Due to adverse weather, the sixth regular meeting of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 24, 2015, from 3:30 pm – 5:30 pm in the Mendenhall Great Rooms.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**
Andrew Morehead, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**
The minutes of January 27, 2015 were approved, with below corrections:
Professor Carpenter-Aeby was present at the meeting and the incorrect use of the term honoraria in the Proposed Regulation on Conflicts of Interest, Commitment and External Activities for Pay noted by a senator from the floor was communicated to the University Policy Committee.

**Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day**
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Zoller and Tierno (Art and Design), Sorensen (Criminal Justice), Anderson (Education), Shores (Health and Human Performance), Hernandez (History), Parrish (Interior Design and Merchandising), Robinson (Mathematics), Levine (Medicine), Hines (Nutrition Science), Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance), Vice Chancellor Horns, Provost Mitchelson, Dean White (Engineering and Technology), and Taggart (Faculty Assembly Delegate/Music).

Alternates present were: Professors Anselmi for Tuten (Business), Roberson for Julian (Nursing), Whitley for Eason (Nursing), McCarty for Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies), and Smirnova for Francia (Political Science).

B. Announcements
The Chancellor has approved the following resolution from the December 2014, Faculty Senate meeting: #14-90 Revised School of Medicine and College of Health and Human Performance unit code of operations.

Each year Chancellor Ballard hosts a reception for Faculty Senators and Alternates and Academic and Appellate Committee members to thank them for their contributions. This year’s reception is scheduled for Monday, March 30 from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. in the Spilman Building Gallery (lobby). Please place this event on your calendar. Formal invitations will be forthcoming.

Correspondences concerning unit elections for 2015-2016 Faculty Senate representation were distributed to unit code administrators last month. In accordance with the ECU Faculty Manual, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

Faculty interested in periodically receiving issues of The Chronicle of Higher Education are asked to email the Faculty Senate office at facultysenate@ecu.edu and place their name on a list for distribution.

Faculty members are reminded that April 1st Chancellor Ballard will call for candidates for the prestigious Oliver Max Gardner award. University nomination procedures are available online at: http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxjoyneraward.pdf. Please contact Dorothy Muller, Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence with any questions.
C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard started his remarks by commenting on the interesting winter weather the campus has experienced and noting the beautiful snowfall that was happening outside the window. Chancellor Ballard then transitioned into a discussion of the difficult issues facing the campus and university community, beginning with a focus on Heritage Hall and the Aycock name transition. Chancellor Ballard asserted that the taskforce chaired by Dr. Morehead was monumental in getting the campus community to a reasonable place on the Aycock issue, though he acknowledged that some people are still unhappy with the resolution. Chancellor Ballard expressed his belief that this issue was one of the toughest faced by the campus community and that it took time to thoughtfully determine the best road forward. The process and resolution should position ECU to be a model nationally of how to deal with an almost impossible set of questions when it comes to historical figures that in some ways were important to the institution but in other ways had values that don’t reflect the future of the institution. Central to reaching a resolution was the concept of Heritage Hall, which was introduced by Dr. Andrew Morehead in January and was originally called Founders Hall. Dr. Virginia Hardy was also an important force in facilitating the process and the Chancellor expressed gratitude for the intense work she did. Moving forward, a committee will soon be formed to work on the details for Heritage Hall and the Chancellor trusts that the process will work. Following his discussion of Heritage Hall, the chancellor expressed his consternation at the removal of Tom Ross as a leader of the system. He emphatically shared that previous system leaders, such as Erskine Bowles, demonstrated great aptitude for managing up. Tom Ross demonstrated similar aptitude and was also able to manage “up, down and sideways” and his work for the system was excellent in extremely difficult times. Chancellor Ballard expressed that President Ross will be missed by Chancellors, particularly the nine new Chancellors who have recently been hired in the system. Chancellor Ballard expressed hope that some other system will not come along and hire President Ross away before the end of his term, which ends next December. Tom Ross has been selected as the commencement speaker for the ECU’s Spring 2015 commencement. The Chancellor shared his willingness to answer questions, but stated that he was as shocked as anyone about the change in system leadership.

In terms of the Provost Search, the Chancellor expressed happiness with the search committee’s work and with the finalists that were sent forth. He stated that some of the candidates were possibly even better than they seemed in the interview. Chancellor Ballard asserted that Ron Mitchelson is the correct professional for the position. The Chancellor stated that Provost Mitchelson holds the values of this institution and is an excellent fit for serving as ECU’s Provost. The other leaders and deans were virtually unanimous in their support and his academic qualifications are stellar. The Chancellor expressed his belief that the research team of the university is stronger than it has ever been and that this team is powerfully moving the university forward. The Chancellor is excited about the research capabilities of the campus and the Millennial Campus, which was approved the previous Friday by the Board of Trustees, will be another element in the research capabilities that will help to move the university forward. The Chancellor concluded his remarks with a focus on the University Policy Committee. He shared that he had expected to have Chris Locklear, chair of the committee, to lead this component of the discussion, but Dr. Locklear fell in the snow and was injured. Chancellor Ballard explained that the University Policy Committee began efforts to codify the policies of the University following an auditing report in 2007 by Stacie Tronto, which determined that a unified university policy manual was needed. At this time, the committee is 92% finished with the required work. The Chancellor stated that he was happy to answer questions about this or any other items from his remarks.

There were no questions posed to Chancellor Ballard.
D. Rick Niswander, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that he had been asked to talk about budget matters and that he wished to add another item at the end of his remarks, a brief discussion of weather. Currently the state budget is about $270 million dollars behind expectations/projections for revenues, on a budget of $20 billion. This shortfall has resulted in the Office of State Budget Management telling all state agencies that they need to revert 1.25% of their operating budgets back at the end of the year. Though this has been communicated to state agencies, it hasn’t yet been put in writing. However, the office has been acting on it. Each month ECU has to ask for an allocation of money from the state, as is true for all state-funded institutions, and on the most recent request for money, the amount provided was decreased by the appropriate amount for the stated reversions. Vice Chancellor Niswander explained for east campus the 1.25% reversion would be about $2.6 million dollars and because administration has been very conservative in spending this year, they have been able to bring $1.25 million from central funds to spare the units. Of note is that tuition funding is not affected. Last week, Vice Chancellor Niswander sent a memo to all division chiefs sharing the amount that they each had to give back, which worked out to 0.5% to 0.6%. Vice Chancellor Niswander expressed that he understands the strain of reverting dollars, and also acknowledged that this was a relatively small cut for the units and this is a temporary reversion, a one-time reversion for this year only. Next year's state budget appears to be about $600 million dollars to the good, but Vice Chancellor Niswander cautioned that senators should expect that there will be some claims on that money from Medicaid, Medicare, and potentially for state employee raises. The state is so big that a 1% state employee raise is over $150 million dollars for the state. In all likelihood that $600 million dollars is going to be utilized for other things that must be done.

Vice Chancellor Niswander also shared that there is some talk in the halls of potential cuts to state agencies, including universities, in the range of 1-2%. The memo to Division Heads noted by Vice Chancellor Niswander earlier also requested that they work with their constituencies to start to look at what they would do if faced with a cut from the state of 1-2% next year. At this point, it doesn’t look like it is likely to be worse than this, the economic side looks reasonably solid and a lot of the issues that were plaguing the budget in past years have been remedied. However, there could be an issue because when tax laws were changed to go from effectively a graduated tax system to a flat tax system, the estimates used were wrong and they are not exactly sure what the outcome is going to be. Right now it does look like there is a chance that there will be a small negative permanent budget adjustment. Vice Chancellor Niswander stressed again that when the state talks about a cut in appropriations, ECU is funded by appropriations and tuition together, so when there is a 2% cut in appropriations, it translates to about a 1.5% cut in ECU's budget. Vice Chancellor Niswander shared that ECU has a tuition increase request in with the Board of Governors and the Board of Governors is set to meet this week. 80% of that increase is slated for EPA salaries and there has been made a very vigorous case for the need to do the right thing for faculty. If one adjusts for inflation, in the last six years there has been a 13% pay cut.

Vice Chancellor Niswander closed his remarks with a report of the progress of the University Committee of Fiscal Sustainability workgroups. The Marketing and Communications workgroup is complete and one of the outcomes is that ECU-TV is going to an on-demand, digital based system which will save approximately $100,000, maybe a little bit more. Many other groups are in process at
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various states of completion. The Flexible Terms for Courses workgroup has a report to the committee and this will probably be one that completes more rapidly and results in many new ideas for the campus community about how to implement flexible course scheduling. This is not an area that will result in savings, but it is intended to result in increased revenues. Enrollment Management Task Force has many moving parts and though part of the work is close to complete, there is a lot of complex work to do and again this one tends not to be a savings area but instead is a revenue area. The Foundations Curriculum workgroup is working with the Educational Advisory Board, which is an independent group out of Washington, D.C. that does a lot of work and reports for universities around the country. The Board is doing a report for ECU looking at over fifty universities and what these universities do with their foundations curriculum. The report should be completed towards the end of the semester and the workgroup will use it to inform their work. Within the Growing the Research Enterprise workgroup, there are five different sub-groups: 1. Digital Innovation and Scholarship in Social Sciences and Humanities, 2. Rapid Response to Short Turnaround RFPs, 3. Clinical Trials Management Systems, 4. Incentives for Growing Research and Retaining Research Faculty and 5. Process, Procedures and Efficiencies. This workgroup and the work of the sub-groups is focused primarily on working to be more efficient, effective and nimble. The Reduce the Number of Colleges workgroup is working now and hopefully their work will be completed by the end of the summer. Additional workgroups will be started and populated as some of the others are completed with the review of external legal affairs likely to be one of the first ones completed. Regardless of whether a workgroup is active, some of the work is already being done for some of these workgroups. An example of this is that though the Human Resources workgroup hasn’t started, the movement of all of the EPAFs out of the department and to a more consolidated college level or university level has already started and this should relieve some pressure on departments.

Vice Chancellor Niswander addressed the adverse weather policy, sharing that there is a highly prescribed process that is followed to determine if the institution is going to close. For the most part, this is completed in a very timely manner, but sometimes, as was the case with last week’s storm, conditions change quickly and decisions are made in a short time frame. From a state regulation standpoint, for the university to close, on-campus conditions only must be considered. Though many students and faculty commute from a distance, only the on-campus conditions can be considered per state regulations. For last week, on Monday evening it appeared that the weather was going to be slowly improving from 6 pm onward. Then, unexpectedly conditions deteriorated and the decision to close campus was made. An additional component of this is the Personal Responsibility for Safety and there will be additional messaging for that for every message put out concerning weather. We all have to be understanding of that and support people to make their own decisions based on the conditions they are experiencing. With the final comment regarding personal responsibility for safety, Vice Chancellor Niswander concluded his remarks and was available for questions.

Professor Sprague (Physics) commented that since his department teaches night labs it would have been better if a decision were made more quickly regarding the cancellation of classes on campus tonight or a statement provided to students earlier regarding the time to expect a final decision to be made so that they would know when to check to find out if they needed to drive in for night classes or not. Vice Chancellor Niswander responded that this was a day that they fully expected that campus would not be closed. The forecast showed a snow moving to rain scenario and then changed to a snow moving to snow scenario. The team is caught between the necessity to not just cancel classes or go to adverse weather policies too quickly, particularly since Thursday might be worse with the forecast calling for maybe a couple of inches of snow or possibly 6-8 inches of snow. The uncertainty in the forecast has been so high and this has impacted the campus.
E. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor with Campus Operations
   Associate Vice Chancellor Koch graciously agreed to have discussion on his Report on Parking and Transportation Services deferred until March 17, 2015.

F. Andrew Morehead, Chair of the Faculty
   Professor Morehead provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

   “Good afternoon! Today, following the discussion around the resolution last month on the tuition increase, I thought I would address the costs of higher education, the place of a state-supported institution in our society, and why, despite my beliefs, I supported the request for a tuition and fee increase.

   The North Carolina Constitution, Article IX, Section 9 mandates, “The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of The University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense.” (End quote.)

   At ECU, in the 1986-87 academic year, the in-state tuition and fees were $1556/year, in 1996-97 that figure was $3504/year, a 108% increase over that decade. If our request for the increase is granted (no guarantee at all), tuition will approach $6400 next year (ca. 83% over the following two decades). With room and board, textbooks and other costs, the total comes close to $18,000. Not sure about y’all, but as someone with two children in the UNC system, my definition of “free of expense” doesn’t usually have that many digits. Even with financial aid, my children’s college expenses this year approach 70% of my take home income.

   Even in an era of exploding student loan debt, that a college education is still valuable is beyond questioning (not that that stops some people from doing so). Besides the economic benefit of a college degree (which dwarfs the average $25,000 student loan debt), the societal benefits are also well established; going to college is correlated with longer life spans, lower crime rates, and numerous other quality of life indicators. We don’t need standardized tests to tell us that we provide tremendous value to our students and the state.

   It is not uncommon for legislators to defend the choice to cut state and/or federal support for education by saying students and colleges need “skin in the game.” This idea arises from the observation that students graduate in higher percentages from more expensive private schools than from less expensive state schools (when “controlling for other factors”). But that is awfully weak evidence of correlation upon which to base policy decisions. I do strongly support the notion that middle class and upper class families bear their share of college costs, but as part of a societal contract rather than the amorphous idea of “skin in the game.”

   The other argument is that utilizing taxes to subsidize education is redistribution of wealth: that asking the wealthy and corporations to subsidize public education is in some way an imposition. Do we not all benefit from a better-educated electorate? A better-educated workforce? A healthier population? Does society not owe someone willing to work hard an opportunity to better themselves? I may be naive, idealistic, or even one of those dreaded believers in “social justice,” but above all I believe in what ECU is supposed to do: to serve.
If you take just our immediate surroundings, the 3rd congressional district, we rank about the 35th percentile in poverty nationally. The picture gets bleaker if you include the 7th district--20th percentile--and the 1st—the 5th percentile in the nation. Our mission must be to transform this region, but how can we do it if the very people we are to serve can’t even afford to come to ECU?

Somehow, the state persists in ignoring this issue and cutting us further. Somehow, that we are “underworked and overpaid” has become a mantra. Somehow, that noble intent from our constitution, that all students have access to an affordable education, has lost its meaning.

It is clearly true that students benefit from the best faculty we can hire and retain, from participating in high quality research programs, and from a national reputation for quality. It is also true that larger class sizes, reduced options for courses, and an increasing dependence on contingent faculty who have to teach too many students and often have more than one job to make ends meet, all have a significant negative impact on the students.

So, it was with great reluctance that I voted some time ago to pursue a request to increase our tuition and fees. It was also with great reluctance that I supported the resolution we passed last month about that request. I know, both firsthand and in my heart, that it is painful for our most needy students. But what option do we have when our legislators forget the state’s obligation?

I return now to the sentiments I expressed at the start of the year at convocation. I spoke of educating the public about what we do--sharing our passion for our work, for educating, for scholarship, for service. Today I add that we must educate the public about the impact of the state’s neglect on their and their children’s education: about the deferred maintenance on the public’s buildings, the larger class sizes and other student impacts I have mentioned here, the value of our colleagues lost to other institutions; and finally, that with great reluctance, we have had to share some of the costs with our students, for whom, quoting again from the state constitution, “the benefits of The University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable,” [shall] “be extended free of expense.”

There were no questions posed to Professor Morehead.

G. Election of Five Members to the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee
Following, ECU Faculty Manual, Part II, Section II the following faculty members were elected to the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee: Professor Tracy Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work), Donna Kain (English), Charles Boklage (Medicine), Jane Painter-Patton (Allied Health Sciences) and Ron Cortright (Health and Human Performance). The committee will meet soon to begin their work and provide a slate of Faculty Officer nominees to the Faculty Senate on April 21, 2015.

H. John Tucker, University Historian
Professor Tucker ‘s report was deferred until the March 17 meeting.

I. Question Period
No questions were offered at this time.

**Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**
There was no unfinished business to come before the body.
**Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council**

Professor Bob Thompson (Political Science), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 26, 2015 Graduate Council meeting minutes (GC#15-1) including revision of Graduate School Strategic Plan; Revision to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Section II, Part IV, Graduate School Organization (excluding Section G); Revision to Graduate Faculty Criteria, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, School of Communication and consideration of a Request to Plan a DrPH (Doctor of Public Health) in Public Health within the School of Medicine; January 14, 2015 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes including curriculum actions (GC#15-2) from the Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education within the College of Education; Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology within the School of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, programmatic actions (GC#15-3) forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee include a proposal of a new Public Health Foundations and Practice certificate in the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine, new Business Analytics certificate in the Department of Management Information Systems within the College of Business and a proposal of a new Professional Science Masters concentration within the MS in Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry.

There was no discussion and curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 26, 2015 Graduate Council meeting minutes (GC#15-1) including revision of Graduate School Strategic Plan; Revision to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Section II, Part IV, Graduate School Organization (excluding Section G); Revision to Graduate Faculty Criteria, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, School of Communication and consideration of a Request to Plan a DrPH (Doctor of Public Health) in Public Health within the School of Medicine; January 14, 2015 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes including curriculum actions (GC#15-2) from the Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education within the College of Education; Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology within the School of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, programmatic actions (GC#15-3) forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee include a proposal of a new Public Health Foundations and Practice certificate in the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine, new Business Analytics certificate in the Department of Management Information Systems within the College of Business and a proposal of a new Professional Science Masters concentration within the MS in Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry were reviewed and approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #15-18**

**Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**

A. Committee on Committees

Professor Boklage (Medicine), Chair of the Committee, presented first the second reading of proposed revisions to the Student Academic Appellate Committee Charge. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Student Academic Appellate Committee Charge were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #15-19**

Professor Boklage then presented the first reading of proposed revisions to the University Budget Committee charge. This change is simply to add the word “tenured” in the membership structure to seven elected tenured faculty members. This is simply a matter of meeting the expectations of the limitations that have been placed on the use of fixed-term faculty members. It was impossible with the
membership structure of the University Budget Committee to maintain the certainty of the majority of
the voting members being tenured or tenure-track faculty. By making all of the elected faculty
members tenured, that problem is taken care of.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning, and Environment) explained that he has served the last four
years on the University Budget Committee, including the last two years as Chair. Professor Popke
explained that the committee heretofore has never been restricted to only tenured faculty members
and he stated that he sees no good reason for this proposal. He explained that there is an issue with
the numbers around the new fixed term faculty rule, which can be easily fixed with restricting fixed
term membership to one member only. The budget committee does not make budget decisions. It
has dialogue and discussion and makes recommendations to the Chancellor and Executive Council
around matters involving a wide range of faculty, including those who may be tenure-track and
including those who may be fixed term. Professor Popke explained that he speaks strongly against
the proposed changes and further that he had discussed the proposed change with the University
Budget Committee last week and the committee was unanimously opposed. He will bring forward at
the second reading in March, the committee’s proposed solution, which would be simply to restrict
fixed-term elected membership to one fixed-term member as opposed to two as the bylaws state and
he expressed his hope that his fellow senators will go along with the suggestion.

Professor Kain (English) shared her agreement with Professor Popke’s suggestion that some fixed-
term membership be allowed and then requested clarification as to why tenure-track faculty would not
be allowed to serve on the University Budget Committee. Professor Boklage responded that there
seemed to be a need to go back to the drawing board to consider the proposed revisions.

Following discussion on the University Budget Committee, Professor Boklage presented the first
reading of proposed revisions to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee charge. He noted
that final action by the Senate on these revisions will occur during the March 17, 2015 meeting.
Professor Boklage explained that the only way to meet the restrictions imposed by Faculty
Governance is to have all elected members be tenured members.

Professor Given (Vice Chair/Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked for clarification regarding the
intent of the proposed revision, asking if the change is proposed because of the bylaws rule and not
because it is trying to protect membership to people who only have tenure, so that is why tenure-track
is not permitted. Professor Boklage responded that the proposed revisions were made in order to
align with the rules and though the committee wishes to put fixed-term faculty on committees, the
rules for this committee would not allow that. As to the issue of the exclusion of tenure-track faculty,
Professor Boklage stated that he would revisit this issue with the committee.

Professor Justiniano (Physics), a member of the Committee on Committees, stated that he would like
to share a little additional information from the discussion of the Committee on Committees explaining
that the committee decided that the reason for going with tenured only is that members of the
committee felt that these two committees would be better served by people who had been around
campus longer.

Professor Kain (English) expressed her belief that tenure-track faculty are invested in the future of
their careers and want the opportunity to serve on committees and contribute to the campus
community. She encouraged the committee to consider including tenure-track faculty in the revisions
to the charge.
B. Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee  
Professor Kathy Cable (Health Sciences Library), member of the committee, stated that that committee recommended the regulation without revision and noted that the web regulation provided guidance and minimum content-neutral standards for faculty, staff, and student web developers. As noted in the policy the regulation was designed to promote the use of websites in a manner consistent with the mission of the university; address security issues associated with university information and equipment; mandate that the websites comply with university policies, and state and federal laws; and provide necessary management and oversight of university resources. It was important that web pages hosted at East Carolina University were on an official capacity, ADA compliant, and did not include advertisements. The university would provide support via ITCS to assist faculty and staff in the transition of their sites through training and consulting support. In addition, after reviewing the content found in the ECU Faculty Manual, the Committee found no revisions necessary.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked if the definition of official university webpages excludes athletic webpages. Wendy Creasy, who was granted speaking privileges, explained that athletics webpages have been an exception for many years. She further explained that a unit has to get permission to be a .com as opposed to a .edu and must go through the Web Oversight Committee to be granted permission to be a .com.

Following discussion, the proposed Web Content Regulation was approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #15-20**

C. University Budget Committee  
Professor Jeff Popke (Geography, Planning, and Environment), Chair of the Committee presented recommendations regarding promotion raises for ECU Faculty. The committee has been investigating, as a matter of policy, centrally funding raises for all promotions. Chair Popke acknowledged the other members of his sub-committee team: Mark Sanders, John Given and Shanan Gibson. This subcommittee reviewed the typical processes for promotion raises at sister institutions and ran figures to see what the different costs would be to fund different promotion scenarios. The committee presented three recommendations to the senate. The first recommended the establishment of a formal policy guaranteeing centrally funded raises for all faculty receiving promotion. Last year promotion raises were funded centrally with 75 promotion raises granted at a cost of $300,000. Secondly, the committee recommended the amounts of $4000 for a raise from assistant professor to associate professor and a raise of $6000 from associate professor to full professor. The committee estimated that in a typical year there will be 70-80 raises with the total cost of $300,000-400,000 to fund all promotion raises. In some cases this money will have to come from an internal cut, taken from the budgets of different divisions across campus. The committee decided to recommend a flat raise amount and acknowledged that some units may want to supplement these raises. In terms of the central provision of funds for promotion raises, the committee felt the flat raise amount to be the most equitable and sustainable option, and the committee supported the ability of some units to supplement the raise amount. The third recommendation is that advancement in rank for fixed-term faculty should be included in a policy governing overall promotion raises, but Professor Popke noted that this would require additional investigation.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) queried how centrally funding promotion raises would work in the future with the weaknesses in the current system. He wondered how this would be feasible in the future given the type of budget cuts the institution is facing. Professor Popke noted Professor
Justiniano’s concerns and shared that the committee has been informed by administration that finding the money for this is not insurmountable. Most units have been funding promotion raises, so this money would be held back centrally, so the policy is a matter of making a commitment to the process moving forward.

Professor Yao (Engineering and Technology) mentioned that some faculty in the past received promotion raises of only $2000 and he asked if there would be a plan to catch up those folks? Professor Popke responded that there was not a plan for that at that time and this is a challenge.

Professor Painter-Patton (Allied Health Sciences) spoke in support of this recommendation, noting that some faculty in Allied Health who were promoted and then waited three years to receive raises due to budget constraints.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked how the recommended amount aligned with the tuition increase raise pool that was mentioned earlier by Vice Chancellor Niswander. Vice Chancellor Niswander explained that from a 2.1% pool, the total amount for raises would be somewhere in the 5 million range. He further shared that if the decision is to provide these raises centrally, then the priority shifts and it will require for spending to shift to meet this priority.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked Professor Popke if he believed, based on his conversations with the Vice Chancellor, that the proposed policy recommendation will become an official policy if approved by the senate. Professor Popke explained that though he has no way to know for sure, the provost is on the record advocating for a policy of this sort, but there is no telling.

Professor Powers (Sociology) asked for follow-up information regarding where this money might come from, particularly as priorities shift. Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that at ECU we typically allocate money down to the units much more than other institutions in the system do. The priority planning process that we go through each summer to determine allocations would have to include the priority of funding the promotion raises if the policy is put into place and that would mean that other priorities would have to shift. At this time, he was unable to say where the money might be taken from or to speculate how the priorities might shift.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) expressed his perception that it might be better to send the proposal back to committee to determine the specifics of how it would be funded going forward into the future. He asserted that he would like to know that he was not approving an unfunded mandate. He then made a motion that the proposal be sent back to the committee with a request that the specifics of how the policy would be funded be provided. Professor Boklage seconded the motion. Once the discussion of the motion was opened, Professor Given (Vice Chair/Foreign Languages and Literatures) spoke against the motion, stating that there would be need to be flexible in where the funding would be drawn from each year and it would be impossible to say with certainty how the funding would be constituted. The policy however would ensure that faculty promotion raises were part of the yearly budget planning and this is important for the retention of highly qualified faculty. Professors Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) and Powers (Sociology) echoed their support of Professor Given’s remarks. Professor Justiniano responded that though he understands the point being made by Professor Given, on the larger scale, it seems more prudent to have an idea of the potential sources of funding for the proposed policy. Professor Roper (Medicine) stated that the university has been giving faculty promotion raises and has been funding those raises for years and the proposed policy would make the process more clearly a university priority. Professor Kain
(English) agreed with both ideas and noted that there seems to be unfairness in the process as it has been done in the past, but she also maintained that there should be some way to identify where the funds are likely to come from to fund the proposed policy. Professor Given provided an example, stating that there are two University Committee of Fiscal Sustainability workgroups that were mentioned earlier, Enrollment Management and Flexible Course Scheduling that are intended to result in increased revenues, though we don’t know exactly what that money will be yet, these are possible sources. Professor Given hoped that we can all agree that this is a priority for fairness and equity. Professor Yao (Engineering and Technology) expressed support for Professor Justiniano’s request that the proposal be sent back to committee, but for a different reason. Different departments pay different amounts for promotion raises and the flat rate may not be as much as what is typically paid and this seems unfair. Professor Roper (Medicine) noted that the proposed policy allowed for units to supplement the flat rate provided for promotion raises. Professor Dotson-Blake (Secretary, Education) expressed support for the policy and then asked how units have funded promotion raises in the past, explaining that it may help to illuminate what funds might be reverted for centrally funded promotion raises if Senators had a sense of how these raises had typically been funded at the unit level. Professor Popke responded that the committee did not look into this information. Vice Chancellor Niswander explained that in the past, some units have taken money from lapsed salary dollars to fund promotion increases. There are a limited number of lapsed salary dollars and to the extent that these dollars are used for faculty promotion increases, there is less money available for additional fixed-term positions or summer faculty support. Some colleges, not all, have decided that this is something they want to do and they have made a prioritization decision that this is important and should be done. There are a lot of moving parts to the budget and in some years this is not going to be an issue and in some years, it will have to be figured out. Vice Chancellor Niswander ended his response by saying that he agreed with Professor Given that sending it back to the committee to determine the set of circumstances that we might follow for the next ten years is almost an impossible task, but if it is determined that this is a priority of the institution, it can be made to work.

The question was called and the motion to return the report to University Budget Committee failed.

The recommendations regarding promotion raises for ECU Faculty were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #15-21

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee
Professor Puri Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Secretary of the Committee, presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of January 26, 2015 including approval for global diversity designation for ISDN 1500: Color and Light in Interior Design, CMGT 4320: Global Sustainable Construction and SOCI 1050: Global Understanding: Sociological Perspectives; domestic diversity designation for SOCI 3035: Sociology through Film; humanities foundations credit for LING 2720: Invented Languages; social science foundations credit for LING 2050 (cross-listed with COMM 2050): English for Global Communication, LING 2710: English Grammar, LING 3700: History of the English Language, LING 3720: Writing Systems of the World Social Science, LING 3730: The Structure of English: Phonology and Morphology, LING 3740: The Structure of English: Syntax and Semantics, and SOCI 1050: Global Understanding: Sociological Perspectives.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 26, 2015 Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including approval for global diversity designation for ISDN 1500: Color and Light in Interior

Professor Martinez then presented recommendations regarding COAD 1000 including that the Division of Student Affairs continue to oversee COAD 1000 through the 2016-2017 academic year and that in the spring 2017 term, the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee report to the Faculty Senate its findings regarding the impact of COAD 1000 on student success, personal growth, grade point average, retention, and like factors.

There was no discussion and the recommendations regarding COAD 1000 including that the Division of Student Affairs continue to oversee COAD 1000 through the 2016-2017 academic year and that in the spring 2017 term, the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee report to the Faculty Senate its findings regarding the impact of COAD 1000 on student success, personal growth, grade point average, retention, and like factors were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #15-23

E. University Curriculum Committee
Professor Mark Richardson (Music), Secretary of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 22, 2015 meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Psychology, Department of Geography, Planning, and Environment, Department of Biology, College of Health and Human Performance, and College of Engineering and Technology.

Professor Richardson also noted that Dr. Linda Kean had notified the committee that COMM 2420, which is a course in business and professional speaking, that is slated for discontinuation will be extended for another year until May 2016 to allow programs time to make revisions.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 22, 2015 University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Psychology, Department of Geography, Planning, and Environment, Department of Biology, College of Health and Human Performance, and College of Engineering and Technology were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #15-24

Agenda Item VII. New Business

Professor Mark McCarthy (Business), Chair of the Calendar Committee, presented proposed changes to Fall 2015 University Calendar and noted that the Committee had been asked to consider changing the 2015 Fall break to Halloween weekend and increasing the break from two to three class days in order to address the following concerns:

- The history of Halloween activities in Greenville is such that parties, disturbances and excessive drinking have created a growing concern for the University and Greenville community at large.
The growth in the number of large parties and gatherings that require police intervention has grown to such a point that university and Greenville city resources are insufficient to reasonably and effectively respond.

The incidents of October 2014 where several thousand college-aged individuals gathered at multiple locations in Greenville disrupting neighborhoods and placing students and the Greenville community at risk have created a concern that further problems will occur in October 2015.

Campus Living has offered to close residence halls during the five day fall break, requiring all students to vacate campus which would remove an estimated 5,800 students from Greenville over the Halloween weekend and limit the scope of resources required by ECU and Greenville police in managing crowd control and individual incidents that require police support.

Inappropriate behaviors have reached such a level on Halloween night that students are at risk and cooperating with the city to minimize the number of students in Greenville by moving fall break and closing the residence halls will help to make the overall city environment safer by reducing the number of students who stay in town over the holiday weekend.

To meet this request, additional changes to the Fall 2015 University Calendar would include:

- Canceling the current two day fall break from Saturday, October 11 through Tuesday, October 14 and establishing a fall break from Thursday, October 29 through Monday, November 2.
- Moving the last day of class back one day from Monday, December 7 to Tuesday, December 8.
- Moving Reading day back one day from Tuesday, December 8 to Wednesday, December 9.
- Moving Final exam week back one day beginning on Thursday, December 10 and ending on Thursday December 17.
- Establishing the last day of class, Tuesday, December 8 as a make-up class day for the Friday October 30 class.
- Establishing the Tuesday after fall break, November 3, as a Thursday class day to maintain the required 14 Tuesday/Thursday class meetings.

Virginia Hardy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs stated that administration would like to try this and see if it has an impact; hoping those students in apartment complexes may also decide to leave town. She explained that this change in the fall calendar may help with safety aspects since the ECU police had to handle a few things on campus as well as off campus. She remarked that she had heard that other university campuses were happy that their students left their campuses to travel to Greenville for the celebration and that changing the calendar would allow ECU police to help the Greenville police with matters relating to Halloween celebrations on Saturday night.

Professor Powers (Sociology) remarked that most parties were off campus and did not involve ECU freshman students, so if residence halls were closed, it would require students to move elsewhere for the weekend at an expense when it was not the freshman students that were the problem.

Vice Chancellor Hardy replied that ECU hosted a Halloween party at Minges and they saw a lot of students that came from not only the residence halls but from downtown. There were students who were intoxicated and coming to ECU’s Halloween party and being disruptive. Staff had to call in additional campus police to assist. Additionally, 3-4 residence hall rooms were damaged from students punching holes in the walls and writing graffiti on the walls. There were also alleged sexual assaults that are being investigated.
Professor Montgomery (English) stated that she talked with her colleagues and requested input on the proposed changes to the Fall 2015 calendar. Her faculty shared several concerns: closing the residence halls would mean that dorms are no longer a safe place to get away from trouble, it would be expensive for a lot of students to have to vacate dorms just to stop a few from misbehaving, the make-up day at the end of the semester causes many problems with student employment and other non-academic activities, changing the calendar would make a hectic November for both students and faculty, time with advisors would be compressed due to other activities, and policing concerns were valid but didn’t relate to academics.

Professor Christian (Business) received 26 emails from colleagues in his College and, although faculty understood the problems that exist and would love to help solve the problems, not one faculty member he corresponded with thought this was a good policy, i.e. moving freshman off campus and penalizing them. Faculty thought the proposed change would result in students being forced to go home twice in a month and the action would send a message to most students that Halloween was a five-day holiday. He also spoke with students and none thought this was a good idea or an effective way to handle the problem. No one agreed to the proposed change in the Fall 2015 University calendar.

Professor Painter-Patton (Allied Health Sciences) stated that she had received similar responses to the proposed change in the calendar and the disruption in the latter part of the academic activities, with only a couple of faculty speaking in favor of any change. Faculty expressed more interest in the Calendar Committee proposing a change in Fall break to allow for an entire week in November at Thanksgiving and expressed her hope that this would be a part of the committee’s report in March.

Professor Felts (Parliamentarian/Health and Human Performance) stated that the culture among students at ECU is what needs to be addressed and changing the Fall 2015 calendar doesn’t change the culture. He asserted that this was a bad message to give to both students and parents and he didn’t want to read about this in a future article in The Chronicle.

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) stated, that in addition to the comments already stated, adding an additional day at the end of the semester left zero ability to account for the unexpected, such as weather concerns.

Professor Powers (Sociology) stated that because the calendar is approved two years in advance administration should think of other ways to address the immediate problem and the Calendar Committee should consider trying something different two years out.

Professor Morin (Communication) stated that the same concerns were shared from her colleagues, i.e. too many interruptions in one academic month; does not leave time for any unforeseen circumstance where the extra class days would be needed; closing dorms hurt freshman students the most, students seeing the change as a week long Halloween holiday; and ECU labeling our students as a problem and sending that message out to the Greenville community. Her colleagues did not support changing the teaching schedule to address what may happen next year and felt that what happens in relation to outrageous behavior remains the responsibility of the police department.

Vice Chancellor Hardy replied that the students she asked liked the idea of being able to travel home during Fall break and that student athletes were an exception to the rule. She further explained that since residence halls are closed during Spring Break, students are familiar with the process and
expectation. This would allow out-of-state students to go home and the current Fall Break does not. The Vice Chancellor expressed that she has heard and understood the concerns with the proposed plan shared by the senators and that she will take that information back to her team as they consider alternative ways to address the issues. She shared that we must all look at the culture issue and be part of the effort to determine how to move forward to deal with this issue.

Professor Christian (Business) suggested that, to aid in changing the culture, maybe ECU should no longer hold any type of activity during Halloween and see if things improve. Vice Chancellor Hardy said that she would not support that idea because she thinks that not all students want to go downtown and need a safe place to go without alcohol.

Following discussion the change to the Fall 2015 University calendar failed.

Professor Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences) presented a report on the February 20, 2015 UNC Faculty Assembly meeting and then offered a resolution on Adherence to the UNC Policy on Centers and Institutes and the Proposed Changes to that Policy that supported the UNC Faculty Assembly’s action, that stated:

Whereas, East Carolina University has a distinct mission and a unique role to play within our region; and

Whereas, our Board of Trustees, Chancellor and his administration, and the faculty of East Carolina University are best informed and positioned to make decisions about how we pursue our mission;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That, the East Carolina University Faculty strongly endorse the February 20th, 2015 Faculty Assembly Resolution Calling For Adherence To UNC Policy 400.5[R] (below) which clearly states the role of each campus in establishing, managing, and discontinuing their Centers and Institutes; and

Be It Further Resolved That, the East Carolina University Faculty also oppose the proposed insertion of the Board of Governors and/or the President of the UNC System into decisions about Center and Institute discontinuation, which belong at the campus level.

---

**UNC FACULTY ASSEMBLY**

Resolution Calling For Adherence To UNC Policy 400.5[R]: Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in The University of North Carolina

Whereas, Policy 400.5[R] Stipulates:

A. “The University of North Carolina (UNC) encourages partnerships within, across, and beyond its constituent institutions that maximize the capacities of UNC to address complex problems of importance to North Carolina, the nation and the world. Such partnerships may take the form of centers and institutes”

B.1.a “Full authority for oversight of institutional centers and institutes rests at the campus level, including establishment, management and discontinuation.”

B.2.b. “The board of trustees of each administrative campus has the authority to approve
campus level policies centers and institutes and to authorize establishment and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes.”

B.5 “Campus level policies must provide a clear process for the discontinuation of centers and institutes, whether on probationary status, performing satisfactorily, or in other extraordinary circumstances. For those entities that involve only a single campus, the process should include approval by the Board of Trustees and notification to the UNC Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. For those centers and institutes that require significant and sustained cooperation among more than one UNC campus, agreement must be reached and documented by the partner Chancellors or designee before the recommendation to discontinue goes before the Board of Trustees at the administrative campus. If such an agreement cannot be reached by partner Chancellors or designees, then UNC General Administration, through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, will convene partners and determine an acceptable solution.”

Whereas, the Proposed Draft Amendment to UNC Policy Manual 400.5 [R], Section E. 1. b, inserts the ability of “the president or the Board of Governors [to] determine that a center or institute should be considered for discontinuation;”

Therefore Be it Resolved, that the Faculty Assembly calls upon the Board of Governors to act in keeping with established UNC policy that exclusively designates campus based leadership with the authority to discontinue a center or institute; and

Be it Further Resolved, that the Faculty Assembly opposes the insertion of the authority of president or Board of Governors into the process for the establishment, management and discontinuation of centers and institutes which currently is assigned by policy solely to campus based leadership.

Professor Powers (Sociology) expressed her support for the resolution. There being no further discussion, the resolution on Adherence to the UNC Policy on Centers and Institutes and the Proposed Changes to that Policy that supported the UNC Faculty Assembly’s action was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #15-25**

Professor Morehead thanked everyone for their willingness to meet and conduct business, given the snow and weather advisory, and wished everyone a safe trip home.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kylie Dotson-Blake
Secretary of the Faculty
College of Education

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE FEBRUARY 24, 2015 MEETING**

Resolution #15-18
Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the **January 26, 2015** Graduate Council meeting minutes (GC#15-1) including revision of Graduate School Strategic
Plan; Revision to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Section II, Part IV, Graduate School Organization (excluding Section G); Revision to Graduate Faculty Criteria, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, School of Communication and consideration of a Request to Plan a DrPH (Doctor of Public Health) in Public Health within the School of Medicine; January 14, 2015 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes including curriculum actions (GC#15-2) from the Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education within the College of Education; Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology within the School of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, programmatic actions (GC#15-3) forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee include a proposal of a new Public Health Foundations and Practice certificate in the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine, new Business Analytics certificate in the Department of Management Information Systems within the College of Business and a proposal of a new Professional Science Masters concentration within the MS in Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry.

---

Resolution #15-19
Revised Student Academic Appellate Committee Charge, as follows:

(Deletions are noted in strikethrough and additions in **bold** print.)

1. Name: Student Academic Appellate Committee

2. Membership:
   6 elected faculty members **7 regular and 2 alternate elected faculty members**
   Ex-officio members (with vote): The Chancellor or an appointed representative, the Provost or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies or an appointed representative the Chair of the Faculty, one faculty senator selected by the Chair of the Faculty, and one student member from the Student Government Association.

   The chair of the committee may invite resource persons as necessary to realize the committee charge. The chair of the committee may appoint such subcommittees as he or she deems necessary.

3. Quorum: 4 elected members **including alternates** exclusive of ex-officio

4. Committee Responsibilities:
   A. The committee serves as an appeals board for entering students who do not meet admission requirements.
   B. The committee serves as an appeals board for students denied permission to drop a course.
   C. The committee serves as an appeals board for students who wish to appeal administrative decisions involving the interpretation and enforcement of policies pertaining to academic credits and standards.
   D. The committee serves as an appeals board for students seeking readmission after being declared academically ineligible to return.
   E. The committee serves as an appeals board for students appealing financial aid decisions.
   F. The Committee reviews at least annually those sections within the University
Undergraduate Catalog and University Graduate Catalog that correspond to the Committee’s charge and recommends changes as necessary.

5. To Whom The Committee Reports:
The committee reports its appellate decisions to the appropriate administrative office.

6. How Often The Committee Reports:
The committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and at other times as necessary.

7. Power Of The Committee To Act Without Faculty Senate Approval:
The committee is empowered to make appellate decisions regarding students as outlined in its committee responsibilities.

8. Standard Meeting Time:
The committee meeting time is scheduled for the first Wednesday of each month, including January, June, July and August.

Resolution #15-20
Formal Faculty Advice on Proposed Web Content Regulation.

The Committee reviewed the proposed regulation and is suggesting no revisions to the document provided below. In addition, after reviewing the content found in the ECU Faculty Manual, the Committee found no revisions necessary.

Authority: Chief Information Officer

Related Policies:
- ECU Academic Computer Use Policy
- ECU University Student and Employee Computer Use Policy
- East Carolina University Patent Policy
- East Carolina University Copyright Regulation

Additional Resources:
- https://www.section508.gov/
- http://www.ada.gov/
- http://www.ecu/edu/accessibility
- ECU Publications: Guidelines for Using the East Carolina University Logo
- ECU Policy Statement on commercial exploitation of classroom materials

Contact Information:
- Chief Information Officer – Don Sweet – 328.9000

1. Purpose of Regulation
The East Carolina University Web Page Policy provides guidance and minimum content-neutral standards for faculty, staff, and student web developers contributing to the university’s web presence
by maintaining web pages on university servers or providing web content to students for instructional purposes. University web space is provided to support the academic and administrative functions of the university. University-related websites are an important means of conducting university business, including but not limited to advancement, communication, education, research, and scholarship.

Specifically, this regulation is designed to:

a. Promote the use of websites in a manner consistent with the mission of the university;

b. Address security issues associated with university information and equipment, and enable appropriate online transactions of university business;

c. Mandate that the development of websites comply with university policies, and applicable state and federal laws; and

d. Provide necessary management and oversight of the university’s resources.

1.1 Web Pages Subject to This Policy

All websites on university servers are subject to this policy. Websites on university servers are either Official University Web Pages or Unofficial Web Pages.

Official University Web Pages include the East Carolina University home page (www.ecu.edu); academic department and program pages; office, administrative, and support unit pages; news and information pages; and any other World Wide Web address that is otherwise sponsored or endorsed or created on authority of a university department or administrative unit; including course pages residing outside the secure course management system.

Unofficial Web Pages are maintained by individual university computer account holders on university servers, such as personal faculty and staff web pages; individual student web pages and university-recognized student organization web pages.

2. Minimum Requirements for Both Official University Web Pages and Unofficial Web Pages

2.1 Accessibility

ECU requires web authors of both official and unofficial faculty and staff web sites at ecu.edu to comply with accessibility requirements mandated by federal and state law. Such requirements include but are not limited to adherence to Section 508. Accordingly, ECU web resources will be accessible to persons with disabilities, where feasible, or a reasonable accommodation will be offered to qualified persons such as providing alternative formats or auxiliary aids and/or making adjustments.

2.2 Hosting within .edu domain

All official websites will be hosted within the .edu domain. Exceptions to this requirement may be granted by the University Web Oversight Committee based on compelling business, technical or security reasons.

2.3 Affiliation and Disclaimer
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Official University Web Pages must include a link to the ECU Web Terms of Use/Disclaimer

Unofficial Web Pages: The appearance or design of an Unofficial Web Page should not create confusion that a reasonable person viewing that page would believe that it is an Official University Web Page, or is otherwise sponsored or endorsed or created on authority of a university department or administrative unit. To reduce the likelihood of confusion, every Unofficial Web Page maintained on a university server must contain the following disclaimer:

This web page is not a publication of East Carolina University, nor is it in any way sponsored or endorsed or created on authority of a university department or administrative unit. The author(s) of this page are solely responsible for its content.

2.4 Advertising

Advertising by external, unaffiliated organizations is not permitted on any university webpage. Advertising is defined as banner ads or other promotional messages being displayed on webpages in exchange for direct compensation (monetary or otherwise) for their delivery. This regulation does not prohibit the appropriate recognition of sponsors or donors on the webpages of programs supported by their contributions.

2.5 Web Applications and Databases

ITCS must be notified of all intentions to put interactive applications on ECU operated servers. Such applications must be reasonably constrained due to concerns about security, server performance, operational monitoring, and ongoing maintenance. Collecting data received through web applications using applications, such as ColdFusion scripting requires a data source be established on the server. ITCS has the right to deny requests for data sources or to disable existing data sources if security or performance concerns are brought to our attention. Applications that require extensive scripting or involve monetary transactions must be approved by ITCS. Data that is sensitive, private, or requires increased protection is generally not allowed on all public web servers. There are special cases, where information may be collected; however, in all such cases the security requires the approval of ITCS and the data owner. Sensitive information should not be displayed or collected by any website residing outside a secure connection.

2.5 Minimum Requirements for Official University Web Pages Only

2.5.1 General Appearance

All Official University Web Pages must follow the minimum design requirements.

2.5.2 University Content Management System Regulation

Effective July 1, 2011, official websites hosted in the ecu.edu domain are to be created and maintained using the content management tools approved by the University Web Oversight Committee.

2.5.3 Maintenance
Each department, office and academic center must designate one person to be the site’s primary web contact (PWC). The PWC is responsible for ensuring his or her department, office, or academic website adheres to the university web policy. The PWC may delegate steps needed to be in accordance with the policy, such as content creation, but should be prepared to serve as the primary informational contact for inquiries regarding the site. Each area must designate a PWC to obtain space on ECU web servers. In the absence of a PWC, the chair or director will be listed by default.

Official web pages must be kept up to date. Out-of-date information should be removed and new information added on a regular basis. To verify when a site was last updated, all sites will automatically display a "date last modified: mm/dd/yyyy" in the footer of the page. Only active files should be kept on the Internet servers. Inactive sites and files should be removed from official directories and stored either locally or on another campus network.

3 Oversight

Oversight of web pages subject to this policy is the responsibility of the University Web Oversight Committee. Violations of the web policy will be made known to the PWC for resolution. Noncompliance with applicable policies and/or laws may result in removal of web pages or directories from the main web server and/or removal of links to the site from the upper level university web pages and site index. Oversight of web pages will be consistent with the First Amendment.

Beginning January 1, 2014, a quarterly sample of web sites will be reviewed by Disability Support Services, ITCS, and Marketing to ensure sites meet ADA, security, and design requirements. The PWC will be notified if sites are out of compliance and be giving a reasonable timeline to make corrective action. If corrective action is not taken, then the site will be removed from ECU servers and as appropriate the Dean, Director, Department Chair, or Vice Chancellor will be notified.

3.1 Responsibility at Termination

An author of an unofficial web page is solely responsible for moving that page to a new non-university server once the employment and/or academic relationship with East Carolina University has ended, such as when an individual leaves university employment, a student graduates or is otherwise no longer enrolled at ECU, or where a student organization ceases to exist. ECU reserves the right to remove unofficial websites authored by an individual and/or group who/that no longer maintains an employment and/or academic relationship with ECU without notice as part of its routine maintenance of university servers.

Resolution #15-21
Recommendations Regarding Promotion Raises for ECU Faculty, as follows:

In a 2014 report to the Faculty Senate, the University Budget Committee examined recent salary increases for ECU employees. Among other things, the report noted that “there are disparities in faculty salary increases across divisions and colleges, including raises for promotion.” In response to this information, the UBC was charged by the Faculty Senate (Resolution #14-52) with reviewing ECU’s policies governing faculty promotion raises. Our review and recommendations follow.
Recommendations

- The University Budget Committee recommends the establishment of a formal policy guaranteeing a raise for all faculty achieving promotion, with funds provided centrally (i.e., not by departments and colleges).

- The University Budget Committee recommends that promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor include a raise of $4,000 and that promotion from Associate Professor to Professor include a raise of $6,000.

- The University Budget Committee recommends that the policy include fixed-term faculty who achieve an increase in rank, but makes no specific recommendation as to the amount of fixed-term raises.

Policies at Peer Institutions

To provide context, the committee contacted ECU’s peer institutions and other UNC system schools to request information about promotion raise policies. The institutions that responded are listed below. It is noteworthy that all of the institutions have in recent years provided campus-wide promotion raises, although in some cases (such as NC State and UNC-Greensboro) this is not codified. Western Michigan and Wright State are governed by a union contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Assistant to</th>
<th>Associate to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan*</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State*</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNC Institutions</th>
<th>Assistant to</th>
<th>Associate to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCSU</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCG</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost

The cost of providing for promotion raises is dependent upon the number of promotions. Looking at the past five years at ECU, there were, on average, 54 promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor (45 in Academic Affairs and 9 in the Health Sciences) and 17 promotions from Associate to Full Professor (12 in Academic Affair and 5 in the Health Sciences). These figures are used in the analysis below.

Promotion Raise Scenarios

To estimate the cost of different scenarios, salaries were drawn at random from ECU’s salary database in order to simulate both an average year and a year with higher than expected promotions. For this analysis, no distinction was made between 9-month and 12-month salaries. Appendix A shows how Assistant Professors with different salaries would fare under three different
proposals. In general, percentage raises are more costly than set amounts, although this could be partially offset by a cap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Average Year ($)</th>
<th>High Year ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2000/$3000</td>
<td>$159K</td>
<td>$320K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3500/$5000</td>
<td>$274K</td>
<td>$372K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4000/$6000</td>
<td>$318K</td>
<td>$454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5000/$7000</td>
<td>$389</td>
<td>$558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6000/$9000</td>
<td>$477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Average Year ($)</th>
<th>High Year ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%/5%</td>
<td>$334K</td>
<td>$418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%/7.5%</td>
<td>$380K</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%/7.5%</td>
<td>$501K</td>
<td>$626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%/10%</td>
<td>$548K</td>
<td>$685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Considerations**

- In an era of flat or declining state appropriations, money for centralized promotion raises will, in most years, have to be funded through an ‘internal cut’. Thus, raises will need to be offset by reductions in permanent funds totaling $300-400 thousand in other areas of the budget. Given existing budget allocations at ECU, much of this cut can be expected to be taken from Academic Affairs and the Health Sciences, which may result in reduced budget flexibility and increased fiscal pressures at the college level.

- Given that our suggested figures are higher than has generally been the norm at ECU, we expect that this proposal will be welcomed by most faculty. That said, for faculty members with relatively high salaries, these dollar amounts equate to small raises in percentage terms (see Appendix A). We therefore consider the university-wide commitment to be a minimum, and would expected that some colleges and/or units may wish to supplement these figures for retention purposes.

- Enacting the new policy will exacerbate existing problems of salary compression, which could negatively impact morale, and may also lead to increased pressure for redress, placing strain on future budgets.

- The inclusion of fixed-term faculty will add additional cost, but it is difficult to estimate how much. Last year, 21 fixed-term faculty members achieved an increase in rank (6 in Academic Affairs and 15 in the Health Sciences), figures that would likely increase once there are fiscal incentives. If promotion raises are implemented for fixed-term faculty, we recommend that the appropriate Faculty Senate committee(s) undertake a review of the criteria for advancement in rank, and the policies and procedures governing the process.
Appendix A. Hypothetical Raises for Assistant Professors under different scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical Raise for 20 faculty members (Assistant to Associate)</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>$4,000</th>
<th>5.00%</th>
<th>7.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts and Communication</td>
<td>$53,624</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>$2,681.20</td>
<td>$4,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$53,636</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>$2,681.80</td>
<td>$4,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>$53,636</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>$2,681.80</td>
<td>$4,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$57,684</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>$2,884.20</td>
<td>$4,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts and Communication</td>
<td>$59,708</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$2,985.40</td>
<td>$4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$59,708</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$2,985.40</td>
<td>$4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>$61,820</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>$3,091.00</td>
<td>$4,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$63,067</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>$3,153.50</td>
<td>$4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$64,262</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
<td>$3,213.10</td>
<td>$4,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>$65,780</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>$3,289.00</td>
<td>$4,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$66,064</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>$3,303.20</td>
<td>$4,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$66,792</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>$3,339.60</td>
<td>$5,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Computer Science</td>
<td>$74,875</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>$3,743.75</td>
<td>$5,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>$77,889</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>$3,894.45</td>
<td>$5,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriot College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>$79,740</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>$3,987.00</td>
<td>$5,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody School Of Medicine</td>
<td>$86,020</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>$4,301.00</td>
<td>$6,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$103,224</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>$5,161.20</td>
<td>$7,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody School Of Medicine</td>
<td>$222,225</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>$11,111.25</td>
<td>$16,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody School Of Medicine</td>
<td>$303,600</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>$15,180.00</td>
<td>$22,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raise (for 54 raises)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>$3,993</td>
<td>$5,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost (for 54 raises)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>$215,595</td>
<td>$323,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolution #15-22

Resolution #15-23
Recommendations regarding COAD 1000 including that the Division of Student Affairs continue to oversee COAD 1000 through the 2016-2017 academic year and that in the spring 2017 term, the
Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee report to the Faculty Senate its findings regarding the impact of COAD 1000 on student success, personal growth, grade point average, retention, and like factors.

Resolution #15-24
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 22, 2015 University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Psychology, Department of Geography, Planning, and Environment, Department of Biology, College of Health and Human Performance, and College of Engineering and Technology.

Resolution #15-25
Resolution on Adherence to the UNC Policy on Centers and Institutes and the Proposed Changes to that Policy, as follows:

Whereas, East Carolina University has a distinct mission and a unique role to play within our region; and
Whereas, our Board of Trustees, Chancellor and his administration, and the faculty of East Carolina University are best informed and positioned to make decisions about how we pursue our mission;

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the East Carolina University Faculty Senate strongly endorse the February 20th, 2015 Faculty Assembly Resolution Calling For Adherence To UNC Policy 400.5[R] (below) which clearly states the role of each campus in establishing, managing, and discontinuing their Centers and Institutes; and

Be It Further Resolved that the East Carolina University Faculty Senate also oppose the proposed insertion of the Board of Governors and/or the President of the UNC System into decisions about Center and Institute discontinuation, which belong at the campus level.

UNC FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Resolution Calling For Adherence To UNC Policy 400.5[R]: Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in The University of North Carolina

Whereas, Policy 400.5[R] Stipulates:

A. “The University of North Carolina (UNC) encourages partnerships within, across, and beyond its constituent institutions that maximize the capacities of UNC to address complex problems of importance to North Carolina, the nation and the world. Such partnerships may take the form of centers and institutes”

B.1.a “Full authority for oversight of institutional centers and institutes rests at the campus level, including establishment, management and discontinuation.”

B.2.b. “The board of trustees of each administrative campus has the authority to approve
campus level policies centers and institutes and to authorize establishment and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes."

B.5 “Campus level policies must provide a clear process for the discontinuation of centers and institutes, whether on probationary status, performing satisfactorily, or in other extraordinary circumstances. For those entities that involve only a single campus, the process should include approval by the Board of Trustees and notification to the UNC Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. For those centers and institutes that require significant and sustained cooperation among more than one UNC campus, agreement must be reached and documented by the partner Chancellors or designee before the recommendation to discontinue goes before the Board of Trustees at the administrative campus. If such an agreement cannot be reached by partner Chancellors or designees, then UNC General Administration, through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, will convene partners and determine an acceptable solution.”

Whereas, the Proposed Draft Amendment to UNC Policy Manual 400.5 [R], Section E. 1. b, inserts the ability of “the president or the Board of Governors [to] determine that a center or institute should be considered for discontinuation;”

Therefore, Be it Resolved that the Faculty Assembly calls upon the Board of Governors to act in keeping with established UNC policy that exclusively designates campus based leadership with the authority to discontinue a center or institute; and

Be it Further Resolved that the Faculty Assembly opposes the insertion of the authority of president or Board of Governors into the process for the establishment, management and discontinuation of centers and institutes which currently is assigned by policy solely to campus based leadership.