our good fortune at being included in the bond package given that attempts were made to remove our item in the package. Three institutions did not receive any allocations in the bond package. If we can get it passed in the March statewide vote, it will be a great addition in the nick of time since our current science building is in poor condition. The Chancellor noted disappointment that the funding was reduced as the bond package was reviewed, but receiving \$90M for a project at this time is a victory for ECU. The Chancellor said he is proud of Michelle Brooks and dozens of other people who worked hard to keep our building in the package. The statewide campaign is being directed through President Ross's office and his chief of staff has communicated with all the chiefs of staff and they are working on messaging and communication to try to make the difference for the March vote. The Chancellor will be reporting and requesting assistance from the ECU community to make sure we're speaking with one voice to encourage voter approval.

The Chancellor stated that questions have been raised about the financial picture for the Brody School of Medicine. Drs. Horns and Niswander and the Chancellor and many people have been working on these issues for several years. The fundamental issue is that the state support has gone from well over 50% to about 20%. The huge decline in state support for the medical school—which is a community-based academic medical center that does not have many specialties or its own hospital—is a major concern because without state support, this type of center is not viable. The administration has been working on a plan for the school for the last three years and will continue in the fall working on a longer-term plan. The key is getting the Board of Governors to approve it. The Chancellor is optimistic that the Board of Governors will continue to support the medical school. We have \$8 million for two years with the next effort to get the \$8 million to be recurring going forward. The \$8 million is about one-third that we will be asking the state to provide to sustain the school, which has been noted as one of the top ten in the United States by the American Academy of Family Physicians for seven or eight years. The Governor was especially very helpful for the two-year support. The legislature has refused to do anything with our debt collection capacity, which we have always had until the last two years. While they're giving us the two-year appropriation, they are restricting the funding from debt collection of over \$4 million. The Chancellor will continue to request that the new funds be recurring and that we be allowed to reestablish debt collection, and we will continue the great relationship with the Vidant medical group. Fiscal sustainability is one of the most

important issues, but the fiscal problems are different from the past and are not going away anytime soon. However, the Chancellor assured senators that we are better off this October than in the previous October and much better off than two or three Octobers ago.

The Chancellor stated that several questions have been raised about the Chancellor search. The Chancellor has no additional information to offer since the last Senate meeting. The search committee and leadership committee (which will develop a leadership profile of chancellor) rosters have been announced and appeared in the newspaper. The search committee includes many good members and has a lot of work to do. Dr. Ross will charge the Committee on Oct. 27<sup>th</sup> and the committee will move forward. Vice-Chancellors Hardy and Dyba are involved with the leadership committee. Moving forward, the best sources of information on the search are Dr. Stiller, Dr. Hardy, and Mr. Diyba.

Professor Pearce (Sociology) asked about the status of the planned Women's Center. Chancellor Ballard stated that he wasn't sure what Dr. Pearce meant by the planned Women's Center. He indicated that campus administrators have been evaluating the possibility of a Women's Center for a long time. The Chancellor indicated that the only way to afford a new center is to do it in steps, and that they are working on some ways to get that going. He would be able to say more about those steps after October once the university budget and funding is finalized. Salaries and other priorities have been committed and equity remains a critical focus. The Chancellor noted that major resources have been devoted to sexual assault and misconduct; he concluded by explaining that to open a new center, we must identify other revenues for a new center.

Professor Christensen (Biology) asked about the status of the salary equity study. Chancellor Ballard replied that the committee is not satisfied with it yet. The report does not yet answer all the questions that it was intended to address. The key issue is that the questions need to be answered correctly. LaKeshia Alston, Associate Provost of Equity and Diversity, stated that the committee currently is looking at different models applied to the data but the analyses need additional clarification. We will have an update before the end of the month, and the update will be public.

No further questions were posed to the Chancellor.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Vice Chancellor Horns discussed the Brody reorganization. Vice Chancellor Horns focused on the recommendation coming from the University Committee of Fiscal Sustainability that asked the school to look at the departmental structure in the basic science areas. A work group is working on that exploration and has issued a draft report that is not ready for dissemination yet. Dr. Horns is reviewing it. The working group looked at best practices in medical schools across the country and at academic administrative efficiencies. There was no mandate that the school be reorganized; there was a mandate that it be studied and that the school look at every opportunity to create academic and administrative efficiencies. Dr. Horns' initial read of the report is that the working group has accomplished a great deal of the work. Dr. Horns has identified several questions for the work group to answer more specifically. Dr. Horns expects that the report will not be ready for a few months but that it will produce something very good and helpful to the medical school in the fine work that it has been doing in producing excellent doctors and graduates from the PhD program. Some work is being done on creating an umbrella for the PhD programs that have been on the list of low performing programs list. Bringing these programs under a common umbrella is intended to help streamline the structure while still allowing small numbers for focused areas.

Dr. Horns also discussed the School of Public Health. Dr. Horns is pleased with the progress. The Academic Council has impaneled an advisory committee earlier in the summer. The group is 20-25 members from all across the university representing a diversity of the programs that might be involved with the school. Dr. Nicholas Benson from the BSOM is chairing the group. They are discussing how to craft the future directions with regard to the school of public health including the elements that exist already at ECU that could be part of the school. The time-frame for the school is 2020-2021. The reason is that there are already individual accredited programs and that the accrediting body for those will also accredit the school. This body requires that all the accreditation criteria be met before a university can declare that it has a school. We currently have excellent programs in public health at the undergraduate level in HHP and the Master's degree in Public Health in the Brody School. A search is getting underway to replace the chair of the department of Public Health in BSOM. Don Cheney is chairing that committee.

Vice Chancellor Horns also addressed the Division of Health Sciences [Employee Code of Conduct](#). This code is an extension of the professional ethics statement in the faculty manual. But this is a code for all employees and is modeled on the code of conduct that the BSOM has had in place. These codes are related to public safety and to necessary activities required to meet state and federal laws relative to all areas of patient care. The code was disseminated to 2,600 employees in the division. Of those, 2,300 have read and signed the code.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked for clarification on the timeline of the School of Public Health's accreditation date. Is 2020 when the other programs are up for accreditation? Vice Chancellor Horns replied that these programs are already accredited and we do not wish to jeopardize their accreditation for declaring pre-maturely that we have a school of public health. The balance is to do that work so that in 2019 we are within two years of meeting all the standards that are applicable to schools of public health as opposed to programs.

E. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor for Campus Operations

Mr. Koch provided information relating to the construction of Student Centers on Main Campus and Health Sciences Campus and the related issue of parking. Over the summer, Mr. Koch worked with key people on the health science campus to work through and implement a parking plan. About 100 spaces have been saved for faculty and staff and redirect students to other locations. That project is underway the parking plan is working well.

This project will have a considerable impact on the core campus, with much of the impact in the eastern portion. As for main campus, all 400 parking spaces behind Mendenhall and Joyner out to 10<sup>th</sup> St. will be enclosed in a fence and no longer available. The project will impact about 180 "A" permit spaces out of 400 that we will lose (during the day). The top priority is to accommodate ADA spaces as required by law and then "A" permits. The scope and impact of the project will be inconvenient. After the project is over, a 700 space parking deck will be opened that will be part of the student center. Areas that will be available for "A" permits are north of Mendenhall and east, near Speight and Rivers. Parking and Transportation have been reducing the sale of "A" permits through attrition for several years to prepare for the project and loss of spaces on the core campus during the construction. They will convert two other small lots to "A" parking west of Cotanche. The additional spaces will accommodate all the people who currently have "A" permits and they will not sell any more this year. "B" lots will shift further west to 10<sup>th</sup> and Evans and additional work will be done on lots to accommodate all current "B" permit holders. The real impacts are to students and visitors. Student access will be through transit. Additional shuttles will be provided for people with disabilities.

Parking and Transportation have also worked with transit to double the route from core campus out to Belk, and other buildings serving the College of Health and Human Performance. They worked with SGA, Student Affairs, and Transit to double the Safe Ride capacity, especially in the area from Cotanche west; they are increasing cameras, phones, and police patrols in those areas as well. Meetings are being held to discuss plans with SGA Senate, Parking and Transportation committee (which include four faculty members), Executive Council, Board of Trustees, and Staff Senate. Beginning in November, a website will be available with a lot of information to get people ready. They are working with Student Affairs and the News Service to communicate these changes and there will be newspaper articles, forum in November and an informational website created to increase information on the project. Beginning spring semester, parking personnel will be monitoring the parking area and educating people on where to park and later in the spring they will actually begin issuing citations.

Professor Cope (Psychology) asked when the actual construction physically started. Associate Vice Chancellor Koch replied that it has already started and that the main campus center will start in the spring, after December graduation. Students will see changes after break.

Professor Kain (English) expressed concern about the impact the construction will have on students and visitors and wondered if more could be done for the visitors to campus. Mr. Koch replied that they are still looking at what can be done for visitors but that will depend on transit, especially for any type of large event. They're down to deciding whether to accommodate visitors or faculty and staff. Ideas are welcome. The parking deck downtown would be utilized although it was not close to campus. The Core campus will be very tight and the success of the parking situation was really going to depend on transit. Mr. Koch and his staff were trying to decide if they were going to accommodate visitors at the expense of faculty and staff. Those with A and B decal parking permits should be accommodated first.

F. John Fletcher, Associate Provost Enrollment Services and Dave Meredith, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

Mr. Fletcher stated that this fall ECU reached a milestone was with the largest enrollment in university history, with a total of 28,289 graduate and undergraduate students enrolled. That is an almost 3% increase over the most recent year. Undergraduate enrollment was also at a record high with 23,039. Our graduate enrollment is currently stable.

Mr. Meredith provided an annual report on the 2015 Freshman Class and the Retention Rate of Home Schooled Admissions. He stated that this was a good year for applications—we went up 18.6%, 600 additional applications, the biggest jump of any UNC system school. Admits and enrollments were also up. We also saw better applicants with the average SAT score up 19 points from last year, also the largest jump from last year of any UNC school. The SAT is being redesigned to return to a 1600 point test. Counties that are home to students coming here are Wake, Pitt, and Mecklenburg. Two large events are upcoming, open house in October and April 2 for admitted students. Transfer numbers are also good—fall transfers were 1,738, with transfer hours still very strong and good performance on GPA. Most of the transfer class (52%) comes from eastern North Carolina, particularly from Pitt Community College.

Professor Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences) asked what percentage of the freshman class were from out-of-state and from where did they come. Mr. Meredith replied that 15.1% of the freshman class were from out-of-state, which was about 700 students. They came mainly from the strip straight up Interstate 95 with Virginia being the largest, following with Maryland and New Jersey.

Professor Christian (Business) asked how many international students we have. Mr. Meredith replied there were 18 international students.

G. Mike Felts, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Felts provided a brief report on the September 11, 2015, [UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting](#) noting that this first meeting of the year served as an orientation, which as is typical. The theme of the meeting was shared governance and the work of assembly. Round tables in the morning focused on shared governance and system issues and shared governance and campus specific issues. Issues related to the system include environmental issues (e.g., cost vs perceived value of higher education, public support; business vs academic models and disconnects; and increasing influence of the legislature). Campus specific issues were transparency, particularly in budget issues; relationships between faculty and administrators (e.g. who is the voice of the faculty; “us” vs “them” mentality between faculty and administration and the effects); and access, affordability, and accountability and concern in the state that these are forcing the campuses to be more alike, though diversity of campuses may be important. Chairperson Leonard spoke about the work of the assembly and reminded the assembly that they exist at that pleasure of the Board of Governors. In the afternoon series speakers discussed online education: learner-relationship management systems, funding model for online education; UNC data mining of data bases to have better reporting; an ETS assessment of foundations that will be used on six campuses in 2016. The last item in the afternoon was to draft a letter about the President search, which was not well received. The Assembly meets again on the 20<sup>th</sup>.

Professor Kain (English) asked if ECU was one of the six campuses designated for the ETS test. Mike Felts didn't think so. Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) replied that ECU is involved.

H. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

In considering my remarks to you today, I'd been thinking that it would timely to talk about our upcoming search for a new Chancellor, as well as the recent regional and national landscape for similar university leadership searches. Unfortunately, as I was short on details to share with you, I was having some trouble with the first part of those comments. Thus, yesterday afternoon I was happy see that Steve Jones, Chair of the Board of Trustees, announced the formation of our Chancellor Search Committee, as well as a Leadership working group. The Search Committee will be tasked with identifying finalists for the Chancellor position and forwarding their recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Board then will forward the names of three unranked candidates to the General Administration, and the UNC President will forward a specific recommendation to the Board of Governors for final approval. The Search Committee has seventeen members, two of whom are faculty representatives, Dr. Marianna Walker and yours truly.

The Leadership Working group will be co-chaired by Vice-Chancellors Hardy and Dyba, and includes somewhat broader faculty participation. The full membership was included in the announcement yesterday, which can be found on the main ECU web page. The working group is tasked with developing a leadership statement that will provide the philosophical basis and direction for the work of the search committee. This working group also can be part of broader

interactions with finalists for the chancellor position, and can provide additional and more fully representative feedback to the search committee and the Board of Trustees.

These groups will not begin formal activities until late this month when President Ross is scheduled to come to campus and deliver the charge to the search committee. At present, there are few specifics available on the structure of the search, beyond what was included in the public announcement yesterday.

What we do know is that recent Chancellor searches within the UNC system have been largely confidential in nature, meaning that candidates do not meet or interact publically with a broad cross-section of their potential future constituents. The idea is to encourage individuals to apply who might not do so if their identities would become known to their current employers, particularly very early in the search process. Although this model seems alien to most faculty, given that we generally give public seminars when interviewing for a University position, it has been the rule at other UNC institutions, and will be the general approach used here as well.

Now, I must confess that when Dr. Ballard made clear that we would be searching for his replacement this year, shortly after my election as Chair last spring, it gave me pause on a number of counts. Those of you who've followed news from around the country, and within our own state, know that recent searches for top level university administrators have not always concluded with unanimity and widespread satisfaction. In our own state system, serious issues have been raised regarding a lack of transparency in the current search for President Ross' replacement, along with a perceived unwillingness of the Search Committee seek advice and input from both university and public constituencies. This has resulted a lack of trust in the process by many, and has contributed to the development of legislation, Senate resolution S670, which has serious implications for further politicizing the central governing body of the UNC system.

I should also point out that an open search is not necessarily synonymous with a transparent search. In one of the most recent and most disturbing cases, in the search for a new president for the University of Iowa, the four finalists all held public forums that permitted interaction with broad university and public stakeholders. However, two days after the final interview, with a notable lack of transparency with respect to how the decision was made, the Iowa Board of Regents chose to ignore overwhelmingly consistent feedback from faculty, students and staff when they decided on a new University President. Their decision, and more importantly, the nature of process that led to that decision, prompted a vote of no confidence in the Board of Regents by the University of Iowa Faculty Senate, along with some very embarrassing headlines and damage to the University's reputation.

Now, as a new Faculty Chair and now a newly appointed member of the Chancellor Search Committee, I do not find either of these to be appealing models for how to carry out a successful search; particularly one that can launch the next era of an university in a unified and excited manner, and lay the groundwork for a new Chancellor to enter into a strongly collaborative and supportive environment.

Here at ECU we have a long and robust tradition of shared governance, and we approach this current search with full expectations that all university and public stakeholders will work together, in a transparent and collective manner, to identify the next great leader for this institution. I have been encouraged by aspects of our process to date, particularly my initial interactions with Chairman Jones and Vice-Chair Kieran Shanahan. Both have expressed a desire to make the search as inclusive and transparent as feasible, and both have been

responsive to an open dialog about faculty concerns. Even in the final hours before yesterday's announcement, discussions with Mr. Shanahan led to increased breadth and diversity in faculty representation on the leadership-working group. I am confident that faculty representatives on both these committees, all of whom are steeped in our traditions of shared governance, will foster strong collaborative relationships through the search process. It is my deepest hope that, unlike many other recent searches, if the process we follow makes headlines, they will be to cite us as a model for how to work together to bring the best possible top-level leadership to a major university.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked how faculty were selected for the Chancellor Search Committee and the related Leadership Working Committee recently announced. Chair Stiller replied that he couldn't say a lot. Dr. Stiller and Dr. Walker were approached individually; He also made some recommendations with names. Some of the names ended up on the working committee, but they chose not to expand the search committee. Decisions for the working group were made in collaboration with Vice Chancellors Hardy and Dyba. Suggestions were made to include additional, and more diverse, faculty on the workgroup and people were added,

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) asked if the additional names have appeared on the list. Chair Stiller indicated that they had. Dr. Morehead stated that he thought the list was short on people from Arts and Sciences and asked whether additional names could be added to the working group from arts and humanities faculty. Chair Stiller replied that there was hope, but it was not clear what the working group would be doing beyond drafting the leadership statement. Chair Stiller hopes that the group and other faculty will interact with candidates. Currently, we don't know what the recommendations will be from the search firm or who the finalists will be and how open the finalists will be to meeting the various constituents. Chair Stiller's approach will be to open the process as much as possible.

#### I. Question Period

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) expressed concerns about the proposed revisions to the Faculty Workload Policy:

My concern is that the workload policy confuses two different things. The first is the understanding of workload as defined in the UNC policy manual, relating to instructional load and policies regarding reassigned time for research or other activities. The second element of the policy as set forth here has to do with instructional productivity as defined by specified targets for student credit hour generation. Now, I can certainly see why instructional productivity might be a factor in campus decision-making, but I question its inclusion in a formal workload policy. The section on workload in the UNC Policy Manual focuses on organized class sections and makes no mention of SCH generation. From my cursory review, the workload policies at Chapel Hill, NC State, Charlotte and Greensboro likewise appear to contain no reference to student credit hour mandates. So this aspect of our workload policy to be quite specific to ECU, and it reflects I think an increasing proclivity to view the generation of student credit hours as the cardinal virtue when determining the worth or value of different programs.

I have two specific concerns about this that I want to registers. The first is the increasing propensity to view student credit production not in the aggregate, as has generally been the case in the past, but as a mandate for departments and even individual faculty members. I

note in this regard the new phrase under section 3.4: “failure by an individual faculty member to satisfy the workload and productivity criteria established for the relevant period may result in unsatisfactory performance evaluation.” This ambiguous phrase would seem to conflate research productivity, which we are familiar with as an aspect of performance review, with instructional productivity. One implication of this is that a negative review might well result if, for example, student enrollment in a particular instructor’s courses was less than anticipated. This leads to my second concern, and that is the use of the instructional position factors from the UNC system enrollment change funding formula as student credit hour targets. Personally, I am no longer willing to provide affirmative faculty advice on any workload policy that does so. As I have noted before, the numbers in the funding formula matrix are not student credit hours; they are neither national nor system-wide averages. They are best considered ‘student credit hour dollars’ that are indexed to differences in instructional costs that are aggregated across all programs on all UNC system campuses, costs that are determined to a large degree by faculty salaries. The indices in the matrix are used by the UNC GA to prepare their budget request for enrollment growth funding across the system, and they simply reflect the empirical fact that some programs are more expensive than others; if growth across the system is taking place in relatively expensive degree programs, new faculty lines are ‘triggered’ more quickly. I refer my colleagues to Chapter 6 of the user manual for the Enrollment Change Funding Model, which describes how the position factors are determined:

[http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/oaa/ncate/upload/263\\_SCH\\_Enrollment\\_Change\\_Funding\\_Model\\_Manual.pdf](http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/oaa/ncate/upload/263_SCH_Enrollment_Change_Funding_Model_Manual.pdf)

I repeat that I am not opposed to using data to assist in our strategic decision-making, but I do not believe these indices are being used in an appropriate manner. Our use of them basically says to the campus, the less expensive your program is and the lower your faculty salaries, the more students we expect you to teach. I can find no indication that the UNC General Administration has ever intended that they be used in the way we are using them, as student credit hour mandates. Indeed, the legislature asked GA in 2010 to comment on workload in relation to the funding formula and they replied that “the model did not contemplate this type of analysis when it was developed so it will not be possible to provide some of the data the General Assembly requested.” So, my questions (to the Provost):

What is your view on the extent to which student credit hour targets should be viewed as “individual workload and productivity requirements” as stated in section 3.4, and should individual faculty members receive unsatisfactory performance evaluations for failing to meet them;

Could you please explain the extent to which our use of the enrollment growth matrix responds to any system-wide mandates or practices that we may be unaware of, or how you see them as helpful targets for assessing instructional productivity?

Provost Mitchelson stated that historically this has become increasingly important over the last years as we’ve been trying to provide good learning environments and outcomes for our students despite cuts. The focus on credit hour production, which is our basic revenue generator, is probably at least to be somewhat expected. It is the driver for the budget. When General Administration reports to the Board of Governors on workload, organized sections and student credit hour production are in the reports. Provost Mitchelson indicated that there will be a meeting about what the budget looks like going forward. We just heard about the healthy enrollment numbers but how that translates into how

much money we'll have is a real concern. ECU's enrollment was lower than expected and ECU had failed to reach our enrollment goals and we will return money this year as a result. The Provost indicated that it [student credit hour production] doesn't drive any individual's or the Provost's decisions. The application of this information starts with the unit administrators in meetings with faculty deciding what the goals for the year should be. Provost Mitchelson said that as a chair, he didn't give a bad evaluation based on student credit hour production. At the request of chief academic officers system-wide, ECU's workload policy was distributed as the best model.

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) asked for clarification since Mr. John Fletcher had just stated that ECU had the largest enrollment. Did the Provost just say that we didn't reach our enrollment goals? Provost Mitchelson replied that we didn't meet the goals that were established two years ago, which were optimistic. Meetings are taking place to discuss the enrollment expectations and goals.

#### **Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business to come before the body.

#### **Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council**

Graduate Council

Professor Denise Donica (Allied Health Sciences), Chair of the Graduate Council, provided brief information about the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the September 14, 2015 Graduate Council [meeting minutes](#) and [supporting documents](#) (GC#15-17) that included Policy changes to Graduate School Appeals Procedure (GC#15-18), priority admission for Honor students, and the [04-15-15 GCC organizational meeting minutes](#).

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the September 14, 2015 Graduate Council [meeting minutes](#) and [supporting documents](#) (GC#15-17) that included Policy changes to Graduate School Appeals Procedure (GC#15-18), priority admission for Honor students, and the [04-15-15 GCC organizational meeting minutes](#) were approved as presented with no changes and will be forwarded to the Chancellor as formal faculty advice.

#### **RESOLUTION 15-80**

#### **Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**

##### **A. Faculty Grievance Committee**

Professor Alexandra Shlapentokh (Mathematics), Secretary of the Committee provided an overview of the 2014-2015 Committee Activities as required in their charge and detailed in the *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Part XII, Section I](#), subsection V. There was no discussion and the report was accepted as presented.

##### **B. Committee on Committees**

Professor Carol Goodwillie (Biology), a member of the Committee presented Professor Robert Kulesher's (Allied Health Sciences) name as a nominee for the open 2017 alternate member seat on the UNC Faculty Assembly.

Professor Patricia Anderson (Education) raised a point of order that the previous item should not have been a report but a nomination that required an election.

Chair Stiller noted that one nominee was offered by the Committee on Committees and called for nominations. There were no further nominations from the floor and Professor Kulesher was elected by acclamation.

C. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Lori Flint (Education), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 10, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Economics, College of Health and Human Performance and School of Communications and a suggested change to the committee's name.

Chair Stiller noted that the suggested change to the committee's name will need to be forwarded to the Committee on Committees prior to action by the Faculty Senate and that he would forward this item of business to the Committee on Committees as soon as possible.

Following discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee's meeting minutes of [September 10, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Economics, College of Health and Human Performance and School of Communications were approved as presented, and excluding action on the proposed change to the Committee's name. **RESOLUTION 15-81**

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 21, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee's meeting minutes of [September 21, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION 15-82**

Professor Bailey provided a clarification on a discussion from last spring on the diversity credit requirement. At one point in the spring, there was a suggestion to wait on the 6 hour requirement and to use a 3 hour requirement initially. This plan did not go the Senate for action and the previous implementation of a 6-hour diversity credit requirement is in place.

Provost Mitchelson and Dean of Nursing Sylvia Brown, who chaired the Chancellor's foundations committee workgroup, brought a report to the committee, [Foundations Curriculum Work Group Report](#). Provost Mitchelson stated that one of the 61 recommendations from the university committee on fiscal sustainability was that the foundations curriculum be reviewed by a work group to bring recommendations to the FCIEC. Professor Bailey pointed out the recommendations and asked for any questions.

Following his report for information only, there were no questions from the body.

Professor Bailey clarified the timeline and suggested that the faculty should begin moving forward on planning related actions.

E. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Don Chaney (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented the curriculum and academic program matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 11, 2015](#) including a Request to approve two new concentrations (Family Science, Child Development) in the BS in Family and Community Services within the Department of Human Development and Family Science in the College of Health and Human Performance; Request to approve two new concentrations (Theatre Management, Community Engagement) in the BA in Theatre Arts within the School of Theatre and Dance in the College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request to approve offering the MAEd in Mathematics Education via distance education (online) format within the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education in the College of Education; and Program Review revision response for the PhD in Pharmacology and Toxicology within the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology in the School of Medicine.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters contained in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's meeting minutes of [September 11, 2015](#) including a Request to approve two new concentrations (Family Science, Child Development) in the BS in Family and Community Services within the Department of Human Development and Family Science in the College of Health and Human Performance; Request to approve two new concentrations (Theatre Management, Community Engagement) in the BA in Theatre Arts within the School of Theatre and Dance in the College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request to approve offering the MAEd in Mathematics Education via distance education (online) format within the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education in the College of Education; and Program Review revision response for the PhD in Pharmacology and Toxicology within the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology in the School of Medicine were approved as presented. (Copies of items listed are available through the Faculty Senate office.) **RESOLUTION 15-83**

F. Unit Code Screening Committee

Professor Patricia Anderson (Education), Chair of the Committee presented the proposed revisions to the Department of Human Development and Family Science Unit Code of Operations (formerly Department of Child Development and Family Relations), which will be used as operational guidelines as part of the Provisional Code of Operations for the Reorganized College of Health & Human Performance.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Department of Human Development and Family Science Unit Code of Operations (formerly Department of Child Development and Family Relations) which will be used as operational guidelines as part of the Provisional Code of Operations for the Reorganized College of Health & Human Performance were approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION 15-84**

G. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake (Education), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the Faculty Workload Policy and stated that the workload policy received requested changes from GA. One point of discussion focused on the ways the credit hours would be used in that the individual faculty may not have any control over student credit hours. The term "aggregated" was added to that section.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) noted that on the UNC General Administrations' website was a link to a [User Manual for Semester Credit Hour Enrollment Change](#)

[Funding Model](#), which included in Chapter 6 a complicated 7 step process showing the funding model and that the figures were not student credit hours. The numbers seem to be based on the average cost of credit hour per faculty member system-wide; other calculations are indexed to this number.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) noted that when reading the material from General Administration they explicitly state that the formula is not intended to be used to evaluate individual faculty.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the Faculty Workload Policy were approved as presented and will be forwarded to the Chancellor as formal faculty advice. **RESOLUTION 15-85**

Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake (Education) took a moment to thank Professor Popke for his thoughtful remarks and endorsed the positive working relationship between the University Budget and Faculty Governance Committees.

#### H. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Sharon Knight (Health and Human Performance) presented the curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 28, 2015](#) including changing JUST 3200 from “WI” to “WI by section” and writing intensive (WI) course designation for ART 4942, ART 4944 and ART 4948.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of [September 28, 2015](#) including changing JUST 3200 from “WI” to “WI by section” and writing intensive (WI) course designation for ART 4942, ART 4944 and ART 4948 were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION 15-86**

#### **Agenda Item VII. New Business**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Department of English

Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate

#### **FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 6, 2015, MEETING**

15-80 Formal faculty advice of no changes to curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the September 14, 2015 Graduate Council [meeting minutes](#) and [supporting documents](#) (GC#15-17) that included Policy changes to Graduate School Appeals Procedure (GC#15-18), priority admission for Honor students, and the [04-15-15 GCC organizational meeting minutes](#).

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-81 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of [September 10, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Economics, College of Health and Human Performance and School of Communications and excluding action on the proposed change to the Committee’s name.

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-82 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee's meeting minutes of [September 21, 2015](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-83 Curriculum and academic program matters contained in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's meeting minutes of [September 11, 2015](#) including a Request to approve two new concentrations (Family Science, Child Development) in the BS in Family and Community Services within the Department of Human Development and Family Science in the College of Health and Human Performance; Request to approve two new concentrations (Theatre Management, Community Engagement) in the BA in Theatre Arts within the School of Theatre and Dance in the College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request to approve offering the MAEd in Mathematics Education via distance education (online) format within the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education in the College of Education; and Program Review revision response for the PhD in Pharmacology and Toxicology within the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology in the School of Medicine.

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-84 Revised Department of Human Development and Family Science Unit Code of Operations (formerly Department of Child Development and Family Relations) which will be used as operational guidelines as part of the Provisional Code of Operations for the Reorganized College of Health & Human Performance.

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-85 Formal faculty advice on revised Faculty Workload Policy.

**Disposition: Chancellor**

15-86 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee's meeting minutes of [September 28, 2015](#) including changing JUST 3200 from "WI" to "WI by section" and writing intensive (WI) course designation for ART 4942, ART 4944 and ART 4948.

**Disposition: Chancellor**