

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2016**

The fourth regular meeting of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, December 6, 2016, in the East Caroline Heart Institute.

**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**

Minutes of [September 6, 2016](#), [October 4, 2016](#) and [November 1, 2016](#) were approved as presented.

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

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Chullen (Business), Morin (Communication), Sorensen (Criminal Justice), Hood and Cotterill (Dental Medicine), Gueye (English), Averett (Health and Human Performance), Robinson (Mathematics), Powers (Sociology), Provost Mitchelson and UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate Holloway (Business).

Alternates present were: Professors Gross-McMillan for Stokes (Allied Health Sciences), Reisch for Christian (Business), Doty for Venters (Engineering and Technology), Cortright for Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) and Loy for Cooper (Health and Human Performance).

B. Announcements

There are [openings](#) on several standing University committees. Please let faculty in your academic unit know of these service opportunities and ask anyone interested to please contact John Stiller at [stillerj@ecu.edu](mailto:stillerj@ecu.edu).

The Chancellor has approved/received the following resolutions from the October 2016 Faculty Senate meeting. No final action yet on the November 2016 resolutions.

16-50 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 19, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, including curriculum action items (GC 15-29) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [March 30, 2016](#), and [April 13, 2016](#) including items from the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Department of Educational Leadership, and the Department of Political Sciences. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 30, 2016](#) were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a proposal of New Graduate Certificate: Dual Language Immersion Administration (DLI) and New Concentration: DLI Concentration in Educational Specialist in Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership within the College of Education. In addition, policy matters acted on and recorded in the [September 19, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, including policy action item (GC 15-30), changes to the Graduate Catalog policy on "Disruptive Academic Behavior", from "Students removed from a course under this policy will receive a grade of drop" according to university policy" to "Students removed from a course under this policy will receive a grade of "W" according to university policy".

16-51 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee's meeting minutes of [January 11, 2016](#), removing WI designation from READ 4534; meeting minutes of [March 14, 2016](#), removing WI designation from WOST 3500 and WOST 4200; and meeting minutes of [September 12, 2016](#), removing WI designation from NURS 4420, NURS 4440, NURS 4910 and IENG 2020.

16-52 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee's meeting minutes of [September 22, 2016](#) including curricular actions within the Colleges of Allied Health Sciences, Business, Fine Arts and Communication, Engineering and Technology and Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Chemistry and Interdisciplinary Program in Russian Studies.

16-53 Rescind the moratorium on consideration of courses for foundations credit that was approved by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Chancellor on December 8, 2015 (#15-90 below).

Resolution #15-90

*Recommendation that a moratorium on consideration of courses for Foundations credit be instituted effective January 1, 2016 and lasting until January 1, 2017. The moratorium does not apply to revisions to courses that already carry foundations credit.*

16-54 Revised [Department of Chemistry](#) Unit Code of Operation (approved [with edit.](#))

Email correspondences concerning unit elections for 2017-2018 Faculty Senate representation will be disseminated to unit code administrators (and Faculty Senators and Alternates) in January. 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.

Special thanks was extended to Vice Chancellor Horns for providing the food for the meeting.

C. Cecil Staton, Chancellor

Chancellor Staton stated that he will be meeting with donors and prospective donors in the next few days. He called attention to actions taken by the Board of Trustees to begin a major transformational capital campaign of \$500 million, a significant goal for the university. This level of campaign will take a lot of work, focus, and effort on all of our parts over the next five to eight years. The Chancellor believes this is an attainable goal. Major capital projects included in the plans for the funds will be forthcoming, including professorships, scholarships, and increases in research and increasing international opportunities for students. The Chancellor and others have been working on initiatives during this silent phase of the campaign.

Chancellor Staton also shared information about the Southside Stadium renovation project, a \$55 million west stadium expansion that is moving forward. This project is the first of mini-campaigns that will begin moving forward. The Board of Trustees has endorsed the project and it is moving forward to the Board of Governors for approval early next year and then to the legislature in the spring.

The Chancellor discussed "Project Unify," which refers to conversations with our partners at Vidant and ECU Physicians about coming together to strengthen the clinical side of medical education with the Brody School Of Medicine (BSOM). We will be moving forward this year with those plans and to increase enrollment at BSOM and to increase resident spots in the eastern part of the state to get the most return on our investments in medical education particularly in the east and underserved areas. As part of the capital campaign, a new medical education training facility for the BSOM is planned.

Over the last five months since arriving, the Chancellor and Mrs. Stanton have seen a number of things they didn't expect—including a hurricane, band controversy, and other things. He believes that ECU will be the next great National University. We will engage in the capital campaign and raise resources. Chancellor Staton recognizes the critical role the faculty play in the university in working to

prepare students to live in the global knowledge-based economy. We have many wonderful alums that have gone on to be very successful.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if the stadium expansion would impact the community surrounding the stadium. Chancellor Staton replied that all of the areas that are a part of the stadium expansion have already been acquired and he does not see any interruptions to the surrounding community. He noted that there are fewer than 1,000 seats being added to the stadium. The expansion relates more to updating the facility for the student-athletes and addressing the “trailer in the sky” structure.

Professor Barber (Health Sciences Library) asked about the process and criteria for evaluating and deciding on the projects that will be part of the capital campaign. Chancellor Staton replied that the decision process would filter down through the community. He doesn't want people to be overly concerned because we are at the beginning of the process and “the train has not left the station.” A few major things that the Chancellor has begun talking about including a new healthcare medical education training center because the current building is old and inadequate. He has other ideas, but doesn't want to get into a list and creating questions at this early phase. Not everyone will get everything, because while \$500 million is a lot of money, it will only go so far. The process will engage the academic community much as possible.

The Chancellor wished the faculty happy holidays.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Vice Chancellor Horns welcomed the senate to West campus. Vice Chancellor Horns discussed the School of Public Health planning. An advisory panel including some Senators were involved in the elements that are involved in the report about the School of Public Health and what would become part of the school. Academic Council will be meet with the Chancellor about the next steps. The plan, if everyone agrees, will begin with developing a smaller steering committee to oversee the rollout of the School of Public Health planning over four to five years. Dr. Ronnie Bell has been hired as the new chair of the Department of Public Health. Vice Chancellor Horns expects to hear soon from GA about the proposal to establish the DrPh that many people have been involved in reviewing. The decision should be forthcoming at the beginning of the year. The accrediting group has made changes in the accreditation criteria that will make development of the school more achievable.

The search for BSOM Dean is continuing and more candidates will be on campus at the first of the year.

Professor Nicholas Benson, Interim Dean of the School of Medicine discussed [Project Unify](#) and its goal of integrating the work of ECU physicians within the clinics with the Vidant medical group physicians. Professor Benson has been at ECU for 30 years and is now in the Dean's office of BSOM. He is currently Interim Dean. Professor Benson discussed Project Unify, which is the concept of integrating ECU physicians' clinical work with Vidant Health physicians group. The health care issues created by regulations, requirements for physicians, and reimbursements create challenges. This is the external reality. The internal reality, is that the academic structure is dependent on the clinical part to fund education. For the last two fiscal years, that has been at least \$10 million per year. The state provides funds but state appropriations are also getting ratcheted down the squeezing reimbursement situation is creating challenges for running the program.

The role of physician-faculty is an important role. The BSOM has over 350 physician-faculty now and they teach medical students, residents, and other health care workers in the classroom, clinics, etc. They do a tremendous amount of teaching even as they are seeing patients. Many of the programs require faculty appointments for teaching physicians. What the BSOM is working on is bringing the ECU clinical and the Vidant clinical closer together by using a construct or model with the associated entities that is embedded in the UNC system policy called the Associated Entity. ECU and other campuses already employ this model. The primary purpose of the entity is to support the university. It is written in the agreement that a new corporation is being created. Professor Benson discussed the details of the structure. He also noted that ECU will gain a stable source of funding and add 400 additional physicians across the state and 80 more sites for research and for working on health issues in North Carolina. We also get a better model of health care for Eastern North Carolina. The target launch date is January 2018; 2017 will be very busy with this work. At the end of the planning, the BSOM will be here as much as ever, the research and work here will continue. The faculty tenure process will be as strong. The clinical services across the region will be stronger; both ECU and Vidant will be stronger.

Professor Christiansen (Biology) asked, in relation to the tenured ECU physicians, who would make the firing and hiring decisions after the combination of both ECU and Vidant. Professor Benson replied that this is a huge question. An HR team is working on this and other questions for faculty and staff. The objective is to maintain the tenure of people and questions about how to manage faculty in terms of their interests and strengths.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated in relation to the transfer of public money into a private organization with Vidant, that they were a very aggressive company in his perspective and asked how was it that that state funding for the Brody School of Medicine could be folded into the newly formed institute? How about the employee salaries of the new WECU institute? Professor Benson replied that Vidant is a non-profit and folds any earnings back into facilities and equipment. The salaries of staff and clinical employees will be paid by Vidant, specifically in the practice. He stated that the administration has not yet approached this issue because no one knows yet which employees will be move to contract employees and which ones will be released to Vidant. The state funding is bundled into one appropriations line (Dental Medicine, Health Sciences Library and Medicine) and these appropriations are different from the rest of the University.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) asked if the extra state funds would be used to grow other programs. Professor Benson replied that a huge majority, about 70%, of physicians and staff working in the clinics are paid with clinical revenue. Some administrators are paid with split the funds between the state and clinical funds. The amount of state funds that might be freed up is not going to be as large as some would expect.

Professor Hagwood (Nursing) asked about the 400 new jobs being added. Professor Benson replied that these 400 positions currently employed by Vidant and Vidant Medical Group that are in Manteo, Kill Devil Hills, and other areas outside of Greenville in Eastern North Carolina.

Professor Christensen (Biology) asked what would happen to the SHRA employees, with their state benefits. Professor Benson explained that there are two staff employee classifications at Brody (SHRA and Clinical Support Services (CSS) specific to BSOM) and that the SHRA employees are doing the academic work and will remain Brody employees. CSS employees are at least 51% and as much as 100% in the clinical enterprise, and those several hundred positions (and employees) are

being looked at closely including how close some of them are to retirement with full TSERS-type benefits, how close some are to five-year vesting and other situations. They plan to do the best job possible not to affect anyone. The goal is to have enough CSS employees to help make the new organization function as a company

E. Ryan Beeson, President of [Student Government Association](#)

President Beeson thanked and expressed gratitude to the faculty from the students of ECU. He hears the excitement from students about classes. The SGA members are acting as advocates and let students know what resources are available to them. They started the semester partnering with Career Services, worked with health and wellness on all types of health issues, focused on mental health and finding resources. They provide free blue books and scantrons to students. They are trying to make sure that students know what resources are there for them. SGA also works on relationships to work on goals. Mr. Beeson does his work on the BOT to advocate for students. For the spring, the SGA will work on issues of rights and due process—seeking ways to let students know about resources. They are working on fund-raising to fund scholarships and other initiatives. On behalf of SGA, he expresses openness to work with faculty on initiatives.

No questions were posed to President Beeson at this time.

F. Anne Ticknor, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Ticknor (Education) provided a report on November 18, 2016 UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting. The session began with a reception at the President's residence. The events on Nov. 18 focused on the strategic plan. Groups broke out to continue work on the strategic plan which began in the October meeting. The work involved revising definitions, goals, metrics, etc. The BOG met in the interim and incorporated some of the delegates' suggestions and ignored others. Lunch included an update on legislative affairs and state government relations. President Spellings is hopeful that we will have increased support from the legislature.

No questions were posed to Professor Ticknor at this time.

G. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

“Today I want to comment on the topic of university efficiency. In keeping with the subject, I will try to be succinct.

Faced with decreasing budgets and increased legislative scrutiny in recent years, ECU and other public universities have placed more and more emphasis on efficiency in all our operations. I think this is something we can all embrace, as long as changes we make to be more efficient do not detract from the quality of our core instructional and scholarly missions. Faculty committees currently are working on a number of ideas to improve review of curriculum and academic programs. Shortly, you will hear reports from both the Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum Committees on proposed changes to permit some minor curriculum matters, course name changes as an example, to receive final approval directly from those committees, rather than require further approval by the full Senate and then by the Chancellor, which often also includes further review by the Academic Council.

Currently, EPPC is considering ways to improve review of new program proposals and to remove redundancies in how we work through the two General Administration mandated stages in academic program development. We can expect a report on those deliberations at a future Senate meeting.

All these initiatives are part of a broader assessment of curriculum and program development aimed at better focusing efforts on the most appropriate and specific issues that need to be addressed at each level of review. This will help to avoid redundancies in review processes at the department, college and university levels, and will generally shorten our timelines to implementation. We should always be on the lookout for ways to improve the speed of these processes because, and this is bottom line, doing so can improve the quality of our curriculum and program reviews by allowing faculty and administrators to spend their time in a more efficient and focused manner.

I have and will continue to support and promote all such improvements in efficiency that enhance **both** the speed and the quality of our review processes. However, in considering some recently proposed changes, as well as good some faith efforts to move certain initiatives forward very quickly, I have become increasingly aware of the basic tension that exists between how a University is structured, and how we sometimes think about maximizing speed of operation in our individual idealized worlds. This tension flows from the fact that that many members of the University community, in particular Administrators who are tasked most directly with increasing overall efficiency, are 12-month appointees, whereas most faculty have 9-month appointments. Not only that, summer is precisely the time when many 12-month appointees have more free time and flexibility to catch up with old, and develop new initiatives. In such situations it is good to keep in mind the old proverb, "idle hands are the devil's workshop." But, in all seriousness, it clearly can be frustrating to find that, just when one has the most time to try to move a new program or initiative through processes of shared governance, faculty committees that need to perform the review won't meet again until fall semester.

This confluence of circumstances can lead to what appear to be, at first glance, creative solutions around temporal restrictions created by our basic structure. In looking for such solutions, however, we must guard against those that end up bypassing serious faculty review by making it effectively an afterthought on a policy or process that already has been implemented.

The potential for to become a serious issue crystalized for me very clearly in a recent EPPC meeting that reviewed proposed changes to our timeline for Academic Program Review (APR for short). The proposal encouraged completion of administrative review and implementation of advised program changes during the summer after the review takes place. This effectively would move the step involving EPPC review to a position after the academic program in question had begun to implement changes in response to the APR process. Although the discussion began with thinking of possible ways to enable EPPC to be involved during the summer, it soon became clear that there was a more fundamental issue at stake. The entire process proposed for the summer months involved a back and forth between administrative review and the academic program in question as to how best to respond to the APR report. That is, the process of planning and beginning to implement programmatic changes to the Unit in question.

Think about that for a moment. This is precisely the part of the APR process where it is most critical to have maximum involvement of the faculty in the academic program in question. For most of our academic programs, this is not possible during the summer, when 9-month faculty are not employed by the University. If Academic Program Review is to be a meaningful process, rather than something we just check off the list, in most cases it simply cannot be accomplished rigorously and effectively over the summer, given how we currently are structured as an institution.

When faced with such institutional limitations, it is easy to fall into a trap of viewing shared governance as an obstacle to efficiency, rather than an essential element of our planning, particularly with respect to academic, curricular, scholarly, and other programmatic issues. I've heard comments along this line from individuals whom I know to value and understand the importance of shared governance. Given the current emphases on speed and efficiency, it is critical that we recognize these worthy goals as secondary, and admirable only when they help us in the pursuit of our more fundamental institutional missions; that is to produce the highest quality educational and scholarly products we can. To do that, we must be as careful and rigorous as possible in our review processes. Certainly we want to be fast, but speed and efficiency are not synonymous. Moving an inadequately considered initiative forward can lead to the worst kinds of inefficiencies in the long run, those that sacrifice quality, rigor and ultimately the reputation of our institution.

Thank you, and I'll be happy to take any questions”.

No questions were posed to Professor Stiller at this time.

H. Question Period

No questions were offered during this time period.

IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business to come before the body at this time.

V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Denise Donica (Allied Health Sciences) a member of the Graduate Council provided curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 7, 2016](#) including discussion on the [levels of approval for curricular and program changes](#) and a request for a [review of the approval processes](#).

No questions were posed to Professor Donica at this time and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 7, 2016](#) including discussion on the [levels of approval for curricular and program changes](#) and a request for a [review of the approval processes](#) were approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **Resolution #16-65**

VI. Report of Committees

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Professor Jean Luc Scemama (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [October 27, 2016](#) including

curricular actions within the College of Business, School of Art and Design and Departments of Sociology, Political Science and International Studies Program.

There was no discussion and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-66**

Professor Jean Luc Scemama then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 10, 2016](#) including the redistribution of foundations/general education credits and discussion on the [levels of approval for curricular and program changes](#) and [review of the approval processes](#).

Professor Kain (English) asked, in reference to the changes in levels of approval, why had approval changes to level 1 not been brought forward to the Faculty Senate for review because the EPPC considered that new courses should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate before going forward and the change in approval process proposed by UCC would eliminate that review. EPPC reviewed the changes after UCC and therefore the UCC changes are coming before the senate prior to the EPPC recommendations. Professor Scemama replied that if something was not clear cut within the academic units' curriculum package, the Committee would maintain the right to address the issue with the Faculty Senate for further discussion before formally voting on the new course.

Professor Kain (English) asked if, when the committee noticed a problem with a new course being created and presented their concerns to the Faculty Senate, would the academic unit be aware of the presentation to the Senate and given time to address the issue. Professor Scemama replied yes, the academic unit would be made aware of the process along the way.

Following the discussion, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-67**

Professor Jean Luc Scemama then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 17, 2016](#) including continued redistribution of foundations/general education credits and curricular actions within the School of Art and Design, Departments of History and Geography, Planning and Environment and the College of Health and Human Performance.

There was no discussion and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-68**

B. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Jen Scott Mobley (Theatre and Dance), Vice Chair of the Committee presented curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 14, 2016](#) including restoration of writing intensive (WI) designation for CSCI 3030 and CSCI 4710.

There was no discussion and the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-69**

C. Service Learning Committee

Professor Michelle Mendes (Nursing), Vice Chair of the Committee presented the curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 8, 2016](#) including removal of service learning (SL) designation for NURS 4210 and adding it to NURS 4211.

There was no discussion and the Service Learning Committee minutes were approved as presented.

**Resolution #16-70**

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Don Chaney (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 11, 2016](#) including a revised program degree title from Sustainable Tourism (MS-ST) to Sustainable Tourism and Hospitality (MS-STH) in the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Business and a revised PhD degree title from Communication Sciences and Disorders to Rehabilitation Sciences and the establishment of a concentration entitled Communication Sciences and Disorders within the College of Allied Health Sciences.

There was no discussion and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-71**

E. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Jay Newhard (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented the proposed revisions to the University Transfer Admission Policy and discussed the reasons that we should consider approving the proposal. He provided information about the average transfer admission GPA and the students' potential for success. We have higher targets for transfer enrollment.

John Fletcher, Associate Provost for Enrollment Services, stated that we are at a competitive disadvantage to other state universities who allow transfer students with a 2.0 to apply. We don't have to admit transfer students, but we already don't have the same minimum admission standards for the incoming first year students. The change would make the requirements the same as other schools. With the change, they are planning to have a 5% increase in transfer students. Students would be tracked to determine their success.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked why the administration thinks that graduation rates would go up if the University lowered the GPA for transfer students. Associate Provost Fletcher replied that he wasn't sure because they did not have a cohort to evaluate the results. This was information they would have going forward.

Professor Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies) noted that the Provost has been discussing raising graduation rates and this proposal seems to run in the opposite direction. We can increase our numbers and admit more students, but if we don't get our graduation rate, we might get penalized. Students' ultimate success if they don't begin with us. How then can we balance the goal to increase graduation rates if we lower the GPA? Can they talk about the students in the 2.0 to 2.3 range? Can they talk about graduation rates vs. admission? Associate Provost Fletcher replied that currently ECU does not have an application pool to tell us the number of transfer students we are missing due to the current 2.5 GPA requirement. Prior to 2009, we automatically admitted students with a 2.0 GPA. It is a new day and there needs to be a reasonable time given to try lowering the GPA requirement for

transfer students and see if it works. Four or five years is a reasonable window to really examine and see if this group of transfer students are really being successful.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) expressed skepticism for the arguments that administration is putting forward. Data provided to both the Committee and Faculty Senators shows what to expect from admitting more transfer students with a lower GPA but the data isn't necessarily helping. Even the students accepted through the regular admission process come in with less basic knowledge and poor study habits. We may be doing no favor to society by lowering our expectations. Students with lower GPA's are forcing faculty in various disciplines to institute teaching methods to help them reach their potential. The problem is we may end up producing college degrees that are not based on required knowledge.

Professor Christensen (Biology) asked why there was no data that shows acceptance rates for cohorts now and whether we have data before 2010 and what that shows. He also asked whether there was a vetting process for the students. Associate Provost Fletcher replied that we have five-year data for entrance students. 80% of admitted students meet our current admission requirement as a transfer student and with 2.5 GPA's. In the data provided, prior to 2009 it is similar to current data. In the near term, we don't think we will see a decrease in the graduation rates. The students would be considered based on a number of factors.

Professor Treadwell (Medicine) stated that he knows transfer students from 4-year colleges with a 2.0 GPA, who stay out of school and mature before being readmitted do very well. Students are much better if they directly transfer from the community college don't do as well as students transferring from a 4-year college unless they then take one or two remedial courses if necessary. Students with associate degrees coming into the University should have a 2.5. Associate Provost Fletcher responded that some students are slightly less successful but not that much different. In NC, we have really been focusing on student success.

Professor Kain (English) asked what should transfer students coming in with a 2.0 GPA expect to be able to do if they want to get into a major and they don't meet the required GPA? We have a limited number of majors with a 2.0 GPA requirement. Some of those have high foreign language requirements. She expressed concern if the GPA is lowered, incoming transfer students must achieve a higher GPA than when they are admitted and is concerned about how ECU would address the problem. Associate Provost Fletcher noted some acknowledgement of this issue. Admission and advisors would have to make it clear that they won't get into those programs

Professor Francia (Political Science) referenced the information provided to the Senators and stated that UNC-Charlotte has data on how students do with those who have a 2.0 to 2.5 GPA and if the answer is that they do as well as transfer students then it would address the concerns faculty have expressed today. Associate Provost Fletcher stated that while the minimum is 2.0, we hope not to admit many transfer students with a 2.0 GPA. We would prefer to admit students with higher profiles. Eight of 16 state universities have their GPA set at 2.0; with 3 state universities accepting 2.5. UNC-Chapel Hill and NC State are more rigorous.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies/Chair of General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee) stated that if the Senate passed this proposal, he predicted that would be eliminated.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that lowering the GPA would send a message to General Administration that this was ECU's baseline and asked how this action would fit with the Chancellor's goal to make ECU the next great national university. Associate Provost Fletcher replied that the executive council vetted this proposal before going forward to the Admission and Retention Policies Committee and that the Chancellor was present during the discussion. This decrease in GPA would allow us to bring more students to ECU.

Professor Frank (Technology and Computer Science) stated that the change would benefit military students who have traveled throughout their academic career.

Professor Reisch (Business) stated that when transfer students are in classes with a high 40-50% failure rate are moved to classes that have lower failure rates they may be more successful.

Professor Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies) asked about funding and balance and asked what is motivating this decision. Are we not meeting our 5 % target? How many transfer students did we admit in Fall 2016? Associate Provost Fletcher replied that money does not enter into our thoughts at all. A strategic planning group decided 30,000 students was the target student body size. First year student enrollments stays around 4500 because of the number we can accommodate. WE discussed the need to increase our transfer students with 5% growth per year, with a 2,000 goal for transfer students in 2018.

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) asked for the current total of transfer students admitted and about who determines admission exceptions. Does the data separate the transfer students transferring with associate degrees from other transfer students? If we accept 80% of our applicants why don't we look at those additional 20% again before we lower the GPA across the board. Associate Provost Fletcher replied that we can't tell why the 20% were determined not acceptable, so he is unsure why they were denied. The people in admissions make acceptance determinations. If students don't have the 2.5 GPA they still get a thorough look before denial. Information about students transferring with from 2- and 4-year colleges is not included in the information provided.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that from the data provided, 1,866 transfer students were enrolled this Fall, and with a goal of 2,000 for 2018, do you have a large enough pool of applicants at the 2.5 GPA to select the 2,000 students? Associate Provost Fletcher replied that the pool is not large enough.

Professor Tucker (History) expressed concern about perceptions. ECU brags about our recent increase in honors college enrollment, but he doesn't see lowering the GPA as a positive headline. Despite the fact that we increased our GPA admission requirement from 2.0 to 2.5 earlier in the decade, that now during 2017 we are going back down to 2.0 is not a good positive perception. Especially when the rationale is that 8 institutions allow this lower GPA for admittance.

Professor Morris (Political Science/Chair of Faculty Governance Committee) stated that dropping the requirement down to 2.0 does not necessarily decrease the quality of students being admitted. When a student reads that 2.5 is required and has a lesser GPA, he or she won't apply with a 2.4. So our published literature is what is turning possible students away.

Professor Fay (Business) stated that there is no penalty right now on the performance of transfer students and wondered if there were criteria we could advertise about this. Associate Provost

Fletcher replied that we could craft a statement that could be used in advertisements. The rationale to lowering the GPA to 2.0 was to get as many applicants that we could choose from.

Professor Francia (Political Science) stated that recently he had a student from a 2-year school that transferred in with a low GPA and had to work very hard before graduating with honors. He agreed with Professor Tucker that this is not the best time for negative perceptions of the public stating that a 2.5 GPA is a standard, but a student honestly will need a 3.0 in order to be successful in most academic programs. He stated that there needed to be specific suggested wording in university publications and expressed his sympathy for public opinion.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that we were at 2.0 once, now we are at 2.5, so something in the past told us that we were not reaching the students with most potential to be successful. Now a proposal comes forward to lower our standards again because we don't have enough applicants to increase the transfer goal to 2,000. Why don't we experiment for a year or two with 2.4 GPA and if that gets the applicant pool that admissions is looking for then we are OK. Faculty in Physics are reluctant to go back in time and lower standards.

Associate Provost Fletcher stated that there was a huge freshman class in 2008, so the executive council met and, in order to control enrollment, decided the easiest thing to do was increase the GPA for transfer students. He was not sure that at the time, they thought about where ECU would be eight years later and did not think that admissions would gather that many more students by lowering the GPA to 2.4. If the GPA was lowered to 2.0 for transfer students, he offered to report to the Faculty Senate annually on the admission numbers from the change and maybe over time their success.

Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development and Engagement Van Scott stated that the lowering the GPA to 2.0 was not a race to the bottom but a way to provide the admissions team an option to look at some of the transfer students. He said that the admissions team looks at these students closely and they are increasing their performance over the time. He expressed appreciation for the candid discussion among the Senators and offered to take this information back to the executive council.

Following both a voice and hand count, the proposed revisions to the University Transfer Admission Policy failed.

#### F. Agenda Committee

Professor Tim Christensen (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented proposed 2017-2018 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee Meeting Dates. There was no discussion and the 2017-2018 meeting dates were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-72**

#### G. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) Chair of the Committee presented first the curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [November 21, 2016](#) including general education humanities credit for FORL 1551, Introduction to Russia, Land of the Firebird and FORL 2220, Sci-Fi: East and West and domestic diversity credit for SPAN 3003, Spanish for Heritage Speakers.

There was no discussion and the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-73**

Professor Bailey then presented a resolution on Continued Consideration of New Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction Instrument.

Professor Kain (English) asked, in reference to the survey questions having been drafted and approved, were the survey questions going to be used for Spring 2017 and the Faculty Senate given an opportunity during the March 2017 meeting to review the Fall 2016 survey results and suggest any changes before the questions are used again and will the Committee's report in March also reflect how all has been integrated? Professor Bailey replied yes, that is correct.

Following a brief discussion, the resolution was approved as presented. **Resolution #16-74**

VII. New Business

There was no new business to come before the body at this time.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Department of English

Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 6, 2016, MEETING**

Resolution #16-65

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council meeting minutes of [November 7, 2016](#) including discussion on the [levels of approval for curricular and program changes](#) and a request for a [review of the approval processes](#).

Resolution #16-66

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [October 27, 2016](#) including curricular actions within the College of Business, School of Art and Design and Departments of Sociology, Political Science and International Studies Program.

Resolution #16-67

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [November 10, 2016](#) including the redistribution of foundations/general education credits and discussion on the [levels of approval for curricular and program changes](#) and [review of the approval processes](#).

Resolution #16-68

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [November 17, 2016](#) including continued redistribution of foundations/general education credits and curricular actions within the School of Art and Design,

Departments of History and Geography, Planning and Environment and the College of Health and Human Performance.

**Resolution #16-69**

Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [November 14, 2016](#) including restoration of writing intensive (WI) designation for CSCI 3030 and CSCI 4710.

**Resolution #16-70**

Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee meeting minutes of [November 8, 2016](#) including removal of service learning (SL) designation for NURS 4210 and adding it to NURS 4211.

**Resolution #16-71**

Curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of [November 11, 2016](#) including a revised program degree title from Sustainable Tourism (MS-ST) to Sustainable Tourism and Hospitality (MS-STH) in the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Business and a revised PhD degree title from Communication Sciences and Disorders to Rehabilitation Sciences and the establishment of a concentration entitled Communication Sciences and Disorders within the College of Allied Health Sciences.

**Resolution #16-72**

2017-2018 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee Meeting Dates, as follows:

Agenda Committee	Faculty Senate
August 29, 2017	September 12, 2017
September 26, 2017	October 17, 2017
October 31, 2017	November 14, 2017
November 28, 2017	December 12, 2017
January 16, 2018	January 30, 2018
February 13, 2018	February 27, 2018
March 13, 2018	March 27, 2018
April 10, 2018	April 24, 2018
	May 1, 2018 (2018/2019 organizational mtg.)

**Resolution #16-73**

Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of [November 21, 2016](#) including general education humanities credit for FORL 1551, Introduction to Russia, Land of the Firebird and FORL 2220, Sci-FI: East and West and domestic diversity credit for SPAN 3003, Spanish for Heritage Speakers.

**Resolution #16-74**

Resolution on Continued Consideration of New Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction Instrument, as follows:

Whereas, the General Education and Institutional Effectiveness Committee will, no later than the March 28, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting, recommend to the Faculty Governance Committee a revision of the [ECU Faculty Manual](#) policy on teaching evaluation (*Part VIII, Section I, subsection III, 1.e.*); and

Whereas, the General Education and Institutional Effectiveness Committee will, no later than the March 28, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting, recommend to the Faculty Senate adoption of the new Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction ([as amended by the Faculty Senate](#)) for ongoing use beginning the Fall 2017 semester.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the survey of student opinion of instruction instrument “Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation,” which was used in the pilot study and in Fall 2016, with any amendments approved by the Faculty Senate, be used in Spring 2017, and hereafter be referred to as “Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction” (SSOI).

Rationale:

- This provides the Senate with another opportunity (in March 2017) to amend the form after reviewing the results of using the form Fall 2016 and prior to considering the form for ongoing use, and
- Allows for the new form to be integrated into a package that recommends revisions in how teaching is evaluated for consideration by the Faculty Governance Committee.