The sixth regular meeting of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 23, 2016, at 2:10 p.m. in the Willis Building.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**
John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**
The minutes of January 26, 2016 will be considered at the March 15, 2016 meeting.

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

A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Tierno (Art and Design), Cotterill (Dental Medicine), Chen (Medicine) and Felts (Faculty Assembly Delegate/Health and Human Performance).

Alternates present were: Professors Harris for Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences), Ferguson for Broome (Dental Medicine), Ryan for Yao (Engineering and Technology) and Roberson for McAuliffe (Nursing).

B. Announcements
The Chancellor has approved/received the following resolutions from the January 2016 Faculty Senate meeting:

**#16-01** Formal faculty advice with no changes to the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council’s meeting minutes of December 7, 2015, including the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 18, 2015 which included Programmatic, Policy and Curriculum actions (GC 15-24) Request for Authorization to plan a New Program – MA in Hispanic Studies, request for Authorization to plan a New Program – Joint Ph.D. in Integrative Coastal and Marine Science (ICMS) with the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) and East Carolina University (ECU); changes to the grading scale for graduate students, including elimination of “R/Q” grades and replacement with “S/U” grades; and the College of Nursing: Proposal of New Courses: NURS 8205, NURS 8206, NURS 8236, NURS 8242, NURS 8250, NURS 8262; Revision of Existing Courses: NURS 8200, NURS 8220, NURS 8225, NURS 8226, NURS 8227, NURS 8235, NURS 8240, NURS 8241, NURS 8260.

**#16-02** Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on the Use of Humans in Research.

**#16-03** Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of November 12, 2015, including curricular actions within the Department of Geological Sciences, School of Art and Design, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Department of Health Education and Promotion and Department of Criminal Justice.

**#16-04** Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational and Policies Committee’s meeting minutes of December 11, 2015 including a request to approve the establishment of the Miller School of Entrepreneurship within the College of Business; request to approve the movement of MS in Sustainable Tourism from the Graduate School to the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Business; request to approve the authorization to plan a new Joint (ECU/UNCW) Ph.D. program in Integrative Coastal Marine Science (ICMS); request to
approve the revision of Existing Degree: Industrial and Organizational Concentration of the MA in General-Theoretic Psychology (change requirement) and new graduate certificate in Quantitative Methods for the Social and Behavioral Sciences within the Department of Psychology; request to approve the revision of the PhD in Bioenergetics and Proposal of four New Concentrations: Biomechanics and Motor Control, Cellular and Molecular Bioenergetics, Nutritional Exercise Physiology, Exercise Physiology and Behavioral Science in the Department of Kinesiology within the College of Health and Human Performance; request to approve a New Concentration within the BA in Foreign Languages and Literatures: Global Studies within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; Request to approve the discontinuation of existing certification: Driver and Safety Education Add On Certification in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; and the Program Review response for the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies.

#16-05 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s meeting minutes of January 15, 2016 including a request to discontinue the Alternate Entry (AE) MSN Option, RN/MSN Option, Existing concentrations within the MSN: Family Nurse Practitioner, Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, and Existing certificates: Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, Family Nurse Practitioner within the College of Nursing and a request to approve the authorization to plan a new degree program: MA in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; and receipt of the Annual Audit of the University Studies Program.

#16-06 Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, After Schedule Change Period.

The 2015-2016 ECU Scholar-Teacher Awards and Symposium is scheduled for Thursday, March 31 from 12-4 pm in the EC Heart Institute. All faculty are welcome to attend.

Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by May 1, 2016.

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, May 2 from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. in the Spilman Building Gallery (lobby). Please place this event on your calendar.

The Academic Awards Committee will bring forward next month proposed revisions to the various teaching and research award procedures, prior to the April preliminary call for nominations for the BOG Award for Excellence in Teaching, BOG Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award, Alumni Outstanding Teaching Award, Scholarship of Engagement Award, Joyner Outstanding Teaching in Distance Education Award, and Lifetime and Five-Year Research/Creative Activity Awards. Nomination materials will still be due September 15 and portfolios due no later than November 1. Please direct any questions to Zac Domire, Chair of the Committee at domirez@ecu.edu.

Faculty interested in periodically receiving issues of The Chronicle of Higher Education are asked to email the Faculty Senate office at facultysenate@ecu.edu to have their name placed 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/fsongr/customcf/committee/aa/maxjoyneraward.pdf. Please contact Dorothy Muller, Director of the Office for Faculty Excellence with any questions.

A list of funded 2016-2017 teaching and research/creative activity grants was distributed. Please contact Donna Roberson, Chair of the Teaching Grants Committee or Richard McCabe, Chair of the Research/Creative Activities Committee with any questions.

Last Spring, the Faculty Senate expressed support for a two-year pilot faculty mentoring program in partnership with the ECU Office for Faculty Excellence. Each mentor receives training, identifies the types of assistance they wish to provide (general, career pathways, research/scholarship, teaching, technology, engagement/service, evaluation, etc.) and mentors up to two faculty in the program. Through the program, faculty who request mentoring will be matched with faculty mentors for a period of a semester or a year (one to two hours per week). At the end of the two-year pilot, the program will be evaluated and recommendations made through the Faculty Welfare Committee to the Faculty Senate. Faculty interested in participating in this pilot program are encouraged to contact Director Dorothy Muller at mullerd@ecu.edu.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated the importance of the upcoming referendum on the bond issue, Connect NC, that will be on the March ballot. Professor Powers provided a brochure and additional handouts were provided to the Faculty Senators. The Chancellor noted that many messages about Connect NC will be needed to overcome apathy and encourage people to come out to vote for it. Opposition to the bond from constituents includes concerns over growth in government and increases in taxes. However, there is no factual evidence that taxes will increase as a result of the bond package. Even if the bond passes, the total debt service through 2026 will decline and the outlay from the state will be reduced over time. The State has a AAA bond rating, and many people believe that the state could have managed a $3 to $4 billion bond project. Other criticisms include that the bond doesn’t include transportation; however, $220 million in recurring funding was appropriated last year for transportation and that funding is already in the budget. Over 10 years, compared to the 146 projects proposed in the new bond issue, transportation will be funded more over that time. The building project for ECU that is included in the bond is critical because we need additional lab and classroom space. Data on underutilized classroom space is old and doesn’t take into account the interdisciplinary growth of many areas of the University. The physical campus does not have enough room for all the STEM students. ECU is 22% above national standards for lab usage, and many labs on campus run until 9:30pm, five days per week. The Chancellor expressed the hope that the university community will be engaged and turn out at the polls if we think the bond referendum is important.

The Chancellor addressed questions raised about UNC President Margaret Spellings and the Boston Consulting Group. The Chancellor was invited to a retreat in Greensboro for two days and spent some time with the other chancellors, Board of Governors members, and President Spellings. Chancellor Ballard was impressed with her great political acumen, personal qualities, accountability, and commitment to higher education. President Spellings responded to the Board of Governors members well and answered questions clearly and honestly, indicating that she was the spokesperson for the UNC system. The Chancellor suggested that the ECU community remain open to President Spellings’ efforts. President Spellings will be visiting ECU on March 30 and the Chancellor anticipates that the ECU community will show her who we are.
The Boston Consulting has another month to complete their work. They are looking at how the GA should be organized to serve campuses and the system. President Spellings said that the GA needs to support campuses and that the campuses know what they need. She has also indicated her belief that education is a “civil right.”

Chancellor Ballard stated that there is consternation about NC Gap. The chancellors are more than concerned about guaranteed admission to universities and are working to demonstrate the difficulties in the admissions process for students who might enter through this route. Proponents of NC Gap seem to ignore the intentional and well-developed articulation agreements in place between universities and community colleges that guarantee students the same things already. Proponents argue that it would reduce the total costs of college for students to go to community college first and then transfer. Retention, time to degree, and other student efforts would be harmed though. The Chancellor expressed additional concerns about the convergence of the Access to Education Act that would lower tuition at some of colleges and the proposed cap on the use of state appropriations for advancement funds. Advancement provides significant support to educational programming and student scholarships and the reduction of support for advancement efforts, combined with reduced tuitions due to NC GAP will hamper university initiatives. The Chancellor and others are activity working on getting the rules on the cap changed.

Chancellor Ballard stated that questions have been raised about state health plan and invited Vice Chancellor Horns to comment. The state health plan is having financial problems. The health plan is a $3.3 billion dollar business with costs going up, and the state Legislature has mandated an almost tripling in the health plan reserves; state expenditures for the health plan will also be reduced over time to reduce the costs to the state. There are proposals for dealing with shortfalls including eliminating the 80/20 plan and spousal coverage, both of which have been tabled at the time of this meeting, and increases in monthly premiums and reduction of benefits. The costs will be going up. It is also likely that the cost of the student health plan may go up as much as 30%, reducing the number of people in that plan.

Chancellor Ballard also stated that it is early to talk about raises, however ECU personnel could receive merit-based raises of up to 2% depending on the state revenues and whether we receive enrollment growth funding.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) commented on an NPR report indicating that nationwide just 14% of students who attend community college go on to get 4-year degree. He asked the Chancellor to address faculty concerns about NC GAP plan and whether students could be required to attend community college first. Chancellor Ballard stated that there was confusion about the percentage of students, i.e. 2.5% or 25% of first year students, who would go first to community colleges. He stated that a consulting firm is preparing report on NC Gap and factors to consider. The Chancellor noted that this plan would cause a large budget decrease for universities and that retention rates are poor for those being forced to go to the community colleges. The Chancellor further stated that the current articulation agreements work well.

Professor Kain (English) asked what was meant by students being “forced to go” to the community colleges—is this an incentive program. How can student be forced to go where they don’t want to go? Chancellor replied that the legislation would include language that a percentage of the first year class wouldn’t be able to be admitted into universities. Budget cuts would also be part of the plan. The numbers that have been proposed for admission restrictions and budget cuts are wildly different.

Professor Chambers (Education/guest) stated that the impact of the proposed NC GAP would be tremendous on minority enrollments and would cause a disproportionate effect on minority students.
Chancellor Ballard agreed that data from the system reflected the negative effects to various groups of students. He noted that data gathered from the University system will be going to the legislature in mid-March and the full analysis should be available for review later this Spring.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that this plan would make a huge difference in the characteristics of students who attend universities and community colleges. Chancellor Ballard stated that the proposed plan would pit the community colleges and universities against each other. Currently, the universities have a good relationship with the community colleges.

D. Mark Matulewicz, Student Government Association President
Mr. Matulewicz thanked the Senate for the privilege to speak and share the goals and accomplishments of the SGA on behalf of the executive team.

Affordability. The SGA worked with businesses to offer student discount cards that will save them money, help the local economy, and help with regional transformation. Students can go to restaurants and other businesses and receive discounts. The SGA purchased 10,000 cards and gave them all out within a month. The program was very popular. The SGA also partnered with transportation to create an ECU access line to provide curb-to-curb shuttle service for students with accessibility issues. This has also been very popular.

Transparency. When the executive branch was sworn in, the SGA needed a rebuilding period that required openness between the SGA and faculty and the student body. As part of that effort to reestablish trust and transparency, they developed initiatives such as Senate in a Minute—SGA meetings are recorded and translated into 60-second segments for quick videos.

Elections. Elections are taking place tomorrow. Student participation has been increased 35% and there are four candidates for President and Vice President. The candidates are very diverse and the tickets show different groups working together. Voting starts 2/24 and goes to Friday. A reception will be held to announce winners.

There were no questions posed to Mr. Matulewicz.

E. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor with Campus Operations and Debi Garfi, Director of Parking Services
Mr. Koch provided the annual report on Parking and Transportation Services, including maps of proposed parking adjustments and parking changes and stated that the report with a lot of information has been sent out.

Parking is self-supporting and fees for permits pay for projects. Parking Services also collects parking fees and is beginning to charge for event parking as a way to increase revenue. The building of the first parking deck begins July 2016. The main campus has lost about 450 parking spaces as a result of building projects.

After five years with no increases, there will be an increase in parking fees, approximately $1.50 per pay period for A permits, $.75 cents for B permits.

The numbers of A lot permits sold is well below the parking levels for A parking. Parking has not been selling A zone parking for several years to avoid taking permits back. The parking budget includes $2 million in expenses and $3 million in revenue. The difference is used for building, re-paying bond funding, another bond has been sold recently, and for the maintenance of parking decks, which will be $200 thousand per year.
ECU has lost 200 parking spaces on the medical campus cause of building there in addition to the 450 parking spaces lost behind Mendenhall and Joyner on the main campus. To adjust parking, parking services has changed signage and helped people get used to new traffic flow and lots. Changes made to accommodate permit holders include the creation of more A lots. A and B zones on campus have been locked down and access after 4:00 has been changed to after 7:00 parking. The plan was created based on data collected over several years. The system seems to be working well. Information is available in the report.

All visitor parking has been moved off the core. Increased transit safe-ride, and accessible transit is being provided. Added phones, increased patrols on some areas, have also been added to lots that are farther from the core campus. Parking has not yet been ticketing, but they are giving warnings. People are doing better about stopping at crosswalks

PARKING IS MONITORING THE PARKING SITUATION ON CAMPUS AND IS CONSIDERING RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING PROVIDING DAY A ZONE LIMITED DEPARTMENTAL GUEST PARKING FOR SMALL EVENTS (20 SPACES); SOME LIMITED PARKING FOR SMALL EVENTS, IN THE EVENING THERE IS AVAILABILITY IN THE A ZONE; B1 ZONE PERMIT HOLDERS ALLOWED TO PARK IN A/LOTS AFTER 5:30. MR. KOCH IS CONFIDENT THAT SOME OF THESE ACTIONS CAN BE TAKEN. PARKING FOR SMALL EVENTS UP TO 40 SPACES IS AVAILABLE IN A ZONES. THEY WILL ALSO CONCENTRATE ON PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS WHO NEED TO GET CLOSE TO BUILDINGS. SEVERAL B LOTS WILL BE OPEN TO STUDENTS AFTER 5:30 WHO WOULD BE PARKING IN C AND B4 LOTS. STUDENTS ON THE HEALTH CAMPUS HAVE HAD TO GO TO MINGES AND TAKE TWO BUSES TO GET TO CAMPUS.

Professor Gustafson (Music) thanked Mr. Koch for listening to the ECU community and wanted to confirm that the parking lots would be open to more people at 5:30 pm. Theatre is an important public face of ECU and when events begin as early as 5:30, opening parking at 7:00 is too late. She noted that changing the availability of parking to 5:30 was very beneficial for older participants performances. She expressed appreciation for his efforts in listening to those affected by the parking situation. Mr. Koch replied that they would work to accommodate people with accessibility problems, and he would continue to monitor the parking situation and listen to all constituents affected by parking on campus.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) expressed concerns about crossing 10th Street in front of Brewster at the bottom of College Hill; noting the appalling traffic problems including that drivers speed through the area and that the timing of red lights were inconsistent. He noted that he sees people running lights on a regular basis and wondered what could be done about this before someone gets hurt. Mr. Koch expressed his concerns too about this area and shared that they are working with the city police to try and address some of these concerns. ECU has a representative working with the steering committee looking at the area for the next phase which will extend the corridor from 10th street out to Brook Valley. In addition to educating students, they have talked with Greenville Police on things that can be done about this situation now. The pedestrian lights have been adjusted and work well when people follow them. The steering committee is aware of the issues and there have been discussions about the need for a redesign in front of Brewster and not only lowering the speed limit on 10th Street but also changing the look of the area with bicycle pathways and medians to block pathways with landscaping. All involved understand the need to try and enforce speed in this area.

Professor Cope (Psychology) said he was afraid that, once the 10th street corridor was completed, people would view it as a thoroughfare. Mr. Koch replied that many within the community were concerned with that issue.
Professor Powers (Sociology) asked who was in charge of enforcement of 10th Street. Mr. Koch replied that the Greenville City Police are in charge, but that ECU’s Police continue to work with them to address issues.

Professor Campbell (Allied Health Sciences) asked if there had been any talk about Highway 43 and thought that this area was an accident waiting to happen. Mr. Koch stated that the redesign of the median in that location helped some, but the timing was off for changing the design at that time. He noted that there were plans to place pedestrian beacons at Cotanache Street that would immediately activate a stop light and that the Department of Transportation is also looking at the 10th street connector and Highway 43 area intersections.

Professor Christensen (Biology) noted that vandalism had damaged the red light buttons at various intersections, especially at 10th street and wondered who was responsible for replacing those buttons. Mr. Koch stated that he would contact the Department of Transportation about this as soon as possible.

Professor Powers (Sociology) stated that even on 5th Street, no one is stopping for those trying to walk across the street. Mr. Koch reminded Senators that people had to first walk out into the crosswalk in order to necessitate someone, by law, to stop.

Professor Harris (Allied Health Sciences) said that something was needed in front of the Treybrook Apartments and that there was no crosswalk for those turning left. She has seen students walking everywhere without regard to traffic and faculty were driving all the way around the building to avoid this dangerous area. Mr. Koch expressed appreciation from all for their comments on these important topics.

F. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

“Because we are scheduled to take up Part IX in this meeting, I want to keep my remarks brief today. Nevertheless I feel compelled to comment on one particular pressing issue for all of us in higher education in North Carolina.

Earlier this year, Simon Newman, the recently appointed President of Mount Saint Mary’s University in Maryland, announced a new plan to improve graduation rates. The idea is to identify students who are considered most likely to drop out during their first year of college, and get them to drop out during the first three weeks of classes. When Faculty objected to the plan, for a host of reasons, President Newman replied, and I quote, “This is hard for you because you think of the students as cuddly bunnies, but you can’t. You just have to drown the bunnies … put a Glock to their heads.” Of course, in public announcements President Newman speaks of the very humane goals of saving students money and helping them make better choices, for example, postponing enrollment or attending a community college rather than a University.

As I’ve learned to say since moving to North Carolina, however, (one of my now favorite expressions) “you can’t spit” without hitting data that reveal the fallacies in this approach. Just today, the Chronicle of Higher Education reported on a study from Temple University on success rates in higher education of students from economically underprivileged backgrounds. It found that students who enter a college or university in their first semester after high school graduation are two and a half times more
likely to earn a degree in six years than those who postpone enrollment. They also are three times more likely to graduate in six years than students who first enroll in a community college. I’ll leave it to you to decide whether such results support Dr. Newman’s private or public explanations of Mt. Saint Mary’s new approach to retention and graduation.

Last summer, the NC Legislature passed House Bill 97, better known as NCGap, which takes this strategy to its logical conclusion. When this law goes into effect, students identified won’t even have three weeks to demonstrate their propensity for failure. Some fraction of first year applicants qualified to enter our state Universities, perhaps up to 25% if some have their way, will be shunted off to community colleges, with a promise of future admission if they earn their associate degrees. And how will these students be identified? They largely will be chosen based on their rankings on standard admissions criteria, such a grade point average and SAT scores. Not only is this grossly unfair to each individual so identified, it clearly will impact students of color and those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds disproportionately. That is, it is an inherently discriminatory approach.

I must tell you, this issue is deeply personal to me. In just my second year teaching introductory biology, a first-semester, first-generation African American student came into my office. He was struggling with the unanticipated academic expectations of college, and was having trouble managing his newly acquired personal freedom. We worked together over the next months and, in the end, he earned an A for the semester. I nominated him for a national award sponsored by the textbook company. When he won, I believe it was the first such recognition he had ever received for academic achievement. Early the next semester he came to me see me for a different sort of help. Over the holiday break he had been hanging out with some high school friends who’d gotten into trouble with the law, and he was arrested along with them, simply for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. I was able to intervene in his case, supplying a character reference that helped get the charges dropped, and allowed him to continue his studies. That young man is now a Physician’s Assistant and a proud alum of ECU. Had I followed Simon Steven’s plan, I would have told him to drop out when he first showed up in my office. Under NCGap, I probably would never have met him, and he might very well have spent his most crucial years unjustly incarcerated.

I suspect just about every one of you here today could relate your own such personal experiences from your time as an ECU faculty member.

In his remarks to Congress last September, Pope Francis said, "We need to avoid a common temptation nowadays: to discard whatever proves troublesome." Although he referred to the crisis of Syrian refugees, he could just as easily been talking about NCGap and other programs that further marginalize those who’ve had the fewest resources and least opportunities in their lives to begin with. When we faculty object to these efforts, it is not because we have blinders on about our students; it is because we have first-hand knowledge of what they can achieve if given the chance. We do not think of them as cuddly bunnies, nor as statistics, nor as customers on a balance sheet. They are all unique individuals. More than that, they are the future and every one of them deserves the best opportunity available to reach her or his full potential.

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

There were no questions posed to Professor Stiller.
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: Professors Al P. Jones (Education), Nelson Cooper (Health and Human Performance), Rebecca Powers (Sociology), Tim Christensen (Biology) and Susie Harris (Allied Health Sciences).

The committee will meet soon to begin their work and provide a slate of Faculty Officer nominees to the Faculty Senate on April 26, 2016.

H. Question Period

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) asked about the new allocation of FTEs for summer school and noted how his unit was struggling with the new minimum numbers of enrollment, i.e. undergraduate class minimum of 20 students and graduate class minimum of 15. He noted that some courses his unit planned to offer did not make the minimum although they were a degree requirement for academic units such as engineering. He wondered why they were set higher than the academic year minimums. What is the minimum to break even? Provost Mitchelson responded that the thresholds have existed for years, they were established by a Deans group about five years ago for both f-t-f and DE. For DE this year the university is using state money and tuition. The Provost indicated that any course may be brought to the provost to be considered for delivery despite the lack of enrollment. Pro-rating salary can also be done for courses that do not meet the class enrollment minimums.

**Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business to come before the body.

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

Professor Terry Atkinson (Education), Vice Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 25, 2016 Graduate Council meeting minutes, which included Policy and Curriculum actions (GC 15-25), including revision to the Faculty Manual “Part II, Section IV” to allow Graduate Status for retired/emeritus faculty, revision to the Graduate Catalog policy on “Falsification of information on Graduate Application”; Curriculum actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from December 2, 2015 included packages submitted by the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, Department of Elementary Education and Middle Grades Education, Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education, Department of Human Development and Family Services, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Kinesiology, Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research, and the School of Art and Design.

There was no discussion and curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 25, 2016 Graduate Council meeting minutes, and Curriculum actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from December 2, 2015 were reviewed and approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #16-07**

**Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**

A. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Susannah Berry (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of **February 8, 2016** including
writing intensive (WI) course designation for HIST 3840 and AAAS 2500.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of February 8, 2016, including writing intensive (WI) course designation for HIST 3840 and AAAS 2500 were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-08

B. Committee on Committees
Professor Crystal Chambers (Education), Chair of the Committee presented first the second reading of proposed revision to University Curriculum Committee charge, changing the name to “Undergraduate Curriculum Committee” to be congruent to the standing Graduate Curriculum Committee.

There was no discussion and the proposed revision to the University Curriculum Committee charge was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-09

Professor Chambers then presented the first reading of proposed revisions to Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee charge and that the revisions would change the name of the committee to General Education and Effectiveness and add a committee member seat to be appointed from Student affairs.

Professor Knight (Health and Human Performance) expressed concerns about adding a non-faculty member with vote to a curriculum committee.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) agreed that non-faculty administrators should not be directly involved with curriculum matters or be a part of a faculty curriculum committee.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that the committee currently determines domestic and global diversity course designations and that there were more appropriate committees for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to be a part of.

Professor Kain (English) stated that on the University Curriculum Committee, there are some ex-officio members without faculty status who hold voting privileges and, with issues continuing to arise with COAD initiatives, it might be convenient to have a representative from the Division on the committee to hear the concerns and take part in the discussions.

Professor Chambers (Education) commented that people serving could have educational backgrounds.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that in relation to co-curricular issues, it would be useful to have representatives from student affairs to hear the discussion and he did not think that one more person on the committee, with a faculty majority, would change the activities of the committee, only improve things for students.

Professor Montgomery (English) stated that, if the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or representative was being added as a voting member, the committee charge would need to be changed to include reference to co-curricular activities. She suggested that the Committee on Committees address this and revise to charge to reflect this added responsibility.
Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated that there should not be voting members on a curriculum committee without faculty status because the University’s curriculum is the priority of the faculty. He did not understand the need for giving non-faculty voting rights, quoting that the curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies/Guest), current Chair of the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee reminded Senators that when the Faculty Senate agreed several years ago to add administrators, all were given voting rights. If we follow evolution across the country, within the past 35 years student life has begun to play a larger role in an goodwill attempt to provide a part of the student’s education; with more funding going to these divisions to increase their involvement in academics. The goal was to support student affairs personnel to do whatever they could do to help students. If we can align a standing academic committee with an entity with higher resources, it helps the committee meet faculty goals. He sees it as an opportunity for both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to work more closely together. The task of addressing the general education of students is helpful, given Student Affairs’ increased budget to support their efforts.

Professor Stiller (Chair of the Faculty/Biology) stated that he appreciated the comments expressed and suggestions for the Committee on Committees to consider prior to formal action on these revisions in an upcoming meeting.

C. University Curriculum Committee
Professor Jean-Luc Scemama (Biology), Vice Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 14, 2016 meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Classical Studies, Interdisciplinary Programs, and Multidisciplinary Studies (all within College of Arts and Sciences), College of Education, Department of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Department of Economics, Department of English, Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of History, Department of Mathematics, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Department of Physics, Department of Political Science, Department of Psychology, Department of Sociology and the January 28, 2016 meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Department of Interior Design and Merchandising, Department of Health Education and Promotion, Department of Kinesiology (all within the College of Health and Human Performance), Department of Political Science and College of Education.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 14, 2016 meeting minutes and the January 28, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-10

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Professor Don Chaney (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the February 12, 2016 meeting minutes including a request for authorization to establish a new distance education PhD in Nursing program within the College of Nursing and a request to change a degree title from BS in Merchandising to BS in Fashion Merchandising and Consumer Studies in the Department of Interior Design and Merchandising within the College of Health and Human Performance.
There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the February 12, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #16-11**

Professor Chaney then presented the [Provisional Code of Operations for Laupus Health Sciences Library](#).

There was no discussion and the [Provisional Code of Operations for Laupus Health Sciences Library](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #16-12**

Professor Chaney then presented formal faculty advice on the proposed PRR on Centers and Institutes.

There was no discussion and the proposed PRR on Centers and Institutes was approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #16-13**

**E. Faculty Welfare Committee**

Professor Jacqueline De Chabert-Rios (Business), presented first formal faculty advice on the proposed PRR on Volunteer Regulation, which was provided with the agenda.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated that the PRR was long and that the wording was very technical and wondered if this would take away the University’s responsibility for volunteers. He thought it was a bit intrusive when requiring volunteers to report legal matters. Did the University remain responsible if someone was hurt while volunteering and are people employed at ECU, who also volunteer, covered by this proposed regulation?

Donna Payne, Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, responded that in terms of liability for injury, a volunteer would be anyone who comes on campus except for an employee. She stated that the University is still held accountable for any injuries, whether employee or volunteer and that there was nothing that an employee could do to prevent them from being covered. However, under workers compensation, employees are prohibited from filing a tort claim – which are unpredictable and very costly. So a different set of standards must apply for those employees who volunteer. Vice Chancellor Payne outlined several reasons why we need policies that will protect the university.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) referencing, 5.1.5 “Non-US citizens who do not possess valid work authorizations are not eligible to volunteer.” asked if this means that an international student who is not a US student with work privileges cannot volunteer at ECU. How about classes that require service learning and volunteer engagement on campus? Mrs. Payne replied that those in this situation are allowed to engage in what your visa/immigration documentation allows. The documentation would impose the restrictions on the international student. She stated that these were good questions and that a student who volunteers because of a class responsibility or through service learning and engagement program would be fine. This proposed regulation relates to those who provide volunteer services for the benefit of the University, i.e. summer learning programs.

University Attorney Payne stated that she was not familiar with this particular proposed regulation, but in terms of liability for injury, any visitor to campus that slips and falls contrast that with an employee who falls and hurts. Workers comp is more favorable to an employee versus a volunteer or guest, even if the employee was negligent. This idea goes back to when then-Governor Jim Hunt put into
place an executive order to allow Universities to defend volunteers if there is a volunteer policy. This also relates to the situation a few years ago at Penn State.

Professor Kain (English) asked in reference to conferences, are nonnative students who volunteer to work at the conferences required to fill out the volunteer form. In previous proposed policies, rules and regulations, what faculty can and cannot do are clearly stated. She recommended that a FAQ sheet be formulated to address these specific concerns and be a part of the posted PRR before it is approved and finalized.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that she wanted to make sure that the regulation allowed for international students to participate in volunteer activities. Someone needs to re-read this with a critical eye so as to not prohibit international student from participating in various volunteer opportunities, particularly those embedded within curriculum.

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) stated that the regulation seems to address how to use the services of volunteers but the legal implications of volunteering and focus on the responsibilities of volunteers need to be clearly defined and separated in an easy to understand document.

Professor Stiller, Chair of the Faculty reminded Senators that this proposed regulation was drafted within the Employee Relations Department of ECU's Human Resources and reviewed by University Counsel before being sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for faculty review and consideration.

Professor Christian (Biology) stated that a FAQ document would be helpful. He asked if a volunteer agreement was required now if he volunteered at a baseball game and which volunteer activities require background checks?

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies/Guest) stated that those on tourist visas came to campus to give papers to academic departments, etc. and are volunteering. They do not have permission to work in the United States or to be compensated. He noted that he thought this proposed regulation needed additional work

Professor Fletcher (Medicine) stated that, when it comes to volunteers, he was married to a volunteer, who has a commitment to science and was probably known by more Nobel laureates than many on campus. He expressed his hope that this proposed regulation would not deter volunteers.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) expressed concerns about what happened to students with F1 visas and suggested that the regulation needed to address these types of students too.

Professor Christenson (Biology) moved to send this proposed regulation back to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked, given the expressed concerns and request for a FAQ, how would the proposed regulation be addressed now.

Professor Stiller, Chair of the Faculty stated that, although the proposed regulation was referred back to the Faculty Welfare Committee as a formality, it really needed to go back to the group that authored the proposed regulation, along with the questions that Senators raised during the discussion. He stated that the Faculty Senate office would send an email to Senators asking them to
share any additional specific concerns with the proposed regulation. Any issues received, in addition to all expressed during the meeting, would be sent back to the authors. They would be asked to address these issues in the proposed regulation, and/or return a FAQ with clear explanations of areas that were unclear. Then the Faculty Welfare Committee would review and report again to the Faculty Senate.

Professor De Chabert-Rios then presented formal faculty advice on the proposed PRR on Information Security Regulation.

There was no discussion and the proposed PRR on Information Security Regulation was approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #16-14**

F. Faculty Governance Committee
Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake (Education), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IX, Section I. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures of East Carolina University, subsections I. – IV. and stated the following:

Thank you for considering the report from the Faculty Governance Committee with proposed revisions to Part IX of the Faculty Manual. Revising Part IX requires approval by the Faculty Senate, the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees and ultimately the Board of Governors. The Faculty Governance Committee’s membership includes nine faculty members, the three Vice-Chancellors on the Academic Council and a Representative of the Chancellor. Over the last several years, this team has worked together to revise Part IX to be consistent with the contemporary needs of our Faculty and Units and to conform to state law and the requirements of the UNC General Administration. We have worked to ensure that both tenure track and fixed term faculty, and the processes for their promotion and advancement, were carefully attended to and that faculty would have appropriate and protected voices in the processes that govern faculty.

Although we have addressed a number of aspects of Part IX over recent years, the last time our tenure and promotion policies and procedures were revised as a whole was in January 2007 when Erskine Bowles was President of the UNC system.

We are at a critical juncture with the pending retirement of Chancellor Ballard who supports shared governance and recognizes that the current tenure and promotion policies and procedures do not adequately address the issues of contemporary faculty members, particularly those in units that are moving to patterns in which new hires will not be tenure track, like our libraries. With the collaborative engagement of administrators and faculty members around these revisions, we hope to find support from the Chancellor and ultimately the Board of Trustees and Board of Governors for the revisions for Part IX.

A new chancellor and new President of the UNC system both may require some time to familiarize themselves with the unique faculty governance structure at ECU, and if the proposed changes are not enacted swiftly, the tenure and promotion policies and procedures could remain outdated and not applicable to contemporary faculty and changing academic units.

The committee deeply respects the powerful impact this section of the Faculty Manual has on the success of our institution and the lives of faculty. Like any complex document that affects thousands of people, the version being considered today is the result of compromise. In many ways, the text
represents an effort to reconcile differences between the cultures of east and west campuses. After drafting a comprehensive revision in 2015, the FCG held two open forums and received dozens of detailed comments, which were fully considered and integrated back into a new revision. A full draft of this section was provided to our 2000+ faculty members on February 10, 2016, and dozens of additional detailed comments were addressed by our committee. A final draft was presented to the faculty on February 17, 2016. At that time, a range of further comments were offered, and even as late as last Thursday, the writing group of the FGC was working to address a few last items. Three specific sections were redrafted and are offered today as amendments to the text from February 17th.

We share this information to clarify the extensive input on this document from faculty across the University, as well as the critical nature of getting it right and achieving approval this time. We believe that the proposed revision before you is a greatly improved and far more relevant version of Part IX that will effectively meet the needs of contemporary faculty and provide the structure necessary to support faculty engagement in governance and access to due process. Thank you for your thoughtful feedback as we have worked to complete this task. We appreciate the time and attention you have each given to considering this document."

Professor Sigounas (Medicine) moved to strike the reference to “fixed-term faculty members” in personnel actions in their unit codes (lines 729-730 and 794-796) unless it relates to other academic units, because it does not relate to the School of Medicine.

Professor Campbell (Allied Health Sciences) stated that his unit did have fixed term faculty who were not pursuing tenure and the text would help his academic unit. He noted that his unit was updating their unit code of operations and would vote on the document in April and he would make sure, if approved, these changes were included.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated these pieces would help those units structuring different academic units. “Units” are defined differently across campus, so this wording now allows units to use different models and not have to disfranchise those who work daily on the efforts of faculty within a unit.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked if Allied Health Sciences’ unit code currently included fixed term faculty in personnel actions, because the manual does not allow it.

Professor Anderson (Education) stated that there were many things that would be slight changes to various academic units. Defining personnel committees to include fixed term faculty are found in some codes and not in others. The control on this would be what is stated in the unit codes drafted and approved by the faculty within the unit.

Professor Gilliland (Medicine) spoke against the motion and stated that it was valuable to many of us. The School of Medicine will have to change in order to get around this and she stated that she has not heard a groundswell to take on this issue.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that we definitely don’t want to specify the wording for any particular unit’s code of operation since this has to go all the way up when making changes. This is enabling language that would allow those units who chose to allow fixed term faculty to participate in personnel matters if they choose to. If a department chooses not to do this then it is ok too. Tenure and promotion actions remain under the control of tenured faculty.
Professor Roberson (Nursing) stated that the College of Nursing also has a large number of fixed term faculty who are needed and serve the school well. We have a task force to address some issues and find this language inclusive of our current activities.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) spoke against the amendment stating that this language does not affect the School of Medicine unless the faculty decide to change their unit code and opens the opportunity for other units who wish to change their unit codes to allow more fixed term faculty involvement in the inner workings of the unit.

The motion to strike the reference to “fixed-term faculty members” in personnel actions in their unit codes (lines 729-730 and 794-796) unless it relates to other academic units failed.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) complimented the Committee for their hard work and wanted to address the progress toward tenure letters referenced in 3 paragraphs, beginning on line 471. He understood that the revised text was an attempt to provide more guidelines for those drafting progress toward tenure letters requiring too much information but it had muddied the waters and he thought the old language was preferable because it left it up to the particular units by and how they wished to address the issues. He expressed a desire to see the requirements for satisfactory and unsatisfactory removed from the document. Professor Dotson-Blake (Chair of the Committee) stated that this section was expanded to address feedback from faculty participating in the open forums. Those comments from faculty included if it was just a summation of what was included in the vita, then faculty should just read the vitas.

Professor Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies) stated that faculty were anxious to have binary summations of ratings. People were wedded to summation ratings to let faculty know where they are headed. This text requires faculty to write blunt, formative advice and clear guidelines on how candidates can meet the requirements of the unit. More detailed advice can be provided if we stop focusing on the rating summation. If it comes down to only one word – then candidates are short-changed and we, as a committee, want unit personnel committees to help guide faculty members on how they are progressing and not focus solely on summative ratings.

Professor Powers (Sociology) stated that the progress toward tenure letters were necessary but unsure about the summative rating. How will this play out over time. Within her unit, there are 5 full professors, with 3 retiring within a few years. If she were to get a progress toward letter now and try to go up to full professor within 3 years, the vagueness included in the letter would last longer than specific details written by the 3 older retiring faculty members who were no longer a part of the academic unit. Professor Dotson-Blake replied that the committee engaged in vigorous debate of the utility of progress toward tenure letters but heard back in forums and feedback from faculty across the university that these letters are wanted by a majority of the faculty.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that there was some push back about not giving summative ratings and those who asked what was the difference between poor, etc. He felt that this way was the best way to give those candidates input from the faculty and administrator.

Professor Francia (Political Science) stated that he was aware of his radical positon and thought that progress toward tenure letters was not necessary no matter what system ECU adopted. It only
created confusion within departments because units are doing it different ways no matter how you write it in a policy. He suggested that the policy eliminate the letters, noting that faculty were all adults and needed to find out what we is required to reach tenure.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that it was difficult to forge a consensus on progress toward tenure letters and he agreed with Professor Francia. The progress toward tenure letters should be two to coincide with the typical schedule of reappointment. If you are reappointed you are making progress, and if you are not reappointed, you are fired.

Professor Gruder (Economics) stated that, in his case, the progress toward tenure letters were helpful and he supported the language and thought it needed to be kept in the proposed policy. Publish or perish and we want everyone to get tenure that we hire. Progress toward tenure letters provide the opportunity to use particular science criteria when writing the letters. Faculty in my unit don’t want to limit ourselves to specific ratings.

Professor Kain (English) stated that she was confused as to why we were doing an annual report and progress toward tenure letters and 2 and 4 year letters at the same time of doing annual reports. If a faculty member is getting one every year, sometime it takes you more than one year to get something done. It is dangerous if you get a good progress toward tenure letter and then at reappointment it is an even better letter and then at the time of a tenure decision, there are questions. She noted that it may be too much wording that causes confusion and leads to problems.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that faculty provided a great deal of feedback to the Governance committee during the open forums, via email and in many other ways, and consistently expressed a desire for ratings.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) moved to strike “of satisfactory or unsatisfactory” from the sentence on lines 476-479 and allow the units to come up with the rating, strengths and weaknesses and stated that his specific concern was with the binary choice because in almost all instances it was going to be a satisfactory rating and understood that we all need to include more text in the letters, but an unsatisfactory rating will be rarely used. He stated he, himself had received progress toward tenure letters with different ratings every year. Professor Montgomery (English) offered a friendly amendment to keep the word “while” and Professor Popke agreed. She then spoke in favor of the motion and stated that the majority of the committee did not want satisfactory or unsatisfactory ratings.

Professor Morris (Political Science/member of the Faculty Governance Committee) spoke against the amendment because it opens up the summative wording and does not focus on the actual words used to evaluate faculty. He stated that in these letters faculty have to use their words and to go to this binary summative language without any specificity will be a wide range if we don’t specify summative languages there will be problems down the line.

Professor Gruder (Economics) stated that academic units are different and the criticism is exactly what we are trying to accomplish.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that the descriptive language in the progress toward tenure letters should be what counts. The summative statement is just a red herring on this document. The best solution would be to eliminate the letters all together.
Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that during the process of the Part IX revisions, the current discussion on the floor is the same discussion that took place within the committee meetings. We agreed to have summative ratings to eliminate unclear messages but then faculty told us that the summative ratings mattered. Therefore, this is the consensus of the committee because this is what most faculty wanted and believed they needed.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked if the faculty asking for the summative ratings those with tenure or those on probationary term and felt they needed a rating to feel comfortable with where they were in the process. If it is those in the process, shouldn’t we want to help those going through the process?

Professor Stiller (Chair of the Faculty) stated that most came from those in the promotion and tenure workshops, which included academic deans, department chairs and chairs of personnel committees.

Professor Christian (Business) spoke against the motion to strike the words and stated that he thought we needed to continue to give guidance to the faculty coming up for tenure.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that too many people wanted to use just one word in the evaluations.

Following the discussion, the motion to remove the words “of satisfactory or unsatisfactory” from the sentence on lines 476-479 so that the sentence would read “While the letter shall include an overall summative rating progress towards tenure, those ratings shall not substitute for thorough narrative evaluations of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.” was approved.

Professor Christensen (Biology) moved to strike references to "multiple candidates" at lines 894-896, 948-950 and 958-961 in the document that reads as follows"

“In cases where multiple candidates are being considered for promotion, a unit may decide to constitute different subcommittees in an effort to ensure candidates are reviewed by committee members with relevant expertise.” (894-896)

“In cases where multiple candidates are being considered for promotion, a unit may decide to constitute different subcommittees in an effort to ensure candidates are reviewed by committee members with relevant expertise.” (948-950)

“In cases where multiple candidates are being considered for promotion, a unit may decide to constitute different committees for each candidate in an effort to ensure candidates are reviewed by committee members with relevant expertise.” (958-961)

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) stated that striking the text about “multiple candidates” allows subcommittees of tenure committees to address preparing progress toward tenure letters but does not allow that same action for promotion committees, thereby setting forth additional roles for tenure committees, i.e. units cannot elect subcommittees to be formed to consider promotions.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that the tenured committee was always in charge of external reviewers, regardless of promotion actions.
Following discussion, the motion to strike these sentences were approved as presented.

Professor Christensen (Biology) made a motion to replace text in Section 2.Voting Procedures for Personnel Actions, (b) at lines 1271-1304 with the following:

“(b) Faculty recommendations for reappointment, promotion and conferral of permanent tenure shall come from the appropriate committee (see Section IV.A). Within fifteen working days of notification by the unit administrator of the need to initiate a personnel action, the chair of the unit Personnel Committee appropriate committee shall convene a meeting of the appropriate committee (see subsection IV.E.1.). Five calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting to deliberate and vote on the required personnel decision, the committee or a subcommittee elected by the appropriate committee in accordance with Section IV will prepare a draft cumulative evaluation in narrative form. This draft evaluation shall be prepared based on the candidate’s Personnel Action Dossier and shall evaluate his or her strengths and weaknesses in light of the unit’s established criteria, similar to the evaluations of Progress Toward Tenure conducted annually during the probationary term.

At the scheduled meeting described above, the committee shall discuss and edit the draft cumulative evaluation and subsequently choose the method to vote by secret ballot on the recommendation for promotion and/or conferral of permanent tenure. The committee’s deliberations may address any of the candidate’s professional activities and conduct. If the committee chooses to vote on the recommendation at this meeting, the vote will be taken by secret ballot. Immediately following this vote on the recommendation and prior to the adjournment of the meeting, the committee may finalize and vote on approval of the cumulative evaluation. If the committee chooses to vote by mail as described below, it may decide to reconvene in a later meeting to revise and approve the cumulative evaluation.

The committee members may choose to vote by mail according to the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. At the scheduled meeting described above, the committee shall discuss, edit, and vote on the draft cumulative evaluation. If a motion to vote on the recommendation by mail is approved by a majority of the committee members present and voting, voting on the recommendation shall be by mail. If a committee chooses to vote on the recommendation by mail, all members must vote by mail. In the event that the university officially adopts a secure and confidential system for online voting, the committee may elect to use it in place of mailed ballots as described in subsection d below.

For limitations on participation in personnel actions due to potential conflicts of interest, see Part IX, subsection IV.A.3.

A committee shall not reconsider a vote on a cumulative evaluation or personnel recommendation after the committee has notified the unit administrator of its recommendation.”

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) expressed support for this replacement text and thought it was much better. He asked if the goal was to provide tenure and promotion committees with leeway on how they vote on the recommendations for progress towards tenure and how they vote on the cumulative evaluations.
Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) replied that the Governance committee did not think the committee should sit down and decide on the final wording of the letter at the same time that they take a vote. The final details of the cumulative evaluation should not be written immediately after the vote. It should be ok for the committee to meet later to draft the letter.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) offered an amendment to strike from the 2nd paragraph “If the committee chooses to vote by mail as described below”.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) stated that the intent of that sentence was to allow an exception to allow a vote to occur by mail instead of putting two votes in an envelope.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that removing that sentence messes the process up.

Professor Hernandez (History) stated that the text still allows the committee to reconvene so that amendment may not be actually necessary.

Following discussion, the amendment to strike from the 2nd paragraph “If the committee chooses to vote by mail as described below” failed.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) offered an amendment to add “on the recommendation” to the same sentence that was just discussed, so that the sentence would read “If the committee chooses to vote on the recommendation by mail as described below, it may decide to reconvene in a later meeting to revise and approve the cumulative evaluation.” The amendment passed.

Professor Powers (Sociology) asked if “strengths and weaknesses” meant to explain the majority and minority vote? Professor Montgomery (English) replied that this was the language we already use and was used for the administrator’s up-the-chain so they would know what was voted on.

Following discussion, the motion to replace all of the text in Section 2.Voting Procedures for Personnel Actions, (b) at lines 1271-1304 was approved as amended.

Professor Hoover (Academic Library Services) made a motion to remove under 7. Notice of Resignation” on line 273 the words “multi-year appointment” since some faculty do have one year contracts.

Professor Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) noted that for those faculty members on one year contracts, the wording was not necessary, its intent was just the sense in timing for fixed term contracts.

The motion to strike “multi-year appointment” failed.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the ECU Faculty Manual, Part IX, Section I. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures of East Carolina University, subsections I. – IV. were approved as amended. RESOLUTION #16-15

Agenda Item VII. New Business
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:28 pm.
Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE FEBRUARY 23, 2016, MEETING

Resolution #16-07
Formal faculty advice with no changes to the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council’s meeting minutes of January 25, 2016, which included Policy and Curriculum actions (GC 15-25), including revision to the Faculty Manual “Part II, Section IV” to allow Graduate Status for retired/emeritus faculty, revision to the Graduate Catalog policy on “Falsification of information on Graduate Application”; Curriculum actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from December 2, 2015 included packages submitted by the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, Department of Elementary Education and Middle Grades Education, Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education, Department of Human Development and Family Services, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Kinesiology, Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research, and the School of Art and Design.

Resolution #16-08
Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of February 8, 2016, including writing intensive (WI) course designation for HIST 3840 and AAAS 2500.

Resolution #16-09
Revised University Curriculum Committee charge, as noted below.

(Deletion is noted in strikethrough and addition in bold print.)

1. Name: University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

2. Membership:
8 elected faculty members.
Ex-officio members (with vote): The Chancellor or an appointed representative, the Provost or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences 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 exclusive of ex-officio.

4. Committee Responsibilities:
A. The committee considers undergraduate courses (through 4000-level) and programs and has the responsibility of assuring the quality of course offerings regardless of mode of course delivery.

B. The committee recommends policies and procedures governing the acceptability of programs and courses.

C. The committee reviews requests for permission to establish new degree programs, certificates, and minors.

D. The committee reviews and acts on proposals for new courses and course revisions.

E. The committee reviews and acts on proposals for new degree programs, certificates, and minors and on revisions to established degree programs, certificates, and minors.

F. The committee reviews and acts on revisions to the standards and requirements for admission to and retention in degree programs, certificates, and minors.

G. The committee considers other items that affect the curriculum of undergraduate programs.

H. The committee acts on recommendations from the Council for Teacher Education regarding proposed changes in teacher education requirements.

I. The Committee reviews at least annually those sections within the University Undergraduate Catalog that corresponds to the Committee’s charge and recommends changes as necessary.

J. The chair or appointed representative serves as a member on the Academic Program Development Collaborative Team, and as appropriate, any university-wide administrative committee that involves undergraduate curriculum.

5. To Whom The Committee Reports:
The committee makes its recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The committee reports on its review of requests to establish new degree programs and requests to establish new minors to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee.

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 report on its review of requests to establish new degree programs and requests to establish new minors to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee.

8. Standard Meeting Time:
The committee meeting time is scheduled for the second and fourth Thursday of each month.

Resolution #16-10
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of January 14, 2016, including curricular actions within the Classical Studies, Interdisciplinary Programs, and Multidisciplinary Studies (all within College of Arts and Sciences), College of Education, Department of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Department of
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Economics, Department of English, Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of History, Department of Mathematics, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Department of Physics, Department of Political Science, Department of Psychology, Department of Sociology and the Committee’s meeting minutes of January 28, 2016, including curricular actions within the Department of Interior Design and Merchandising, Department of Health Education and Promotion, Department of Kinesiology (all within the College of Health and Human Performance), Department of Political Science and College of Education.

Resolution #16-11  
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s meeting minutes of February 12, 2016, including a request for authorization to establish a new distance education PhD in Nursing program within the College of Nursing and a request to change a degree title from BS in Merchandising to BS in Fashion Merchandising and Consumer Studies in the Department of Interior Design and Merchandising within the College of Health and Human Performance.

Resolution #16-12  
Provisional Code of Operations for Laupus Health Sciences Library

Resolution #16-13  
Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on Centers and Institutes, with no additional changes being recommended.

1. Introduction, Purpose, and Definitions  

East Carolina University (ECU) encourages multidisciplinary and multi-institutional partnerships that maximize the ability to address complex problems of importance to North Carolina, the nation, and the world. Such partnerships may take the form of centers and institutes. Centers and institutes are particularly effective structures when efforts require cross-disciplinary or cross-unit coordination. Centers and institutes, when formed, should result in strengthened and enriched programs around the core missions of research, service, and instruction; enhanced opportunities for faculty, staff and students; heightened economic impact and societal well-being in Eastern NC and the State; increased efficiency; and reduced duplication of effort. Centers and institutes are expected to consolidate and coordinate activities across multiple entities or disciplines, or catalyze implementation of new multi-disciplinary initiatives, and therefore will encompass more than one department, office, or institution.

UNC Policy Manual 400.5[R] provides guidelines for establishing and managing institutional centers and institutes; defines University System Multi-Campus Centers or Institutes and the oversight role of UNC General Administration (UNC-GA); and outlines expectations for management oversight and reporting on centers and institutes. In accordance with these guidelines, the Chancellor approved the following Policy governing planning, establishing, reviewing and operating for Centers and Institutes with ECU as their administrative home.
1.1. Purpose
1.1.1. Providing guidelines for planning, establishment, management, and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes;
1.1.2. Providing guidelines for management and oversight of centers and institutes at East Carolina University (ECU); and
1.1.3. Setting forth requirements for management oversight and reporting on centers and institutes.

1.2. Definitions
1.2.1. “Center or Institute.” For purposes of classification, there is no technical distinction between the terms center and institute. In practice, an institute frequently refers to an entity having a broader scope of activity than a center. For example, an institute may create centers as separate units within its administrative structure. Centers and institutes may require new infrastructures to facilitate administration, fiscal management, and on-going activities. Centers and institutes may involve only units within the institution, or may include the participation of other institutions, agencies, or organizations, such as other colleges and universities, schools, hospitals, industry, foundations, or governmental bodies. Centers and institutes do not have jurisdiction over academic curricula, although they may offer courses in cooperation with academic units.

1.2.2. “General Fund sources” means financial resources originating from the State’s General Fund, including state appropriations and tuition receipts.

1.2.3. “Non-General Fund sources” means financial resources originating from sources other than the State’s General Fund, including fee receipts, endowment income, institutional trust funds, and outside grants.

1.2.4. “In-Kind sources” means support that one or more constituent institutions provides to a center or institute in the form of space, services, graduate assistantships, faculty course buyout, or use of equipment or other materials, and for which it does not receive cash payment.

1.2.5. “Political activity” means, as described in Section 300.5.1 of the UNC Policy Manual, actions directed toward the success or failure of a candidate for public office, political party, or partisan political group including, but not limited to, campaigning, political management, and soliciting financial contributions for political purposes.

2. Policy Provisions for Centers and Institutes
2.1. The following provisions apply to centers and institutes with ECU as their administrative home.

2.1.1. Authority

2.1.1.1. Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees approves campus level policies on centers and institutes and authorizes establishment and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes consistent with regulations and the directions of the president or the Board of Governors. The Board of Trustees may delegate to the Chancellor the authority to approve the discontinuation of centers and institutes.

2.1.1.2. Chancellor. The Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the oversight and management of all centers and institutes at ECU. The Chancellor is responsible for carrying out the requirements of the applicable policies of the
Board of Governors and Board of Trustees with respect to centers and institutes, and for ensuring that all requirements of this Policy are implemented and followed. The Chancellor delegates authority for division-level administration of centers and institutes to the Academic Council (Provost, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, and Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement).

### 2.1.1.3. Centers and Institutes Committee

The Centers and Institutes Committee oversees all centers and institutes at ECU and ensures operations are in compliance with the established policies and procedures. The Committee reports to Academic Council. It is charged with carrying out the following duties:

1. **Establish the composition and membership of the Committee;**
2. **Ensure alignment between the University’s Centers and Institutes Policies and Procedures and the UNC Policy Manual, and advise the Academic Council on changes to the institution’s policies and procedures to rectify discrepancies;**
3. **Authorize permission to plan for new centers and institutes;**
4. **Authorize or recommend, as appropriate, establishment of new centers and institutes;**
5. **Establish the processes for periodic review of centers and institutes and their directors for performance relative to their stated objectives, goals, and mission;**
6. **Oversee conduct of periodic reviews of the established centers and institutes and their directors;**
7. **Recommend discontinuation of centers and institutes when warranted;**
8. **Liaise with UNCGA on issues related to centers and institutes.**

### 2.1.1.4. Directors

Each center or institute must have a director, with a direct report to a senior academic officer appointed by the Chancellor. Directors are responsible for the day-to-day programmatic, fiscal, and personnel decisions associated with the center and institute mission and core personnel.

### 2.1.1.5. Boards and advisory committees

Each center and institute with ECU as its administrative home will maintain a board or advisory committee of at least four members that represent the primary constituents. The boards or advisory committees will report to the directors, providing advice and guidance, and helping coordinate. The board and advisory committees do not have authority to make hiring offers or to discontinue directors or other staff or to access, use, or otherwise control funds associated with the center or institute.

### 2.1.1.6. Bylaws, memoranda of understanding, and other governing documents

Commitments, responsibilities, and interactions of the constituent departments, colleges, schools, divisions, and institutions involved in activities of centers and institutes with their administrative home at ECU must be defined by bylaws, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), or other governing documents such as the original proposal that is signed by all parties. All documents defining the commitments, responsibilities, and working relationships of the above-referenced entities must be approved by the
Chancellor or the Chancellor’s Designee. Centers and institutes that involve multiple campuses, but without such documents, are considered under the full authority of the administrative campus.

3. Obtaining Authorization to Plan Centers and Institutes
   3.1. Units seeking permission to plan a center or institute will develop and submit a written proposal which includes the following required information:
   3.1.1. Name of the proposed center or institute;
   3.1.2. Relevance of the proposed center or institute to the mission of ECU and UNC;
   3.1.3. Specific objectives and goals of the proposed center or institute and why the objectives and goals cannot be achieved within existing institutional or UNC structures, including individual schools, departments, and/or programs;
   3.1.4. Discussion of differentiation from similar centers, institutes or units (if any) within ECU, UNC and the State, and proposed relationship with them;
   3.1.5. Center/institute’s relevance to ECU’s mission, including a statement on the impact upon academic, research, and outreach programs of existing academic departments, schools, institutes and centers;
   3.1.6. Names and credentials of participants in the proposed institute/center and criteria for inclusion of future participants/members;
   3.1.7. Description of the expected benefit/value added to the campus or community anticipated within five years due to the existence of the center or institute;
   3.1.8. Budget estimates for the first year of operation, and projections for the following four years, including the amount to be derived from General Funds, non-General Funds and in kind support, and the source of the required funds (i.e., department, institution, sponsor, etc.);
   3.1.9. Statement of capital needs such as equipment and library resources and documentation of how these needs will be met, such as MOU’s, award notices, and letters of commitment from the sources of the resources;
   3.1.10. Description of immediate space needs, projections of future space needs, and documentation of commitments from the parties committing the space for center and institute activities;
   3.1.11. Plan for becoming self-sustaining and independent of General Funds and ongoing in-kind support including course buyouts and release time for center and institute directors, faculty, and staff; and graduate assistantships used to support operations. Any requirement for ongoing support from General Funds and in-kind support must be justified by the benefits derived from the activities of the center or institute;
   3.1.12. When relevant, statements on the inter-institutional nature of the proposed center or institute, whether it be mission, leadership, activities, funding or other aspects;
   3.1.13. Milestones, timelines, and responsible parties associated with center and institute planning periods.
   3.1.14. Any additional supporting information; and
   3.1.15. Signatures of administrators of all participating units.

3.2. Submission of Proposal to Plan
   3.2.1. Proposals to plan centers and institutes must be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement for referral to the
Educational Policies and Planning Committee and the Centers and Institutes Committee. The Centers and Institutes Committee reviews the proposals, considers input from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, and recommends approval or disapproval of the proposal to plan to the Academic Council and the Chancellor. If the Chancellor authorizes the planning of a center or institute then the approval to plan shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees and the UNC Office of Research within 30 days of the Chancellor’s approval or by the next meeting of the Board of Trustees, whichever is later.

3.3. Obtaining Authorization to Establish Centers and Institutes

3.3.1. After receiving permission to plan a center or institute, units seeking permission to establish a center or institute will develop and submit the following required information:

3.3.1.1. Name of the proposed center or institute;
3.3.1.2. Identification of the proposed center or institute as either primarily research, service or instructional;
3.3.1.3. Statement on the anticipated effects of the proposed unit on the instructional, research and/or public service programs of the administrative campus; and, when inter-institutional arrangements are involved, a statement on the impact upon academic, research, and outreach programs of existing academic departments, schools, institutes and centers of all participating campuses;
3.3.1.4. Organizational structure, including name of the proposed director, description of the membership, proposed organizational structure, and a description of proposed advisory or policy boards;
3.3.1.5. Statement on immediate financial needs, including the amount of General Fund, non-General Fund, and in kind support that will be required;
3.3.1.6. Statement on immediate operating needs, such as equipment, library resources, and space needs, and five-year projections of future space needs;
3.3.1.7. An accountability plan that complies with the policy of the home campus, noting specific dates for the initial director and center or institute reviews;
3.3.1.8. A schedule of milestones, timeliness, and responsible parties associated with establishment; and
3.3.1.9. When relevant, evidence that inter-institutional arrangements regarding leadership, governance, activities, or funding of other aspects have been reached by the cooperating chancellors or designees.

3.4. Submission of Proposal to Establish

3.4.1. Proposals to establish centers and institutes must be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement for referral to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee and the Centers and Institutes Committee. The Centers and Institutes Committee reviews the proposals, considers input from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, and recommends approval or disapproval of the establishment of the center or institute to the Academic Council and the Chancellor. A proposed center or institute satisfying all the above-referenced criteria may be established after approval of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees and notification to the Office of Research at UNC General Administration.

3.5. Reporting and Reviews
3.5.1. All centers and institutes must submit an annual report of activities to the Centers and Institutes Committee via the Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement for archiving and transmission to the Academic Council and the Chancellor. Annual reports must include:
   3.5.1.1. Performance against the stated objectives;
   3.5.1.2. Annual expenditures from General Funds, non-General Funds and in kind support;
   3.5.1.3. Source of the expended funds (i.e., department, institution, and/or sponsor); and
   3.5.1.4. Progress on the plan to self-sustaining and independent of General Funds and ongoing in-kind support including course buyouts and release time for center and institute directors, faculty, and staff; and graduate assistants used to support operations. For centers and institutes that require ongoing support from General Funds and in-kind support the benefits derived from the activities of the center or institute relative to the funds expended must be clearly stated.

3.6. The Centers and Institutes Committee will report deficiencies in performance to the directors and ensure corrective actions are implemented annually.

3.7. Each center and institute must undergo a comprehensive review every 5 years to evaluate ongoing alignment with departmental, college and/or institutional missions and resources, success in accomplishing stated objectives, and sound fiscal status and practices, to include a self-study that is critically evaluated by reviewers not affiliated with the center or institute. Reviews of centers and institutes that receive more than $100,000 in General Funds plus in-kind support annually, or that are authorized to receive distributions of indirect costs through the Division of Research, Economic Development, and Engagement, must include reviewers from outside the institution and onsite visits. The Centers and Institutes Committee will schedule, orchestrate, and document results of the reviews. Review criteria will include, but not limited to, the following:

   3.7.1. Performance against specific objectives and goals as reported in annual reports;
   3.7.2. Quality and quantity of scholarly activity (as appropriate per mission), teaching and other instructional activity (as appropriate per mission), and service (as appropriate per mission);
   3.7.3. Budget required to continue operation, including the amount and proportion of funds received from General Fund and non-General Fund sources as well as in kind support;
   3.7.4. Fiscal oversight;
   3.7.5. Analysis and assurance that the entity does not duplicate other institutional, UNC, or State entities;
   3.7.6. Analysis and consideration as to whether the entity’s work can be effectively accomplished by a single department or program;
   3.7.7. Facilities, personnel, and operational needs;
   3.7.8. Stakeholder feedback (stakeholder defined as appropriate per the unit’s mission)
   3.7.9. Director performance, to include at a minimum:
      3.7.9.1. Performance against individual objectives and goals;
3.7.9.2. Feedback on leadership and communication from center/institute staff, partners and/or clients; and
3.7.9.3. Management of fiscal and human resources.
3.7.10. Standard practices and procedures for involving other UNC constituent institutions in review processes, when relevant; and
3.7.11. Clear plans for occasions when centers, institutes or directors do not meet minimum review expectations, including process, milestones, and responsible parties.

3.8. Results of the reviews will be reported to Academic Council and forwarded to the Chancellor.

3.9. Discontinuing
3.9.1. A center or institute may be discontinued for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to request by its director, its administrative unit, Academic Council, or Chancellor; lack of fiscal resources for sustainability; incompatibility with departmental, college, or institutional missions or objectives; failure to meet performance expectations; unsatisfactory performance as documented in the annual review process and confirmed in the 5 year comprehensive review; and completion of the mission. The Centers and Institutes Committee will make recommendations for discontinuation to the Academic Council for approval by the Chancellor. The Office of Research at UNC General Administration must be notified prior to discontinuation. A center or institute shall be considered discontinued if the discontinuation is approved by the Board of Trustees.
3.9.2. 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 of the administrative campus. If such an agreement cannot be reached by partner Chancellors or designees, then UNC General Administration, through the Office of Research, will convene partners and determine an acceptable solution.
3.9.3. The “phase-out” period for centers and institutes that are to be discontinued shall be sufficient to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations and to allow an effort to find alternative employment for full-time staff. Normally, the “phase-out” period shall be no more than one year after the end of the academic year in which final approval is given to discontinue the center or institute.

4. Other Entities
4.1 Other coordinating entities, such as networks, partnerships, consortia, collaboratives, or centers that form within existing centers or single departments, are exempt from this Policy. For example, faculty within a department may decide to form a collaborative in order to more intentionally connect their research projects and professional networks. While such a group may prove a valuable resource to external partners or other disciplinary contacts, it would likely require little to no structure, funds, or management to function. A final determination will be left to the discretion of the Centers and Institutes Committee as to whether such entities will be governed under institution level processes.
4.2 University System Multi-Campus Centers and Institutes
4.2.2 Some centers and institutes are established either to represent North Carolina in a
federally funded and formula-based program, many of which require state matching funds, or through legislative action with requirements of multiple campus engagement. These entities, known as University System Multi-Campus Centers and Institutes, will maintain varying levels of involvement from UNC General Administration throughout their life cycle.

4.2.3 Centers and institutes that are established via a federally funded and formula-based program and designate ECU as the administrative campus require a reporting line to UNC General Administration through the UNC Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to ensure appropriate system level involvement in the center mission and the federal review processes for these centers, institutes, and their directors. These entities shall reach agreements with their administrative campuses to have any regularly occurring and extensive federal review meet the requirement for periodic external review. A center or institute participating in a federally-funded and formula-based matching program may be discontinued if the sponsoring unit of the federal government terminates funding for the program. When it becomes necessary to discontinue one of these centers or institutes, the Centers and Institutes Committee, in consultation with the other participating constituent institutions, will prepare and forward a written request to the UNC President, with copy to the Vice President for Research. The President will then make such recommendations as are necessary to the Board of Governors for approval of the discontinuation. The “phase out” period considerations noted above will apply to these centers and institutes.

4.2.4 Centers and institutes that function as part of one or more constituent institutions of the UNC system are subject to the administrative management, oversight, and control of the chancellor of the administrative campus (or the chancellor’s designee(s)) as to all activities undertaken by the center or institute, including with respect to the use of funds, services, supplies, equipment, information technology resources, vehicles or other University property.

5. Political Activity and Legislative Activity

5.1. University employees assigned to centers and institutes are subject to UNC Policy Manual Section 300.5.1, concerning Political Activities of Employees, which includes prohibitions against engaging in political activity while on duty and using the authority of one’s position or University or center or institute funds, services, supplies, equipment, information technology resources, vehicles or other resources for such activities, as described in the policy.

5.2. The Internal Revenue Code (IRC) limits the extent to which charitable organizations that are tax-exempt pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the IRC may engage in activities directed towards influencing legislation (lobbying), subject to applicable exceptions. The University is a tax-exempt body, and each center or institute remains subject to the direction of its administrative campus when engaging in legislative (lobbying) activities, which shall be conducted in compliance with all State and federal laws, including regulations adopted by the U.S. Department of Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service. Each center or institute shall adhere to the IRC Section 501(c)(3) limits on lobbying activities to the same extent that such limits would apply if it were an independent charitable organization described in IRC Section 501(c)(3).

5.3. The Chancellor (or Chancellor’s designee) is responsible for overseeing and exercising control over the activities of each center or institute, and for ensuring that the director and professional staff of each center or institute receive comprehensive annual training concerning Internal Revenue Code restrictions on political and legislative activities by
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Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on Information Security, recommending one deletion noted by strikethrough in section 6.1. below.

1. Definitions

1.1. Administrative Head: The administrative director of a university department, such as an academic department chair, an administrative department director, or a college dean. Administrative Heads manage departmental operations and direct the use of departmental resources.

1.2. Employee: A person employed by the University or who serves as a university volunteer. This includes anyone performing work on behalf of the University, such as staff and faculty members, student workers, contractors, and volunteers.

1.3. Information Security: The protection of information from unauthorized and/or unlawful access, use, destruction, and/or loss. Information Security is a business process for achieving university objectives, such as protecting the privacy rights of individuals; ensuring the availability of University Information and IT resources; and complying with federal regulations, state laws and contractual obligations.

1.4. University Information: Information in any form (e.g., electronic, printed or spoken) that is collected, created, stored, distributed or otherwise used by Employees in the course and scope of their employment or volunteer responsibilities, respectively, for any university purpose, including, but not limited to teaching, research, and service.

2. Policy and Purpose

2.1. It is the policy of East Carolina University that Employees shall protect University Information from unauthorized and/or unlawful access, use, disclosure, destruction, and/or loss.

2.2. This Regulation defines Employee and Administrative Head responsibility for Information Security and establishes an administrative structure that facilitates the protection of University Information in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, contractual requirements, and university policies and standards.

3. Scope

3.1. This Regulation applies to all Employees.

4. Guiding Principles

4.1. Information is a strategic university asset. University Information is a valuable asset upon which the University depends to achieve its strategic objectives, carry out its mission and fulfill its commitments to stakeholders. Consequently, University Information must be managed and protected in the same basic manner as other strategic assets (e.g., financial and physical assets).
4.2. Every employee is responsible for Information Security. Information Security is far more about people than technology. Information technology is simply a tool that helps us do things better and faster, but cannot by itself protect University Information from misuse and loss. Consequently, all Employees are responsible for protecting the University Information in their care.

4.3. Information Security is an essential business function of every department. Administrative Heads shall ensure that University Information and IT systems within their respective departments are used appropriately and are adequately protected, just as they do for other institutional assets. While IT support personnel may assist this effort by providing technical advice and solutions, many Information Security safeguards can only be taken by Employees while handling University Information and using IT systems.

5. Employee and Management Responsibilities

5.1. Employees: Employees shall take reasonable precautions to protect University Information from unauthorized and/or unlawful access, use, disclosure, destruction, and/or loss.

5.1.1. Employees shall adhere to all Information Security requirements that are relevant to their assigned roles and responsibilities. This includes federal regulations, state laws, contractual requirements, university policies and ECU Information Security Best Practices and Standards.

5.1.2. Employees shall complete university designated information security training within 30 days of employment and university designated refresher training no less than once every two years.

5.2. Administrative Heads: Administrative Heads are responsible for ensuring the security of all University Information as it is collected, created, accessed, distributed or otherwise handled by their respective departments, as well as of the security of IT systems and services provided or managed by their respective departments.

5.2.1. Administrative Heads shall ensure their employees are aware of their Information Security responsibilities and adhere to all applicable regulations, laws, contractual requirements, university policies and ECU Information Security Best Practices and Standards.

5.3. Chief Information Security Officer (CISO): The Chief Information Security Officer shall manage the University Information Security Program, a collection of enterprise policies, standards and guidance.

5.3.1. The CISO shall develop and maintain university policies and standards that guide and support departmental management of Information Security.

5.3.2. The CISO shall manage the University Employee Awareness Program to promote university-wide awareness of essential employee responsibilities and basic best practices for Information Security. Upon request, the CISO shall provide guidance to Administrative Heads on supplementing the University Employee Awareness Program to address department-specific needs for employee awareness and training.

5.3.3. The CISO shall coordinate the University Information Risk Management Program and advise university and departmental leadership on the identification and management of
risks associated with the handling of University Information and the use of IT systems and services.

5.3.4. The CISO shall coordinate the activities of the University Security Incident Response Team (SIRT), which oversees the University’s response to Information Security incidents. The SIRT assesses risks to individual privacy, facilitates and/or manages data breach notifications, and coordinates its activities with university compliance offices where appropriate.

6. Violations

6.1. Violation of this Regulation may result in disciplinary action being taken in accordance with applicable university policy, up to and including termination from employment.
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