

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2016

The eighth regular meeting of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, April 19, 2016, at 2:10 pm in the Mendenhall Great Rooms.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

Action on the February 23, 2016 and March 15, 2016 minutes were postponed until April 26, 2016.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Allen (Chemistry), Robinson (Mathematics), Apetz, Chen, Levine (Medicine) and VC Horns.

Alternates present were: Professors Arnold for Tierno (Art and Design), Ferguson for Broome (Dental Medicine), Prokopowicz for Hernandez (History) and Meggs for Parrish (Interior Design and Merchandising).

B. Announcements

Faculty are reminded that Fall Faculty Convocation will be held on Friday, August 19, 2016 at 9 am in the Wright Auditorium. Additional information will be forthcoming.

Update on “myEDU” question to the Faculty Senate in March - As part of the North Carolina Public Records Law, ECU is required to release requested information as long as it complies with federal state law and protects data types such as HIPAA, FERPA, etc. The Registrar’s office does recall giving data to Pick A Prof through a public records request some years ago. Data would be de-identified and only be provided where the course size was greater than 10. Pick A Prof was purchased by myEDU in 2009 who in turn was purchased by Blackboard in 2014. A quick review of myEDU indicates the data is around 2012 and inconsistent. Materials Management does not have any documentation indicating that SGA executed an agreement with myEDU. In conclusion, there does not appear to be any active data requests with the Registrar and the myEDU data appears to be several years old. These requests are covered under the Public Records requests and cannot be prevented.

Thank you to Chancellor Ballard for providing the funding for refreshments during the monthly Faculty Senate meetings and for hosting the annual reception for Faculty Senators/Alternates and Academic/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).

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

With the recent completion of Gateway East and West Halls at the top of College Hill Road, Campus Living is in the unique position to assist faculty and departments as they consider hosting adult conferences and professional meetings. The Gateway complex was designed not only to serve our growing living learning community populations but also to serve as an adult conference center during the summer months. Gateway’s unique design provides for up to seven break out spaces for conference presentations, a multipurpose room that can seat 200 theater style or 180 for a banquet meal, sleeping rooms with private or semi-private bathrooms including full linen service, access to a full exercise facility located on College Hill and other support spaces, meeting rooms and food service option within a five minute walk of these buildings. Pricing for meeting space, food service and sleeping rooms are far less than arranging these same services in local hotels and provide organizers the ease of operation by remaining on campus. These are not the residence halls from your time in college. These modern facilities offer sound proof music practice rooms, private outdoor courtyards, an attractive two story lobby and each sleeping room comes with a refrigerator and microwave. Conference or

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

meeting rooms are available during the academic year without access to sleeping spaces which are occupied by students and Transit Services can pick up and drop off participants from local hotels as requested. If you are interested in learning more about the possibilities and want to tour the spaces to see if they might meet your needs, please contact Bill McCartney, Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Living at mccartneyw@ecu.edu to arrange a time to discuss your interest and needs.

The Chancellor has approved/received/edited the following resolutions from the February 2016 and March 2016 Faculty Senate meetings:

- 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.
- 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.
- 16-09 Revised University Curriculum Committee charge.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 16-13 Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on Centers and Institutes.
- 16-14 Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on Information Security.
- 16-15 (approved [with edits](#)) [Revised ECU Faculty Manual](#), Part IX, Section I. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures of East Carolina University, subsections I. – IV.
- 16-16 Approval of Spring 2016 Graduation List, including Honors Program graduates.
- 16-17 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 15, 2016](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, which included Curriculum actions (GC 15-26), within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [January 20, 2016](#), including packages submitted by the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment; Department of Public Health; Department of Technology Systems; Department of Health Education and Promotion; and College of Nursing and Programmatic actions forwarded to Educational Policies and Planning Committee,

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

including the Department of Geography, Proposal of New Concentration: Professional Science Master's [Geographic Information System (GIS)].

- 16-18 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee's meeting minutes of [February 11, 2016](#) including curricular actions within the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Department of Health Education and Promotion, College of Fine Arts and Communication, College of Education and College of Nursing and the [February 18, 2016](#) meeting minutes including curricular actions within the College of Nursing and College of Engineering and Technology.
- 16-19 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee's meeting minutes of [February 15, 2016](#) including approval for domestic diversity designation for AAAS 1000: Introduction to African and African American Studies.
- 16-20 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's meeting minutes of [March 4, 2016](#) including request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree program: Master of School Administration (MSA) in the Department of Educational Leadership within the College of Education; request to approve a new online graduate certificate: Behavior Specialist in the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education; request to approve a new concentration: Master of Arts in Education Special Education (MAEd SPED) Intellectual Disabilities Concentration in the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education; request to approve the discontinuation of the graduate certificate: Community Health Administration in the Department of Health Services and Information Management within the College of Allied Health Sciences; request to approve the Consolidation of Existing Degrees BFA in Dance Performance and BFA in Dance Education into the BFA in Dance; discontinuation of existing degrees BFA in Dance Performance and BFA in Dance Education; proposal of new concentrations: Performance and Choreography and Dance Education in the Department of Dance Performance and Dance Education within the School of Theatre and Dance; request to approve the discontinuation of existing concentration: M.A.T. Health Education in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; request to approve a degree title change from Master of Science in Technology Systems to Master of Science in Technology Management; and discontinuation of existing graduate concentrations in the Department of Technology Systems within the College of Engineering and Technology; request to approve a new concentration (MS in Geography): Professional Science Master's in Geographic Information Science in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment; request to approve a new online graduate certificate: Student Affairs in Higher Education in the Department of Interdisciplinary Programs - Adult Education within the College of Education; Program Review revision response for the Department of Mathematics, Science and Instructional Technology Education (MSITE) within the College of Education.
- 16-21 Additions to the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 Final Exam Schedules.
- 16-22 Summer 2017, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 University Academic Calendars.
- 16-23 (received [with comment](#)) Formal faculty advice on [proposed Leave Policy for Twelve Month Faculty](#).
- 16-24 (approved [with edits](#)) .
- 16-25 Formal faculty advice on proposed Web Content Regulation.
- 16-26 Formal faculty advice on proposed Social Media Use Regulation.
- 16-27 (approved [_](#)) Revisions to the *Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Sections Double Major Requirements and Dual or Second Degree Requirements.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard reported that ECU Police Chief Lewis has completed about half the internal review of the recent assault of Patrick Myrick that started in uptown Greenville and ended on campus. One ECU police person has been dismissed because of inappropriate behavior. Chief Lewis has a full statement that he can provide about the investigation. Chancellor Ballard supports the chief's strong actions showing that ECU does not allow any of its employees, let alone police officers, to act as the dismissed officer did. One other ECU employee is under review, and an outcome will be determined in a few weeks. Two students are under review

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

from with the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities. Neither is a current student. Final decisions about commencement will be determined for two students who were involved in the attack.

All institutions have similar crises, unfortunately, for example in Cincinnati, Missouri, Oregon, and other places. ECU has many fewer incidents, and we are one of the best in our system in terms of freedom from violence. The Chancellor expressed satisfaction with the training and education ECU conducts and with the technologies that are part of campus safety. The Chancellor commented that the sanctions on those involved in Myrick's assault are appropriate; they send a message that ECU will deal swiftly and effectively with people who do not follow the rules or who are violent towards others on the campus. This one attack does not define, represent, or speak to the identity of ECU, nor does it reflect ECU's values, and the university has been clear about that in its messaging. Most of those involved in the assault were not ECU students, but the incident ended on the campus.

ECU will continue to be campus of inclusion and respect and will move forward so everyone can have a safe learning environment. The Chancellor said he hated starting his last meeting at ECU by talking about an assault; but the incident has been covered in the news and continues to be an issue. The Chancellor also reported that the university had hoped to release the videos of the assault, but the District Attorney subpoenaed them. ECU does not control when all the information will be released. We control some of it, pursuant to public records requests that we have control over, but the major part of the investigation is now under the auspices of the District Attorney.

The Chancellor went on to say:

"Since I won't have a chance to talk with you again in a formal way—I do hope to sit among you in the not-too-distant future—I'll need a special dispensation from Ron Mitchelson to get a vote—I want to say a few things. There's lots of consternation about things happening in the state. But, I want to talk about some good things I see happening. I know there's been dispute all over who Margaret Spellings is. I've had now a dozen conversations with her over extended meetings. I'm impressed with her. I'm not asking you to be; I'm just saying that she's a real person and her values about higher education are the right values. She is honestly all about access and openness in the public university. She's saying the right things to the right people in the state about how important we are to the economy and to the future of North Carolina. People should give her a chance. Judge her on what the legislative session looks like even as difficult as that session could be. Judge her on whether we're able to get some salary compensation for our well-deserving employees this year. Judge her on how well she protects the institution from some of the conclusions that are being drawn. She's done all that I could have asked in the little over a month and a half of her time here.

We all need to think constructively about our "business models" —there's no good phraseology for it. But my entire time in higher education has been in what I would call the golden era of higher education, from the 60s to now. In the best of all times in terms of public support and state funding of higher education, North Carolina has done an A++ job for the most part. I think all over the country that era is over. I don't like the fact that it's over; I wish it would come back. The public is in a different place today about public expenditures. I'm sorry that we've lost appropriations that we've had. On the other hand, if you compare us to what's happened in Missouri, or my home state of Illinois, or Louisiana, all of them have proud higher education systems and they've been devastated by budget cuts over the last three or four years. We've found some ways to escape and to still do the major priorities and be able to fund them. Provost Mitchelson and Vice Chancellor Niswander and others are working on some innovative new models for providing incentives for undergraduates. I won't spill the beans on that—it's a little bit too early to talk about the details—but it's just a good example of the kinds of things that we have to do moving forward as we think about different ways, better ways, creative ways, but effective ways for teaching our students, doing our service, doing our research, and being really good at all of those things.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

We're really mission driven, and I think mission driven universities in this system are—if we're honest about it and authentic, and we certainly are—going to be the ones that flourish because we're very clear about our mission. We don't try to use other people's missions, and we say why our mission is important, and spend our money on our mission. One example of that is engagement. We are the most engaged public university that I've ever worked in. We've received dozens of awards and recognitions for that over the last eight or so years. We're really, really good at it and that makes a difference to people who sometimes are cynical about whether we deserve public support and whether we deserve higher tuition and those kinds of things. We just need to keep our focus on our mission, stay engaged in our communities. We make a huge difference in Eastern North Carolina and continue to make a difference in everything we do. I just saw where we got the Paul Simon award for Internationalization because of our global classroom. That's just one example of not doing maybe as much as I would absolutely like in internationalization, but what we do is really, really good and gets a lot of recognition and makes a difference. We have 66 partners around the world. So it's been my pleasure to be a part of that.

You all need to just keep doing what you're doing. It won't be quite the golden era; we'll have to be more creative than we've ever been, be careful of what we charge our students, but there's no reason why this institution can't be among the very best.

Thank you.

There were no questions posed to Chancellor Ballard following his remarks.

Chair Stiller noted that a few individuals had things to say. There are a number of people present who have served as chairs of the faculty and who have worked closely with Dr. Ballard over the years, Jan Tovey obviously can't be with us, and Catherine Rigsby is in Ecuador. However, a number of people do have remarks and a few items to give the Chancellor as he steps down from his position.

Professor Andrew Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) moved a commendation for Steve Ballard, Chancellor. The faculty applauded the Chancellor. Motion approved by acclamation.

Professor Andrew Morehead (Past Chair of the Faculty/Chemistry) moved a commendation for Nancy Ballard, First Lady. The faculty applauded the First Lady. Motion approved by acclamation.

Several past Chairs of the Faculty presented the Chancellor with tokens to commemorate the significant events of their years working with the Chancellor, including Professor Mark Taggart (Music), 2006/08 Chair; Professor Marianna Walker (Allied Health Sciences), 2009/12 Chair; Professor Mark Sprague (Physics), 2012/14 Chair; Professor Andrew Morehead (Chemistry), 2014/15 Chair; and Professor John Stiller (Biology), current Chair of the Faculty.

Professor Mark Taggart stated that working as chair of the faculty was “an honor, a privilege, was demanding, was an impossible task; it was exhilarating. I got to learn so much about this university that I love and I garnered such respect for the faculty in the process.” Professor Taggart remarked that the Chancellor inspired him to be an effective chair. Professor Taggart composed an opera, soon to be complete, and dedicated it to the Chancellor and Nancy Ballard.

Professor Marianna Walker recollected the ways the Faculty Senate worked together with the administration over the three years that she was Chair. Professor Walker presented the Chancellor a brief film made several years ago with the theme—and the Beatles tune—“Come Together.” Professor Walker talked about how supportive the Chancellor was and the ways people came together to accomplish the work of the university. She noted that the Chancellor faced many budget crises during his years here. Professor Walker gave Chancellor Ballard a bound copy of the faculty manual.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Professor Mark Sprague described facing crises and issues during the time he was chair and how the Chancellor helped him acclimate during Professor Sprague's tenure as Chair of the Faculty. Professor Sprague presented the Chancellor with a poster of a word cloud highlighting the terms and names that showed up most frequently in the faculty Senate meeting minutes, and represented the issues they worked on together, during Professor Sprague's tenure as Chair.

Professor Morehead expressed how he appreciated working with the chancellor on issues such as the 5-year strategic plan, program prioritization, and the Aycock Hall renaming effort, which was a challenging time. Professor Morehead praised the Chancellor for taking on issues and, in recognition of their work together, is giving the Chancellor two books on leadership (including one by Charles Brantley Aycock) to commemorate the events of that year. Professor Morehead thanked Chancellor Ballard for his work.

Chair John Stiller recognized that the most impactful decision this year was the Chancellor stepping down. Chair Stiller was pleased to have gotten to know the Chancellor and Ms. Ballard personally. Chair Stiller Presented the Chancellor with a framed piece of art expressing the sentiment, "Gone Fishing."

Chair Stiller then recognized those Senators who are ending their terms with this meeting.

There was no discussion and the commendations for Steve Ballard, Chancellor, and Nancy Ballard, First Lady, were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-28**

D. Ron Mitchelson, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Provost Mitchelson reported on budget matters. Some of the State budget remains uncertain, but significant pieces are in place. The budget includes a bi-annual budget cut for this coming year. The legislature imposed a cap on advancement funding that will affect ECU significantly. President Spellings will be working to defeat this effort.

The second year of the tuition increase will take place, this coming academic year; the 5% increase to in-state students will provide a 1.9 % merit raise pool for ERHA employees. There may also be a legislative salary increase of 1 to 2%. Enrollment growth will yield an increase in State appropriations of an expected \$3.4 million. In context, that funding comes after \$6.8 million in budget cuts over the last two years in academic affairs alone. The enrollment growth funding is helpful but does not make up recent cuts. President Spellings will also attempt to stop the cap on advancement funding.

Provost Mitchelson provided an update on the NC Guaranteed Admission Program (NCGAP). A study by Research Triangle International was issued on March 6, 2016, that has been discussed by the Board of Governors. Provost Mitchelson will be getting additional information about the program at the chief academic officers' committee meeting. The implementation will be challenging. The program might not be severe, but if it is anything like Representative Craig Horn proposed, which is 25% of first year enrollment, or 1,000 students, it will be a disaster for ECU. President Spellings is going to challenge NCGAP and additional work is going on to let the legislature know more about the universities' situation. It is possible that they are not clear about the difference between admissions and enrollment. It takes 11,000 to 12,000 admissions to yield our freshman class of 4400. Also, students from rural areas and from under-represented groups will be disproportionately affected by NCGAP. Students must know their options and have choice. Provost Mitchelson commented that it seems strange that a group of people committed to choice is limiting choices for some students.

Provost Mitchelson provided an update on Fiscal Sustainability and implementing recommendations. Two years ago, the Chancellor accepted the report from the University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability, which included 61 recommendations. About thirty of the recommendations have been worked on. Information about progress on the recommendations is available online. The information summarizes actions the workgroups have taken and the related impacts. There are six working groups looking at administrative efficiencies; business practices; community and industry engagement; procedures for purchasing, travel, etc., for example, travel requests, except for international travel, no longer will go to the Provost's office for approval. A

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

working group is looking at global and international issues and proposing consolidation of global academic initiatives and international affairs, resulting in one less administrator. Much is being done to improve efficiency, but the efforts and the size of the savings pale in comparison to the budget cuts. ECU is working hard to position itself for sustainability in the future.

Professor Montgomery (English) thanked the Provost for the Fiscal Sustainability Scorecard, which is available on the [fiscal sustainability implementation website](#) that details recommendations in six categories: Revenue, Operational Cost, Consolidation and Reorganization, Academic Programming, Workload and Other. She asked why some of the categories/proposals seem not to have not been acted on, whether this activity would become obsolete at some point, and will the administration continue to work on the recommendations.

Provost Mitchelson replied that the idea was initially to work on about ten recommendations at a time. Right now, six or seven are underway, and a new one, military affairs, has just been added. The committees have worked on about half of the recommendations, and there is more to do. Provost Mitchelson commented that the continuation of the effort will depend on the new Chancellor. Provost Mitchelson's plan is to continue working on the recommendations and to make sure things are done in a cost effective manner and that the university is maximizing revenues and diversifying revenue streams.

Professor Francia (Political Science) stated that NCGAP is the law. What is the plan going forward? Is it to work with sympathetic legislators to try to repeal it? What is our response going to be?

Provost Mitchelson replied that there were two levels of strategy beginning with President Spellings and her team at General Administration. The Board of Governors are also aware of the concerns, including Henry Hinton, ECU's liaison to the board. The Provost stated that he hoped NCGAP would be repealed, and if not at least a less intrusive implementation determined.

E. LaKeshia Alston, Associate Provost for Equity and Diversity

Associate Provost Alston provided an annual report on diversity of faculty and administration as detailed in [2013 Resolution](#), including a [Report on 2013-2015 Data](#) and a [Report on Programs and Initiatives](#) and stated that her office has been focused on several key areas over the year and she presented a report in hard copy. There have been policy changes; some are still under consideration, and being vetted by faculty groups. The office has been working on several initiatives, including the campus climate survey and the informational needs related to that, as well as building our mediation and conflict resolution program. These have been areas of focus this year.

Associate Provost Alston discussed the 2013-2015 report. Highlights include that in fall 2015 over 17% of the faculty were minorities, up from 13% in fall 2013. The number of African-American and Asian faculty grew about 20% over the three-year period. The number of faculty with unknown race/ethnicity fluctuated, but increased by 2%. In looking at new hires, a significant number of unknowns were in the system and the office is working on ensuring that demographic information is collected when people are hired; opportunities are also being provided for people to update their information after employment. Associate Provost Alston reported that women make up about half the faculty; over 50% of new hires in 2015 were women.

As of fall 2015, nearly 18% of all tenured faculty identified as a racial/ethnic minority, up from almost 15% in fall 2013. By fall 2015, the number of tenured female faculty increased by 7% since fall 2013, and the number of males tenured decreased slightly. The number of tenured African American faculty has increased. As of fall 2015, nearly 12% of fixed term-faculty were racial or ethnic minority, up just over 10% from 2013. The number of fixed-term female faculty remained steady since fall 2013; the number of males decreased by 8%.

It is notable that women are 36% of tenured faculty while men are 64%. Women slightly out-number men in tenure-track faculty and fixed term faculty. In the coming year, the office will look at the gaps in those categories. Data is also available for administrators with low numbers of minorities in these positions and increasing numbers of males.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Professor Justiniano (Physics) expressed concern over the low number of Hispanic faculty and asked what plans were in place to recruit more Hispanic faculty, considering that Hispanics are one of the fastest growing groups in the U.S.

Associate Provost Alston replied that in the past her office worked directly with search committees to be helpful in the search process. They are also monitoring search processes. Going forward, they want to be more proactive and work directly with departments to develop plans ahead of hiring, develop pipelines, connect with feeder groups, and be proactive.

Professor Francia (Political Science) asked about the “unknown” race/ethnicity percentage of 56.43% listed on page three of the report and wondered why the number was so high.

Associate Provost Alston agreed that this was a problem and that we have more work to do on gathering this important information. People are not required to provide this information. However, Associate Provost Alston noted that several points in the hiring process are the best times to gather that information; she also noted that ECU has moved from paper reporting documents to electronic forms, and they have been asking people to update their information

F. James Holloway, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor James Holloway (Business) provided a [report](#) on the April 8, 2016 UNC Faculty Assembly meeting and [materials](#) provided at the meeting. He stated that the meeting was Dr. Steve Leonard’s last meeting, and he gave a report on the accomplishments of the faculty assembly during its term. A legislative update addressed pay raises, capital improvements, caps on institutional advancement, and budget cuts. The Assembly received an update on NCGAP and talked about the issues and the uncertainties surrounding NCGAP. The Chair of Faculty Assembly believes NCGAP is the most important piece of legislation in forty years. A speaker from the NC School of Law discussed the impact of the UNC system on the economic growth and development of North Carolina and the dangers the system faces in meeting the challenges placed on it during the last few sessions of the General Assembly. Another important item is the restructuring of the organization at GA. A Chief of Staff position is being created to support the president. UNC press, television, and research will be under academic affairs at UNC-GA. The faculty considered and successfully approved four resolutions; one was critical of NCGAP; another responded to the negative impacts of House Bill 2 on universities.

There were no questions for Professor Holloway following his remarks.

G. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

“At our February meeting I spoke to you about the recently adopted legislation known as NCGAP, which poses numerous challenges for ECU and public higher education in North Carolina. I believe we must continue to speak against this law, and work toward its repeal. Not the least of the problems with NCGAP is its inherently discriminatory approach in how it would track some of our qualified first-year applicants to community colleges. In the case of NCGAP the discriminatory aspects of the law are implicit rather than explicit. The language of the law is couched in terms that suggest it aims to help rather than hurt minority, first generation and low-income students.

Last month, our state legislature passed another law that makes no pretense about its discriminatory nature. It represents a direct threat the University of North Carolina’s commitments to equality, and to fostering a diverse, inclusive and welcoming environment for all. House Bill 2, generally called HB2, was passed with almost no opportunity for public input or even for debate within the legislature itself, and was signed into law the next day. In no uncertain terms, it legalizes discrimination based on sexual preference and gender identity. Remarkably.... presumably because it was rushed through with so little time for consideration, even by its own authors, HB2 also legalizes discrimination

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

against people based on their military status. This is because excludes all these classes from legal protection under the state law, and also prevents municipal or regional government bodies from passing ordinances that ban discrimination in these areas. It goes even further by precluding any civil legal action in state courts against acts of discrimination, even in those categories that are offered protection by the act itself. Finally, for an inexplicable reason, at least with respect to the supposed purpose of the law, it prevents local or other government subdivisions within the state from raising the minimum wage. I will not take the time to elaborate on how some of these provisions conflict with other existing laws, nor about the reactions this bill has engendered regionally, nationally and internationally; this all has have been well documented in the media.

Proponents of HB2 focus the discussion on a single issue; that is, preventing transgender individuals from using bathroom facilities that match their gender identities rather than the sex noted on their birth certificates. While there is no evidence that this was a problem in search of a legislative solution, there is evidence that transgender youth are at a greater risk of bullying and a sense of marginalization. Nevertheless, it is clear that reasonable people can have different viewpoints on how to best manage access to public bathrooms; I hope we can all recognize that it is a complicated issue that requires careful, thoughtful consideration, open and constructive dialog, leading to equitable solutions. It is just as clear that this is exactly what DID NOT OCCUR before HB2 was passed into law.

Creating and maintaining an environment for such constructive dialogs, the kinds that can lead to fair and meaningful solutions to complex problems, whether scientific or sociopolitical, is a key role of an institution of higher learning like ECU. So is helping to develop well-rounded and thoughtful citizens who can continue of tackle such problems effectively once they've graduated from the University. Beyond a simple moral imperative, this is why faculty oppose measures that lead to inequalities, and that can diminish inclusiveness and diversity on our campuses. We must continue to uphold principles of free and open exchange of ideas, and welcome all to a civil discourse about the most pressing and controversial issues facing our society and our planet. When any of us feels excluded from that discourse, or feels marginalized by discriminatory policies or practices, every one of is diminished...and we all lose. We must continue to reaffirm this institution's commitments to academic freedom, diversity, openness and inclusiveness at every opportunity.

Thank you for your attention and I would be happy to take any questions.”

There were no questions for Chair Stiller following his remarks.

H. Question Period

There were no questions to come before the body.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business to come before the body.

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Denise Donica (Allied Health Sciences), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [March 14, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, including curriculum action items (GC 15-27) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [February 3, 2016](#), and [March 2, 2016](#) which included packages submitted by the Department of Health Services and Information Management; Department of Interdisciplinary Programs – Adult Education; Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research; Department of Geological Sciences; Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 2, 2016](#) were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a proposal of New Doctoral Degree: DrPH in the Department of Public Health within The Brody School of Medicine. (Please note DrPH courses in the March 2, 2016 Graduate Council Committee meeting minutes will be held until fall 2016 when additional course proposals will be presented.)

Professor Donica (Allied Health Sciences) then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

and recorded in the [April 11, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, noting that action on the March 30, 2016 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting activities would be postponed until September. The academic matters being presented for approval included policy and curriculum action items (GC 15-28), changes to the Faculty Manual, Section G – Removal of Graduate Faculty policy; changes to last date to drop policy to reflect 60% of the term, to align with the new undergraduate drop date and the ECU Office Financial Aid payback; changes to Admission by Exception rule from 9 hours attempted to return to good academic standing to 9 hours completed to return to good academic standing; within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [February 17, 2016](#) and [March 16, 2016](#), which included packages from the Department of Political Science; Department of Human Development and Family Science; Department of Public Health; Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies; Department of International Studies; Department of Occupational Therapy; College of Nursing; Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies; Department of Educational Leadership; Department of Political Sciences – Security Studies Program. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [February 17, 2016](#) and [March 16, 2016](#) were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included title revision from MS in Child Development and Family Relations to MS in Human Development and Family Science in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance, revision of an existing degree title: MS in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling program to MS in Clinical Counseling program in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences, proposal of a new post-doctoral certificate: Adult-Gerontology Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (AGPCNP) Concentration and the Family Nurse Practitioner Concentration (FNP) within the College of Nursing, proposal of a new graduate certificate: Dual Language Immersion Administration (DLI) and proposal of a New Concentration: DLI Concentration in Educational Specialist in Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership within the College of Education.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [March 14, 2016](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes; the [February 3, 2016](#), and [March 2, 2016](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, which were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC); the [April 11, 2016](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes; and the [February 17, 2016](#), and [March 16, 2016](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, which were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), were reviewed and approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor.

Resolution #16-29

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Professor Lori Flint (Education), Chair of the Committee, noted that the committee met 15 times in seven months this year. Professor Flint then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 25, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the College of Nursing and School of Art and Design; and [March 24, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the College of Engineering and Technology, Department of Mathematics, College of Education, and College of Arts and Sciences African and African American Studies program.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 25, 2016](#) meeting minutes and the [March 24, 2016](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-30**

B. Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee

Professor Timm Hackett (English), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies, subsection VI, Evaluation of Distance Education. Professor Hackett noted that there was confusion about the 2010 language that gave the impression both the DE professor and the DE course needed peer review. Professor Hackett read the proposed change.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies, subsection VI. Evaluation of Distance Education were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-31**

C. Unit Code Screening Committee

Professor Patricia Anderson (Education), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the [School of Communication](#), [School of Art and Design](#) and the [College of Nursing](#) unit codes of operation.

There was no discussion and the revised [School of Communication](#), [School of Art and Design](#) and [College of Nursing](#) unit codes of operation were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-32**

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [March 21, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including approval for domestic diversity designation for RELI 1500: Uses and Abuses of the Bible, IDIS 3790: Technical Presentations, IDIS 4802: Distribution and Logistics research and global diversity designation for RELI 2697: Judaism, ITEC 3290: Technical Writing, HIST 3840: Africa and the Atlantic World.

There was no discussion, and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [March 21, 2016](#), meeting minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-33**

Professor Bailey then presented a recommendation to use the proposed questions in a Student Opinion of Instruction Survey that would replace SPOTS. He provided background on the history of the student survey. Back in the late 1980s, ECU used a survey that had 20-25 questions using a five-point scale and comments. Administrators misused the data by inaccurately assigning value to data. ECU then went to a seven-point scale, but the problems continued. Also, question #19 on the SOIS was erroneously used as an overall teaching score. The survey was put online and the student response rate dropped almost 70%. The current efforts are meant to address the response rate problem, which involves returning to a student opinion survey similar to the ones in the past. The current SPOTS survey was supposed to stop misuse of numbers and to help people think through what the surveys mean in terms of teaching. That hasn't worked well. The committee searched for a new delivery system that would allow students to do the survey on their phones. Questions have been developed, which the Senate received, and undergone review. The committee also discovered that Purdue University has collected a bank of 600 questions sorted into categories. Improvements in ECU's proposed questions were modeled on Purdue's questions and categories.

In 1993, the rule was made that we had to do the survey each year. For that reason, the committee is proposing to pilot the new survey in the summer; evaluate results, make any necessary changes, have the Senate act on recommendations in the fall 2016. The survey would be implemented in the fall 2016.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked whether the headings under which the questions are grouped would be visible to students or are they just for faculty.

Associate Provost Zhou replied that the headings were important for analyzing the dimensions of the survey; the students will not see the headings.

Professor Montgomery noted that up through question #11 all of the statements were about the instructor. Question #12 changes to a statement about the course. Professor Montgomery suggested that switching from evaluating the instructor to the course seems like it could introduce problems.

Associate Provost Zhou replied that this was a good point, and said that according to Purdue University's test findings, every course evaluation would include two questions evaluating the course and the instructor. The finding was that it is more appropriate to evaluate the course than the instructor.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that the instructor was responsible for the course and the way it is organized. If the instructor has done a good job of organizing and presenting the course, then the instruction is covered.

Professor Chullen (Business) stated that he attended Purdue University and has been subject to these surveys; he noted that there is a series of questions for the instructor and a series of questions for the course. Distinct scores for the course and for the instructor are derived from the survey; students can like the instructor and not the course for example. Professor Chullen agreed that it seems inconsistent to have a shift in questions from instructor to course rather than a separate list of questions for each.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) stated that in his history of the surveys, Professor Bailey mentioned the old question #19, which became the overarching question because it gave an easy out for evaluating instruction. In the new questions, he sees the return of question #19 in question #12 with the additional issue that in looking at 11 questions about the instructor and then one question about the course, students might not pick up on the detail. The overall question #12 does not reflect the previous 11 questions. Would it not be prudent to remove question #12?

Professor Bailey replied that this had been discussed within both the subcommittee and full committee, and a number of people felt question #12 was appropriate. If the issue was whether people would use question #12 in the ways that the old question #19 was used, and the Senate did not want a summative question, then someone can make a motion to take the question out.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) stated that it has been well established that student opinion surveys do not correlate with actual performance and are biased in various ways towards women and second language speakers, among others. The issue will not be gotten rid of by getting rid of some of the questions; summative questions about the course and the instructor might work. More important is how to train administrators to use the survey results appropriately. Professor Morehead asked if the Committee was planning to address training for administrators?

Professor Bailey replied that the Committee provided workshops on SPOTS, but administrators were not required to participate. He expects that going forward there would be required workshops for unit administrators.

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) stated that concerns might be addressed if the word "overall" from question #12 was removed.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) stated that in relation to consumer satisfaction, we were going to get two responses—those who love the course and those who hate it; we're not going to get much in between. But we have to do something, and if this new survey is better than nothing, then we have to train administrators to use it correctly.

Professor Bailey noted that the model the committee is looking at to evaluate teaching is a portfolio approach that has materials in three categories, only one of which included the survey, putting the significance of the student survey in its place. A form will be provided that explains how the survey results would be used.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that some of the questions are contradictory, asking about two different things in one question. There are items that are worded badly.

Professor Bailey responded that people can make suggestions, but the questions do not matter that much. Senators can propose changes.

Professor Montgomery (English) stated that she is excited about moving forward and the questions are an improvement. However, she still has concerns about shift in the questions from instructor to course. Professor

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Montgomery moved to amend question #12 to “Overall, I would rate the quality of the quality of instruction in this course as. . . .” The motion was seconded.

Professor Sorensen (Criminal Justice) noted that these types of surveys have been studied for a long time and asked why we don’t use surveys and scales that currently exist and that have been tested.

Professor Bailey noted that overall results you get with various existing scales are not significantly different and they are very expensive.

The motion on the amendment passed.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) applauded the committee’s efforts but questioned specific wording in some of the questions. Question #5 about clarity and organization refers to instructors checking on student understanding during presentations, which seems too narrow and has never been a question we have used. He noted that questions #3 and #19 in the current SPOTS survey address this issue better and asked if faculty could provide additional feedback to the committee before the pilot went into effect.

Professor Bailey indicated that faculty could send suggestions to the committee for improvements but the Faculty Senate needs to decide how it wants to proceed.

Chair Stiller clarified that the survey instrument would come back to the Senate in the fall after the summer pilot at which point edits could be sent to the committee.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) suggested that including the categories on the form might encourage students to think about what they were evaluating instead of just having them go quickly through the survey and replying because they either like or dislike the faculty member would help. Thirty-some years ago, when SIOS was first implemented, he did a factor analysis, and it all comes back to one significant factor—students liking the instructor.

Professor Gruder (Economics) stated that if the response rate was very low, it doesn’t matter what questions were used. It would be helpful to know what students are responding to the survey.

Professor Bailey replied that he would report back to the Faculty Senate in the fall on the results of the pilot.

Professor Kain (English) stated that in reference to the wording in question #5, “presentation” did not relate well to some courses and the wording needed to be tweaked to make sense. She expressed concerns that keeping the category headings might confuse students.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) noted that question #5 related to organization and clarity of presentation by the instructor. Student could misunderstand it. He moved to strike question #5. The motion was seconded

The motion passed.

Professor Anderson (Education) thanked the committee for their efforts, said she looked forward to the results of the pilot study that would be brought back to the Senate in the fall, and encouraged senate to vote in favor of the survey as a pilot. She called the question.

The motion to call the question passed.

Following discussion, the recommendation to use the questions in a pilot Student Opinion of Instruction Survey that would replace SPOTS was approved as amended. **Resolution #16-34**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Professor Bailey noted that there were questions about what would be done to improve the response rate. He asked Associate Provost Zhou to comments on that issue.

Associate Provost Zhou reported that last summer, 2200 students were registered each summer term. The response rate for SPOTS in summer 1 was 25% and in summer 2 was 15%. If we pilot this year, we need better participation. We are under pressure and have a very aggressive time line to implement. They would like to pilot in summer 1, but summer 2 is more realistic. Dr. Zhou needs faculty to volunteer to have students participate.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked what the results of the pilot would be used for because it may be easier to get faculty participation if they know that their participation will help to make the final instrument better. If faculty opted to have the survey administered in their summer class, will the results be provided to the administrators?

Associate Provost Zhou replied that the Faculty Senate can determine if the results will be used in any evaluative way by the administrators. She noted that part of the pilot is to see how the delivery system works from end-to-end, so administrators will need to access results. Students will be able to take the survey a number of ways—Blackboard, cell phone, or web-site. If we teach face-to-face, we could even give them time in class. Faculty need to encourage their students to participate.

Professor Kain (English) stated that in the past we have had to ask to have our classes surveyed in the summer. To help in the Committee's efforts, can we just say that for Second Summer Session 2016, if you want to have your course surveyed, this is how it will be done.

Associate Provost Zhou replied that it would be easier to survey all the courses and actually harder to survey only a few courses opting to participate in the pilot study.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked why don't we include all summer courses in the pilot study, especially if the results are not going to count in personnel actions. The administrators would still see the results but would not use the results in an evaluative manner. Professor Montgomery moved that "In summer session 2 and the 11 week session, 2016, this survey be piloted in all sections with 6 or more students and that it be explained to faculty and to administrators that this is a pilot and that the responses are to be used in no way in evaluation and personnel matters." Motion was seconded.

Associate Provost Zhou clarified that the timing would be summer 2 and the 11-week session.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) requested that the committee follow up so that it's understood that that the survey will be done and how the results will be used.

Professor Kain (English) asked if we can have the survey count in a personnel matter is we want them?

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) noted that a faculty member could always include the results of the pilot study in their PAD.

Motion passed.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) stated that a letter telling faculty to participate should be sent to the administrators from the Provost.

Professor Kain (English) agreed that she wanted to make sure that everyone received the correspondence.

Professor Cope (Psychology) asked if the Faculty Senate was imposing a mandate for participation.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Chair Stiller replied the motion on the floor advises the Chancellor to mandate the pilot for the second summer session and the 11-week session.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) offered a friendly amendment: “that it be communicated to faculty and administrators by letter.” Following discussion, the friendly amendment was accepted and the motion was approved.

Motion passed as amended.

Following discussion, the recommendation that ECU conduct a pilot of the new Student Opinion of Instruction Survey delivery system using the approved questions (FS Resolution #16-34), and the recommendation that “in summer session 2 and the 11-week session, 2016, this survey be piloted in all sections with 6 or more students and that it be communicated to administrators and faculty by letter that results are not to be used in any way toward evaluations and personnel matters,” were approved as amended.

Resolution #16-35

E. Committee on Committees

Professor Crystal Chambers (Education), Chair of the Committee presented the second reading of proposed revisions to the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee charge.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee charge were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-36**

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Ed Stellwag (Biology), Vice Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [April 8, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including Addition of new concentration (Caribbean, Latin America and the Diaspora) within the BA in African and African American Studies program in the College of Art and Sciences; revision of an existing degree title: M.S. in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program to M.S. in Clinical Counseling Program in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; revision of an existing degree title: MS in Child Development and Family Relations to MS in Human Development and Family Science in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance; proposed new post-doctoral certificates: Adult-Gerontology Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (AGPCNP) and Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) within the College of Nursing; proposed new doctoral degree: DrPH in the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine; Program Review revision response for the Department of Economics; and Program Review revision response for the Department of Criminal Justice.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee [April 8, 2016](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-37**

Professor Stellwag presented a review of the Bachelor of Science University Studies [Faculty Oversight Committee Manual and Guidelines](#), including proposed revisions to the process for the selection of members.

Professor Stellwag stated that after reviewing the BSUS program, the committee proposed revisions to the process of selection of the members of the faculty oversight committee and their terms of service. The revisions are meant to make the faculty and Faculty Senate central to the process of selecting those committee members. The revisions to the terms of service is meant to simplify the staggered terms.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked if this would go into effect this year since we have to wait on the chancellor’s approval. If we make this change, it would not affect the membership of this next year.

Professor Stellwag replied that the changes would go into effect next year.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

There was no further discussion and the proposed revisions to the process for the selection of members included in the Bachelor of Science University Studies [Faculty Oversight Committee Manual and Guidelines](#) were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-38**

Professor Stellwag then presented, for information only, a report on [2014 Low Productivity Program Review](#) and [Recommendation Summary](#). There was no discussion.

G. Research/Creative Activities Committee

Professor Richard McCabe (Dental Medicine), Chair of the Committee presented formal faculty advice on the proposed Research Space Allocation PRR and summarized the revisions.

Prof. McCabe. The policy had not been available previously and was considered “in house.” This is a policy about allocating research space on three levels—department, college, school. The criteria for allocation include funds, mostly external; productivity (peer-reviewed productivity); and department priorities. The University Space Committee has been given the final oversight on space allocation by the Chancellor. Disagreements about space at levels one and two could go to the space committee; the space committee makes the level three decisions. Committee members were encouraged to discuss the space allocation issues and changes with their faculty. Only two changes are proposed. One change is to 2.6, that the evaluations are done on a 5-year basis. The second change clarifies that level three oversight is by the committee. The committee voted to recommend this document.

There was no discussion and proposed revisions to the Research Space Allocation PRR were approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **Resolution #16-39**

H. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Katie Flanagan (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented proposed changes in the categories to grade changes via Banner.

There was no discussion and the proposed changes in the categories to grade changes via Banner were approved as presented. **Resolution #16-40**

I. Academic Awards Committee

Professor Zac Domire (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented a proposed Policy relating to University Teaching Awards. In response to concerns about faculty getting a number of awards in the same year, the committee suggested a change to allow individuals to accept only one nomination for one university teaching award each year.

There was no discussion and the proposed policy relating to University Teaching Awards was approved as presented. **Resolution #16-41**

J. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake (Education), Chair of the Committee presented first the proposed rename and addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section IV. Student Privacy and Conduct, subsection III, entitled Student Complaints.

The policy came from a working group that the Chancellor established. The group included a number of faculty. When the policy came to governance.

Professor Hoover (Academic Library Sciences) proposed a friendly amendment to make the policy stronger and moved to edit the language in the 2nd paragraph as follows:

“This may requires disclosure of some or all of an otherwise confidential student education record when rights protected by Due Process are at stake, as in situations where the results of a disciplinary proceeding could adversely impact an instructor’s property interests, such as potential loss of tenure or

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

termination of an instructor on a fixed term contract prior to expiration of the term **or any other material sanction.**”

Motion seconded.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked what it would accomplish to strike “may.” Professor Hoover replied that faculty within her unit saw “may” as a possibility that a faculty member may not get all of the disclosures and by removing may, a person is assured of receiving the disclosure.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that she understood Professor Hoover’s efforts to strengthen the support for faculty and how the current text could be interpreted up the line of administrators, but was unsure if this change would be approved by the Chancellor.

Professor Gemperline (Dean of Graduate School/Academic Deans Representative) stated that the language is a matter of law and by striking the word “may,” we are attempting to change the wording of the law.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) reminded Senators that the standard due process procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual has first priority.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) agreed with Professor Gemperline and stated that the text was really informing everyone that the student’s materials would be disclosed. It’s not giving leeway, but maybe signaling students that the policy may require that they be identified. So striking the word “may” conflicts with the previous sentence needs to be changed.

Following discussion, the motion to edit the language in the 2nd paragraph failed.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) asked how the proposed text compares with the State law on personnel files, which was why we have the language, specifically related to secret files. Are there cases that have been adjudicated that suggest whether the proposed language would survive if it was challenged?

Donna Payne (University Attorney) explained that the tension is between the federal law that gives students the right of privacy and the state law and university policy that gives faculty the right to see material that the university collects that related to our jobs. FERPA doesn’t have an express exemption that would allow disclosure of materials. The idea is to keep the student information confidential unless the constitutional right of the employee comes into play. A student gives notice of a potential performance insufficiency and the ECU employee has an opportunity to look at any supporting materials and assess it independently. If the student is not willing to give his or her name, then things have to be handled differently.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) stated that the State courts have recently ruled that FERPA does not trump the State law.

University Attorney Payne replied that we, as a University, should honor the FERPA rights of the students unless or until the due process rights of the employee come into conflict with that. To her knowledge, there is no NC rule on that. The new policy clarifies the existence of a student complaint but doesn’t create the strict “secret file language” that is currently referenced in the ECU in the Faculty Manual. This proposed policy is also designed to let students know how to deal with these issues and to put them on notice that the university can’t take significant action on an anonymous complaint. For such an action, the student would have to be exposed.

Following discussion, the proposed renaming and addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section IV. Student Privacy and Conduct, subsection III, entitled Student Complaints were approved as presented.

Resolution #16-42

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Professor Dotson-Blake then presented a proposed addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VIII, Section I. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of East Carolina University, Subsection III. entitled Faculty Presence.

The intention of the proposed addition to the faculty manual is to help clarify expectations for faculty presence on campus and to articulate the process for faculty who have situations requiring them to be away from campus for reasons other than university or business related travel. The Chancellor spoke earlier about the transformative process that education has experienced and our ways of doing business. They are much different now than they were in the past. We have a lot of online programs, and programs with many online or hybrid components. As a faculty we have an opportunity to consider how we want people to be engaged in our programs, units on campus, and community. What is the process for the people who don't fit into a traditional mold? We need a clear process because there are plenty of faculty who are doing good work in extraordinary circumstances, and if there's a process for those individuals to declare their circumstances and receive approval, that helps everybody. It will help increase morale, help to deal with any sort of commitment. The committee has been approached by faculty members upset that some faculty are not available on campus and not engaging in the work we do. Administrators and department chairs say they're not sure what to do with various faculty who live in many different places, how often they come to campus, and what should they do. All of these issues have to be addressed.

As a group, we need to articulate what we expect, what matters to us, and what we want any policy to look like. The report does not include any set number of office hours, days that people need to be on campus, or ways faculty need to engage when they are on campus. Those issues should be decided at the local level. This is not about how we're using our abilities or how we should be sitting in our offices. This is about what our expectations are for each other so we don't in turn give those expectations over to administrators or others and so that we don't resort to complaining about each other and never making any clear statement about what matters. This policy isn't about who's advising students when a faculty member is gone, or who's picking up the slack. Those small things are symptoms of a larger issue. The way we do education is being transformed, people are in a lot of different places, and we need to say what matters to us, what we expect of each other as faculty, and what is our process for people who fall outside of those expectations. Some people who fall outside those expectations are doing work that is important to their programs.

Professor Anderson (Education) spoke against the proposed policy. Professor Anderson expressed concerns that the next steps would require that everyone to be on campus at certain places at certain times and maybe punching a time clock. It's not realistic for the academic profession.

Professor Dotson-Blake responded that the committee understands and agrees. As she noted, there is no specific expectation. However, the proposal provides a process for declaring a situation where a faculty member may be off campus for weeks at a time.

Professor Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies) stated that this policy is not about monitoring how many hours people are on campus. It's about people who leave this area, go to Florida, move to Europe, and they're just never here. They have duties on campus, but the people are not present at all. It was drafted to address faculty members who have legitimate academic responsibilities on campus but travel and live elsewhere and don't contribute like their colleagues to the academic responsibilities of a unit. This is about chairs not having a policy for people moving away and continuing to teach online. Those faculty who live in other states and teach online classes fail to participate in most normal academic duties so faculty begin to resent them because of the burden placed on those who do physically come to campus on a regular basis and meet face-to-face with colleagues to discuss unit matters.

Professor Dotson-Blake added that if a program has a reason for someone to be located at a distance, there should be a process for getting approval for that. Right now, individual faculty members or chair goes to a dean and requests that. We know about situations like this. And maybe the Dean says no. But there's a discipline

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

specific reason for having a situation set up this way. We need to have a process where faculty have a voice in the situation.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) made a motion to delete “during the academic workweek” from the first paragraph because we’re not talking about week-by-week presence. We’re talking about long term presence. Motion seconded.

Professor Morin (Communication) replied that this deletion would not help the situation because it is expected that all faculty come to campus consistently unless away on official University business. Scratching out “workweek” will not solve the problem because it starts with the first sentence.

Professor Dotson-Blake responded that she didn’t want to confuse anyone. This proposed addition intends that people will have regular engagement on campus. What is being proposed is a way to follow a process for requesting approval for exceptions.

Professor Carpenter-Aeby (Social Work) stated that some faculty members teach on Saturday and wondered if they will now have to obtain permission to take a day off during the week or if someone is leaving for three weeks to get married.

Professor Dotson-Blake responded that this proposal would provide a process for being away for several weeks.

Professor Christian (Business) called the question on the proposed amendment to delete “during the academic workweek” from the first paragraph. Motion seconded.

The motion to delete “during the academic workweek” from the first paragraph was approved.

Professor Winterbauer (Medicine) expressed opposition to the proposed policy because it is a slippery slope to demand that faculty are on campus at specific times. The proposal is too broad and too specific at the same time. Some people teach DE. This could also vary by department and with faculty within various schools and colleges.

Professor Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences) asked why the department chairs and deans are not monitoring this issue and why isn’t this issue addressed in the individual department’s unit codes or informal rules and regulations.

Professor Justiniano (Physics) agreed with Professor Kulesher’s point. If this issue is a problem, it is within the scope of the unit administrators’ responsibilities to take care of. Part VIII, section I of the Faculty Manual states that unit administrators have responsibility for workload. In that sense, it might contradict workload policy and could dilute the power of the unit administrator, who has the final word in faculty evaluations.

Chair Stiller entertained a motion to postpone this discussion until the next business meeting of the senate.

Professor Kain (English) moved to postpone action on this item until the September Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) expressed support for the idea, but noted that the language was too broad and did not accurately address what they were trying to do.

Professor Christian (Biology) agreed with postponing consideration of the proposal. He would like to bring it back because he would like to see it happen, with the right terminology. He would support it.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Chair Stiller clarified that the proposal will be taken up at the first meeting of the fall if the motion passes to postpone.

Professor Kain (English) commented that she had specific concerns related to the proposal but agreed that the role of administrators needs to be clarified.

Motion to postpone passed.

Following discussion, action on the proposed addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VIII, Section I. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of East Carolina University, Subsection III. entitled Faculty Presence was postponed until the September Faculty Senate meeting. **Resolution #16-43**

Agenda Item VII. New Business

Resolution of support for the current Nondiscrimination policy at East Carolina University
Professor Andrew Morehead (Chemistry) brings a resolution before the senate because all people need to be treated with respect. Professor Morehead read the resolution in support of the current Nondiscrimination policy at East Carolina University and in response to North Carolina House Bill 2. Motion seconded.

Professor Bob Morrison (Chemistry), retired faculty member and past Chair of the Faculty, 2002-2003, announced that he just received a text message that the 4th Circuit court of Appeals in Virginia has ruled that not allowing students to use the bathroom according to their gender identity violates Title IX and struck down NC HB2.

The actual suicide rate for transgendered people is horrendous; 41% have attempted suicide whereas the suicide rate for the general population is 1.6%.

Motion passed unanimously.

There the resolution of support for the current Nondiscrimination policy at East Carolina University passed unanimously. **Resolution #16-44**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE APRIL 19, 2016 MEETING

Resolution #16-28

**Commendation for Steve Ballard, Chancellor
East Carolina University (2004-2016)**

- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has served as Chancellor of East Carolina University from 2004 through 2016 and is currently the longest serving Chancellor in the UNC system; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has provided advocacy and support for the entire faculty during his 12 years at the university; and
- WHEREAS,** Under Chancellor Ballard's leadership, East Carolina University has increased enrollment by 23% to over 28,000 students and at the same time has increased the academic profile of freshman classes; and
- WHEREAS,** With Chancellor Steve Ballard's leadership and support, East Carolina University established the Honors College, which has attracted high achieving students to the university, further raising our academic profile; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has vigorously promoted increased diversity and inclusiveness on campus and worked with the faculty, staff, students and alumni to resolve the divisive renaming issue surrounding Aycock Hall in a manner that will serve as a model for other universities to emulate; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has offered his leadership, respectful support, and transparent communication with the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Faculty, including their organizational presence in the Chancellor's division; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has been an advocate for shared governance at East Carolina University and in the University of North Carolina System and, during his tenure as Chancellor, East Carolina University has been a model of shared governance in the UNC System; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard has upheld the core principles of shared governance by supporting and advocating for the ongoing existence of the Faculty Manual by charging the Chair of the Faculty to provide oversight of its review, revision, and reorganization; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard approved of 187 resolutions pertaining to the revision of the Faculty Manual and advocated for the reorganization of the Faculty Manual from 2009 to 2013; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard obtained valuable faculty input and representation on crucial university matters relating to budget crisis, program prioritization, the reaccreditation process, and graduate faculty governance; and
- WHEREAS,** Chancellor Steve Ballard is to be commended for his collaborative spirit and protection of the faculty role in governance at East Carolina University.
- THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that we, the members of East Carolina University's Faculty Senate, hereby express our greatest appreciation and accolades to Chancellor Steve Ballard, for his distinguished leadership and respectful support of the Faculty Senate and the entire faculty of East Carolina University.

**Commendation for Nancy Ballard, First Lady
East Carolina University (2004-2016)**

WHEREAS, Nancy Ballard has served with dignity and grace as First Lady and official hostess of East Carolina University for twelve years, from 2004-2016; and

WHEREAS, throughout her years of service, Mrs. Ballard has been a gracious representative of East Carolina University, having hosted numerous functions for faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of the university; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ballard has served with passion and commitment as a leader at East Carolina University while serving as an Ex-Officio on the Executive Board of the Women's Roundtable, leading the Sister Book Talk Club and serving as Chair of the Spouses Council of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ballard has admirably supported athletics, cultural diversity, the fine arts and its faculty artists including musicians, dancers, and performers, and as an ambassador for EC Scholars and Honors students; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ballard has been a steadfast supporter of the arts with her volunteer work in Greenville and Pitt County.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Nancy Ballard has served East Carolina University, eastern North Carolina and the State of North Carolina, well during her tenure as First Lady and official hostess of East Carolina University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate, on behalf of the faculty of East Carolina University, extends sincere appreciation and best wishes to Nancy Ballard, upon her retirement as First Lady; with gratitude for her twelve years of admirable service, her commitment to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends of the university, and her commendable dignity, kindness, and passion for eastern North Carolina and its residents.

Resolution #16-29

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [March 14, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, including curriculum action items (GC 15-27) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [February 3, 2016](#), and [March 2, 2016](#) which included packages submitted by the Department of Health Services and Information Management; Department of Interdisciplinary Programs – Adult Education; Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research; Department of Geological Sciences; Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 2, 2016](#) were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a proposal of New Doctoral Degree: DrPH in the Department of Public Health within The Brody School of Medicine. (Please note DrPH courses in the March 2, 2016 Graduate Council Committee meeting minutes will be held until fall 2016 when additional course proposals will be presented.)

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [April 11, 2016](#), Graduate Council minutes, including policy and curriculum action items (GC 15-28), changes to the Faculty Manual, Section G – Removal of Graduate Faculty policy; changes to last date to drop policy to reflect 60% of the term, to align with the new undergraduate drop date and the ECU Office Financial Aid payback; changes to Admission by Exception rule from 9 hours attempted to return to good academic standing to 9 hours completed to return to good academic standing; within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

[February 17, 2016](#), and [March 16, 2016](#) which included packages from the Department of Political Science; Department of Human Development and Family Science; Department of Public Health; Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies; Department of International Studies; Department of Occupational Therapy; College of Nursing; Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies; Department of Educational Leadership; Department of Political Sciences – Security Studies Program. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [February 17, 2016](#), [March 16, 2016](#) were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included title revision from MS in Child Development and Family Relations to MS in Human Development and Family Science in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance, revision of an existing degree title: MS in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling program to MS in Clinical Counseling program in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences, proposal of a new post-doctoral certificate: Adult-Gerontology Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (AGPCNP) Concentration and the Family Nurse Practitioner Concentration (FNP) within the College of Nursing, proposal of a new graduate certificate: Dual Language Immersion Administration (DLI) and proposal of a New Concentration: DLI Concentration in Educational Specialist in Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership within the College of Education.

Resolution #16-30

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee [February 25, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the College of Nursing and School of Art and Design and [March 24, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including curricular actions within the College of Engineering and Technology, Department of Mathematics, College of Education, and College of Arts and Sciences African and African American Studies program.

Resolution #16-31

Revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies, subsection VI. Evaluation of Distance Education, as follows:

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

Distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority (i.e. more than 50%) of instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not co-located. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. The course may use Internet, closed circuit, cable, fiber optics, DVDs, CD-ROM or other electronic means to communicate. (The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools definition of “distance education”.)

I. Distance Education Courses and Programs

Programs offered via distance education shall be consistent with the mission of East Carolina University and the academic unit offering the courses or programs. There shall be no distinctions in academic rigor or content between programs offered through distance education and those offered on campus. Development of new online programs and courses will follow the same development and approval procedures as for face-to-face programs and courses (Part V, Section III). Selection of courses and programs to be offered via distance education is the purview of the offering academic unit. The academic units shall provide oversight of programs and courses delivered via distance education to ensure that each is coherent and complete and has learning outcomes appropriate to the level and rigor of the course or program.

II. Oversight of Distance Education

The Office of the Provost shall ensure that academic units adhere to the distance education policies described in this section. The faculty assumes primary responsibility for ensuring the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction offered through distance education.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

III. Courses Delivered by Distance Education

The faculty member teaching a distance education course shall have the same control of content and instruction as in face-to-face courses, consistent with university policies on instruction and academic freedom. Proposals for distance education courses shall be evaluated at the department or school, college and university level. The faculty member, unit curriculum committees, and the unit administrator play a significant role in guiding the development and implementation of distance education courses. Only those proposals demonstrating suitable content and sufficient quality and rigor shall be approved.

Faculty members develop syllabi for distance education courses consistent with the [ECU Standards for Online Learning](#). These standards address learning objectives and other things necessary for student success in distance education courses. The structure of distance education courses and programs reflects consideration of the challenges of time management and the risk of attrition for students in these courses. Course design takes into consideration the need for and importance of interaction between faculty and students and among students.

IV. Faculty Preparation

All courses offered via distance education shall be taught by a qualified, credentialed faculty member approved and assigned by the unit administrator. Faculty who teach distance education courses and programs shall have the same academic qualifications as faculty who teach face-to-face courses. Each faculty member who teaches one or more distance education courses must complete a university training program. Academic units that wish to develop their own training program must use the university training program until their own training program is approved by the appropriate vice chancellor.

Unit administrators are responsible for ensuring that each faculty member teaching distance education courses has the appropriate distance education training. All faculty teaching distance education courses will engage in at least one training activity each academic year that addresses advances in the methodologies and technologies used in distance education. Training is documented in the faculty annual report of each faculty member teaching one or more distance education course. The unit administrator will provide a complete list of faculty members teaching distance education courses and documentation that each faculty member has met the training requirements annually to the Provost's office.

Faculty members teaching a distance education course have access to consultation, implementation, and evaluation support from appropriate supporting units (i.e. Office of Faculty Excellence, IPAR, college Instructional Support Consultants, library services, etc.). The University shall provide appropriate equipment, software, and communications access to faculty necessary to provide effective distance education. The University will ensure the availability of continuing faculty education and training to enhance proficiencies in the methodology and the technologies used in distance education.

V. Quality Standards

Distance education courses shall comply with the [ECU Standards for Online Learning](#).

VI. Evaluation of Distance Education

~~DE Courses and~~ Faculty members teaching through distance education **will be peer reviewed** ~~are subject to periodic review in addition to the faculty annual evaluation (at a minimum, once every three years) to assure the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction.~~ Faculty teaching multiple DE courses will submit only ~~one course for review.~~ Instruction in distance education courses shall be evaluated according to the instruction evaluation procedures in effect for face-to-face courses with appropriate additions consistent with the delivery method, including use of the University Peer Review Instrument for Online Learning or an approved Peer Review Instrument developed by the academic unit. Units that wish to develop their own Peer Review Instrument must use the university instrument until their own instrument is approved by the appropriate vice chancellor. Peer reviewers will be selected based on criteria determined by the faculty of the college, school or department.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Student opinion of instruction will be evaluated through an online evaluation specific for distance education courses approved by the Faculty Senate and the chancellor and administered through the Office of Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research.

Each distance education academic degree program shall be assessed in the same manner and the same frequency as the unit's assessment of academic programs offered on campus. The unit administrator shall review assessment results with assigned faculty and the departmental faculty to facilitate the continual enhancement of the unit's distance education program. (FS Resolution #10-77, November 2010)

Resolution #16-32

Revised [School of Communication](#), [School of Art and Design](#) and [College of Nursing](#) unit codes of operation.

Resolution #16-33

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee [March 21, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including approval for domestic diversity designation for RELI 1500: Uses and Abuses of the Bible, IDIS 3790: Technical Presentations, IDIS 4802: Distribution and Logistics research and global diversity designation for RELI 2697: Judaism, ITEC 3290: Technical Writing, HIST 3840: Africa and the Atlantic World.

Resolution #16-34

Recommendation to use the below questions in a Student Opinion of Instruction Survey that would replace SPOTS.

Survey Form One: Standard Course Evaluation

Section I. University Core Questions

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

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

Relevance of Content

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

Teaching/Learning of Relationships and Concepts

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

Discussion

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

Readings and Assignments

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

Exams/Grades/Evaluation

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

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Providing Feedback to Students

9. My instructor provides useful feedback throughout the semester.

Providing Help as Needed

10. My instructor provides individual assistance when asked.

Overall Rating

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

Section II. Student Participation and Effort

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

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

12. This course has been challenging.

13. I always prepare before class.

Section III. Student Comments

14. What do you feel are the strengths of this course?

15. What would you change to improve this course?

Resolution #16-35

Recommendation that ECU do a pilot of the new Student Opinion of Instruction Survey delivery system using the approved questions (FS Resolution #16-34) in all courses with 6 or more students during both the Second Summer Session and 11-week Summer Session 2016 and that it be communicated to faculty and administrators by letter that the results are not to be used in any way toward evaluations and personnel matters.

Resolution #16-36

Revisions to the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee Charge, as follows:
(Deletions are noted in ~~striketrough~~ and additions in **bold** print.)

1. Name: ~~Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness~~
General Education and Instructional Effectiveness

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 Research, Economic Development and Engagement~~ **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 recommends policies to improve and advance faculty teaching and student learning.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

B. The committee promotes teaching excellence and recommends means to identify faculty teaching success, including development of peer review instruments for teaching face-to-face and distance education courses. The committee assists units requesting aid in developing teaching evaluation instruments for personnel decisions. The committee recommends policies and programs to improve the physical environment in which teaching occurs. The committee provides a forum for faculty opinion concerning the design of new academic buildings and renovation of existing academic buildings.

C. The committee makes recommendations regarding proposed changes, including individual courses, in the ~~Foundations Curriculum~~ **general education and diversity curriculum**. The committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding proposed changes in the ~~Foundations~~ **General Education** Curriculum requirements.

D. The committee reviews the annual report of the Director of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program and the Dean of The Honors College.

E. The committee reviews honors seminar proposals for general education credit, diversity credit, or both.

~~E. F.~~ The chair or appointed representative serves as an ex-officio member of the University Athletics Committee and Honors College Advisory Committee.

F. **G.** The Committee reviews at least annually those sections within the University Undergraduate Catalog and University Graduate Catalog that correspond to the Committee's charge and recommends changes as necessary.

~~G. The chair or appointed representative serves as ex-officio on the University Online Quality Council.~~

5. To Whom The Committee Reports:

The committee reports to the Faculty Senate its recommendations of policies, procedures, and criteria cited above. The committee recommends curricular changes in the ~~Foundations Curriculum~~ **general education and diversity curriculum** to the Faculty Senate.

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:

None

8. Standard Meeting Time:

The committee meeting time is scheduled for the third Monday of each month.

Resolution #16-37

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee [April 8, 2016](#) meeting minutes, including addition of new concentration (Caribbean, Latin America and the Diaspora) within the BA in African and African American Studies program in the College of Art and Sciences; revision of an existing degree title: M.S. in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program to M.S. in Clinical Counseling Program in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; revision of an existing degree title: MS in Child Development and Family Relations to MS in Human Development and Family Science in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance; proposed new post-doctoral certificates: Adult-Gerontology Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (AGPCNP) and Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) within the College of Nursing; proposed new doctoral degree: DrPH in the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine; Program Review revision response for the Department of Economics; and Program Review revision response for the Department of Criminal Justice.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Resolution #16-38

Revisions to the Bachelor of Science University Studies [Faculty Oversight Committee](#) (FOC) [Manual and Guidelines](#), as follows:

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

UNIVERSITY STUDIES FACULTY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MANUAL AND GUIDELINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Construct of the Faculty Oversight Committee

Composition

Selection and Appointment to the Faculty Oversight Committee

Terms of Service

Out-of-Cycle Replacement of Faculty Oversight Committee Members

Selection and Terms of Faculty Oversight Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Faculty Oversight Committee Member Responsibilities

Conduct of Faculty Oversight Committee Meetings

Student *Degree Plan and Proposal* Review and Approval Process

Responsibilities during the Student's UNIV 4990 Practicum

PREFACE

University Studies is a university-wide degree program designed for students who seek a course of study that is personally interesting and professionally relevant outside of the traditional majors path to successful degree completion. Students are required to identify a career objective and design a specific *Degree Plan and Proposal* of integrative coursework around a thematic core. Upon completion of the program, graduates are awarded the Bachelor of Science in University Studies (BSUS) degree, and their transcript will include the title of their thematic core.

The University Studies Faculty Oversight Committee (FOC) is composed of faculty representatives from each of the colleges throughout the university. The committee provides final approval of each student's course of study and thematic core and serves as a resource to University Studies students. Further, the committee provides advice and support to the University Studies Program.

The Faculty Oversight Committee Manual and Guidelines provides operating guidelines, instructions, and procedures for Faculty Oversight Committee (FOC) members and associated responsibilities and duties of the Director of University Studies.

CONSTRUCT OF THE FACULTY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Composition

Each ECU college provides one member to serve on the FOC, except for the Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, which holds three committee positions, and the College of Health and Human Performance, which will have two representatives. Thus, the FOC will include the following members:

Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences (THCAS) – 3 members

- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Natural Sciences/Mathematics

College of Allied Health Sciences (CAHS)

College of Business (COB)

College of Education (COE)

College of Fine Arts and Communication (CFAC)

College of Health and Human Performance (CHHP) – 2 members

- Child Development & Family Services/Social Work/Interior Design

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016**

- Kinesiology/Health Education/Recreation
College of Nursing (CON)
College of Engineering and Technology (CET) ~~Technology and Computer Science (CTCS)~~

Election to the FOC Selection and Appointment to the FOC

~~During each spring semester, the Director of University Studies will notify those college deans the Chair of the Faculty whose of those FOC members are due to change the next academic year (see schedule and rotation below). The Chair of the Faculty will forward that information to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees will compile a list of volunteers for the FOC and forward their nominations to the Faculty Senate, along with all other nominees for standing University committees. Faculty nominees must have a minimum of three years of full-time service at ECU. The Faculty Senate will annually elect the required number of committee members during their April organizational meeting. Not later than spring break, those college deans will forward their selections for vacancies for the next academic year to the Director of University Studies.~~

~~The Director will consolidate the nominations and present them to the Senior Associate Provost, who forwards the nominations to the Provost. The Provost will forward the nominations to the Chair of the Faculty for approval prior to the end of the spring semester. However, t~~
The standing/current FOC will remain intact and conduct any FOC business through the two summer sessions.

Terms of Service

~~Except for the first two years of the program's implementation, FOC members will serve a three-year term. During the program's first two years, terms will vary between one, two, and three years, allowing some members to become "senior," and setting up a committee with a rotational membership. Beginning with Academic Year 2016-2017, all members will serve a three-year term.~~

FOC terms will begin with the fall semester and carry-on through the end of the second summer session. Any UNIV 2000 summer session students who need to make minor changes and obtain approval of their *Degree Plan and Proposal* will continue to work with members of the previous committee for approval (if those committee members are completing their terms), which should occur prior to the start of the fall semester. Should changes become major, or student issues require additional work, the Director of University Studies will work with the student, who will resubmit their proposal to the FOC during the fall semester.

FOC members may not serve consecutive full terms. ~~At the conclusion of their full term, the dean of the college will nominate a new faculty member for FOC duties.~~ Previous FOC members may serve on the committee again, after a one-term break-in-service.

For the first three full years of FOC operations, the implementation schedule is as follows:

~~2014-2015 Academic Year~~

~~3-year term: These FOC member will serve a full three years.~~

~~Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences — Humanities~~

~~College of Allied Health Sciences~~

~~College of Business~~

~~College of Health and Human Performance — CDFR/Social Work/Interior Design~~

~~2-year term: These FOC members will serve two years and their Colleges will nominate new members in 2016, who will serve full three-year terms.~~

~~Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences — Social Sciences~~

~~College of Education~~

~~College of Fine Arts and Communication~~

~~College of Health and Human Performance — Kinesiology/Health Education/Recreation~~

~~1-year term: These FOC members will serve one year and their Colleges will nominate new members in 2015, who will serve full three-year terms.~~

~~Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences — Natural Sciences/Mathematics~~

~~College of Nursing~~

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes April 19, 2016

College of Engineering and Technology

~~At the start of the 2016/2017 Academic Year, the FOC membership will include all three-year term members. Approximately one-third of the membership will change rotate each year as follows: , and will rotate based upon the initial plan above. Therefore the Colleges will change on the dates noted:~~

New members for AY 2015/2016, and every three years thereafter:
Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences – Natural Sciences/Mathematics
College of Engineering and Technology
College of Nursing

New members for AY 2016/2017, and every three years thereafter:
Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences – Social Sciences
College of Education
College of Fine Arts and Communication
College of Health and Human Performance – Kinesiology/Health Education/Recreation

New members for AY 2017/2018, and every three years thereafter:
Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences – Humanities
College of Allied Health Sciences
College of Business
College of Health and Human Performance – CDFR/Social Work/Interior Design

Out-of-Cycle Replacement of FOC Members

Unless special circumstances arise, faculty appointees to the FOC should complete their full terms. From time to time, a replacement may be required (e.g., a faculty member leaving ECU, an appointment to duties at ECU where the commitment to the FOC cannot be maintained, as in becoming a dean or other administrative position). In those cases, the FOC member ~~and/or the dean of the college~~ will notify the Director of University Studies ~~and the Senior Associate Provost~~. The Director of University Studies will notify the Chair of the Faculty who will, in a timely manner, appoint a ~~The dean will select a replacement FOC member and forward the nomination to the Senior Associate Provost, who will seek the concurrence of the Provost and the Chair of the Faculty.~~ Once confirmed, the new FOC member from the college of the departing member to ~~will~~ serve the remaining term of the previous member.

The new FOC member, who will complete the original member's term, may be nominated to continue on the FOC only if they served less than half of the original member's term (18 months). If the replacement served more than 18 months, the replacement FOC member will serve the balance of the term and the Committee on Committees ~~College Dean~~ will nominate to the Faculty Senate a new FOC member at the College's normal rotational schedule (see previous section).

Selection and Terms of FOC Chair and Vice Chair

The FOC will meet prior to, or early in, the new academic year (scheduled as early as possible and based upon availability of the FOC membership). The Director of University Studies will organize the meeting and direct the meeting's first order of business, which will be to elect a chair and vice chair.

1. FOC members will select a chair and vice chair through a nomination process (a FOC member may volunteer for a term of service in either position).
2. The position of chair is selected from members of the FOC with at least one year of service. The vice chair may be selected from among FOC members regardless of time served.
3. The committee will vote on the Chair and Vice Chair nominations, with the positions being selected by a simple majority.
4. Once the Chair has been elected, the Chair will direct the remainder of the meeting, but may use the proposed agenda submitted by the Director of University Studies.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

If the FOC chair can no longer serve on the committee during the academic year (e.g., the faculty member departs ECU, or an appointment duties at ECU where the commitment to the FOC cannot be maintained, as in becoming a dean or other administrative position), the vice chair will assume the chair for the remainder of the academic year. Nominations and elections for a new vice chair will occur at the next meeting, or via electronic means, if the vice chair and the FOC members agree.

The FOC Chair and Vice Chair terms of office are one year. A Vice Chair may be subsequently elected as Chair for a one-year term, but the succession to the Chair position is not automatic or pre-determined.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Each member of the FOC will:

1. Serve as voting member of the FOC for approval of all thematic core and University Studies students' *Degree Plan and Proposals* submitted to the committee.
2. If required and feasible, serve as a faculty mentor for thematic core proposals that have a near majority of coursework in the proposal from the faculty member's college/school. In the Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, proposals will be germane to the areas within the college of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics. If a University Studies student's thematic core choices begin to cause an imbalance in the number of students assigned to certain faculty members, the student's primary faculty mentor may not be from the College with the near majority of coursework. However, that FOC member should stand ready to provide advice to the primary faculty mentor.
3. If required and feasible, work with a second faculty member to serve as faculty mentors in the development process of a thematic concentration proposal when the other major coursework is from the second member's college/school or area within the HCAS.
4. Serve the term of office to which s/he was chosen, unless unforeseen circumstances arise.
5. Provide suggestions for other faculty to assist with the development of a proposal as needed, including the possibility of retired faculty from the appropriate discipline.
6. Other tasks or duties as determined by the University Studies program needs and/or the FOC.

The FOC will report their findings to the Director of University Studies, who serves as the facilitator/coordinator of the FOC.

Conduct of FOC Meetings

The Director of University Studies may propose the need for the FOC to meet and may submit proposed agenda items (to the Chair and Vice Chair), but the FOC Chair will approve and select dates and times for the meetings and direct the meeting and agenda. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume these duties.

The FOC normally will meet at the beginning of the Academic Year, and once each semester. Online/electronic meetings may take place as needed, but at least one meeting will occur in-person during the fall and spring semesters. Summer sessions may be conducted via electronic means or in-person, at the discretion of the Chair.

Student Degree Plan and Proposal Review and Approval Process

Declared University Studies students will take UNIV 2000, which is designed to orient students to the University Studies degree program, initiate the student's career planning efforts, and facilitate the approval of each student's *Degree Plan and Proposal*. The first half of the course is designed for the student to compose their proposal. After reviewing, grading, and coordinating student corrections, the Director of University Studies will compile the proposals for FOC review and approval.

The Director of University Studies will guide and facilitate the proposal review and approval process. The process will follow the following steps:

1. The Director will assign student proposals into three categories: Ready for Approval, Full Committee Review, and Incomplete/Not Ready.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

2. The Director will assign each student proposal to two FOC reviewers. If feasible (based upon student loads and current groupings/themes of students' thematic cores), one of the two faculty members will be from the College with the near majority of that student's coursework. The second faculty member may be anyone from the FOC. The Director will strive to balance student proposal approval loads. Regardless of assignments, any FOC member is welcome to review proposals and offer feedback.
3. The Director will notify and inform all members of the FOC regarding student proposals in the different categories and assignment of FOC reviewers. The notification will usually occur via a spreadsheet sent to all members and/or posted on the BSUS SharePoint site.
4. For proposals judged to be Ready for Approval:
 - a. The Director and Assistant Director/Academic Advisor will select proposals for this category of very high quality.
 - b. The two FOC members may take the following actions on the student proposal:
 - i. Recommend Approval
 - ii. Recommend approved after suggested changes (which the Director will coordinate with the student and FOC faculty mentor)
 - iii. Refer to the full FOC for further consideration, which then places this proposal into the Full Committee Review category
 - c. At each semester's meeting to review student proposals, the Chair will request full FOC committee approval for these proposals, en masse. Any FOC member may request the full FOC's review of a particular proposal. If this occurs, that proposal will be moved to the Full Committee Review category, but all other proposals judged Ready for Approval may be approved en masse by agreement of a majority of the FOC.
5. For proposals selected for Full Committee Review:
 - a. At the FOC meeting (or via electronic media discussions), the two reviewers will present the proposal and provide their recommendations and or suggestions.
 - b. All FOC members may participate in the discussions and offer suggestions (to include thematic core title and/or course changes).
 - c. At the conclusion of the discussions, the proposal may be:
 - i. Approved
 - ii. Approved after suggested changes (which the Director will coordinate with the student and, if required, FOC faculty reviewers)
 - iii. Returned the student for substantive changes and resubmission. The Director will work with the student before resubmitting the proposal to the full committee or to designated FOC reviewers.
6. The Director will continue to work with students whose proposals were judged as Incomplete/Not Ready. If specifically requested by FOC members, the Director will send requested proposals to specific FOC members or the entire committee for review. After additional review and discussions, the proposal may remain in this category (until the Director deems it appropriate for Full Committee Review), or the FOC member who requested the review may submit the proposal to the FOC for a vote.

Responsibilities during the Student's UNIV 4990 Practicum

UNIV 4990 serves as the capstone course for students completing the University Studies program. The practicum experience, via an internship, project, or research paper will provide the student the opportunity to apply their thematic core and gain experience in project planning and execution, leadership, and professional writing.

The Director of University Studies is responsible for oversight and grading of UNIV 4990, which includes a practicum plan. In part, this plan will illustrate how the student's chosen practicum experience allows them to apply their curriculum and thematic core. As soon as possible (after submissions) each semester, the Director of University Studies will send an electronic communication to FOC members with a list of students enrolled in UNIV 4990, their thematic core title, and the student's chosen practicum experience. This communication is intended to inform FOC members that the students are following their FOC-approved thematic core and plan.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

As students are seeking practicum experiences, the student and/or Director of University studies may ask for FOC assistance in recommending and/or securing a practicum experience. Usually, the assistance will be required if students select the project or research practicum, as these options require a faculty member to serve as the Practicum Supervisor (for additional information on these duties and the practicum experience, see *UNIV 4990 Practicum Manual*). FOC members may request a copy of a student's Practicum Final Report.

Resolution #16-39

Formal faculty advice on the proposed Research Space Allocation PRR, as follows:

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

Related Policies:

Space Allocation Committee (Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research): *ECU Space Allocation Procedures and Guidelines* (Adopted Dec 2003; Amended, Apr 2007)

(<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/FifthYearReport/upload/Space-Allocation-Policy-Revised-April2007.pdf>)

Space Allocation/Reallocation Committee (SPARC) (Unit Code of Operations, Brody School of Medicine, <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/unitcodes/medicine.pdf>)

Allocation of University Space. REG07.30.01 <http://www.ecu.edu/prr/07/30/01>

Additional References:

A concept for the integration of space and physical planning (Flye, B. and Duncan, C.S., 2008)

(<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/FifthYearReport/upload/A-Concept-for-the-Integration-of-Space-and-Physical-Planning-030708.pdf>)

Campus Space Planning (<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/planning/SpacePlanning.cfm#>)

IRS Publication4077, Tax Exempt Bonds for 501(c) (3) organizations (<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p4077.pdf>)

Contact for Info: Provost (328-5419), VC for Administration and Finance (328-6966), VC for Research and Graduate Studies (328-9471), Director of Institutional Planning, IPAR (328-9481), Financial Services, Compliance Management (737-1133)

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Research and graduate education are central to the mission of East Carolina University (e.g., *ECU Strategic Action Plan, 2010-13*). These activities require substantial infrastructure, including research space (Code 250 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd) and research support space (Code 255 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd). Research space is intended to promote the scholarly activities of faculty members and students in support of ECU's mission.
- 1.2. This regulation and its foundation principles explicitly align with ECU's REG 07.30.01, *Allocation of University Space*. The Chancellor has delegated full authority to the University Space Committee (USC) to approve all allocations and reallocations of existing University-owned and leased research space. In addition, ECU's REG 07.30.01 specifies that issues regarding the use of space in the Brody School of Medicine (BSOM) will first be considered by its Space Allocation and Reallocation Committee (SPARC) with recommendations made to the USC for final approval.

2. Guiding Principles

- 2.1. Research Space. Research space (Codes 250 and 255 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd) is a valuable resource and is the property of the State of North Carolina and is allocated to, and managed by, ECU as noted above. The USC, with administrative support from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research (IPAR), is ultimately responsible for the allocation and/or reallocation of all space (including research space) to colleges, schools, departments, and other units.
- 2.2. Research Portfolio. Research space allocations are not permanent. Research space is allocated to individuals and groups of individuals in order to engage research activities. Thus, research space may be reallocated as the University's portfolio of research activities changes. Since that portfolio is

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

reasonably expected to change over time, research space also is expected to be reallocated in response to the changing environment and institutional priorities.

- 2.3. Research Space Management Levels. While possessing authority to allocate and reallocate all ECU research space, the USC recognizes and appreciates the knowledge of programmatic space needs and disciplinary expertise that is held at the unit level and grants relative autonomy to departments, schools, colleges, and centers/institutes. Departments, schools, colleges, and centers/institutes are expected to manage research space effectively so that it aligns with university priorities (see 2.4) and is used efficiently (see 2.5). Research space management levels are:
Level I allocations and reallocations occur within departments/units (i.e., between researchers within a department or a unit) and are typically managed by a chair/director, which shall be identified by the USC. Level II allocations and reallocations occur within colleges/schools (i.e., between departments and units within a college or school) and are typically managed by a dean which shall be identified by the USC;
Level III allocations and reallocations are less frequent, occur between colleges, schools, and divisions and these are managed by IPAR with direction and approval from the USC. While Level I and Level II allocations and reallocations of research space do not require approvals above their respective levels, all allocations and reallocations must be properly communicated to IPAR via the IPAR website (www.ecu.edu/ipar) after any new allocations or reallocations so that the University's space inventory is current and accurate. Given its authority, the USC will hear and reconcile any (research space) disputes that are not negotiated successfully at Levels I and II.
- 2.4. Unit Priorities and Strategic Alignment. Research space priorities shall be established at the departmental/unit level, college/school /divisional level, and university level. At all Levels research space allocations and reallocations are made in accordance with established priorities that align with ECU strategic planning goals and objectives.
- 2.5. Efficiency of Use. In addition to strategic alignment, research space allocations and reallocations are made in accordance with efficiency of use. Thus, research space is subject to biennial inventory and efficiency audits by IPAR (see 4 below), as directed by the USC, with the possibility of subsequent allocation or reallocation occurring at any management Level. The conditions for initiating a reallocation at Level I and Level II shall be communicated to and approved by the USC.
- 2.6. Frequency. It is impractical to reallocate research space too frequently. Effective space-use practice recognizes that research funding and output fluctuate over time and that considerable costs can accompany reallocation activities. **The department chair or other unit administrator shall cooperate with the current research space occupant to be sure the person is given access to the space during reasonable hours for purposes of arranging disposal of equipment and supplies.** ~~The department chair or other unit administrator shall cooperate with the current research space occupant to be sure the person is given access to the space during reasonable hours for purposes of arranging disposal of equipment and supplies.~~
- 2.7. New Faculty. Prior to a new faculty member joining ECU, the college and/or department should communicate, in writing to the faculty member and to IPAR, any commitment of research space (including Categories 250 and 255 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd) and space renovation to accommodate the faculty member's research agenda. This written commitment must provide adequate detail regarding: general characteristics, proposed location, plan for renovation including budget, time limits for occupancy, and terms under which the space could be reallocated. If the space commitment to a new faculty member requires additional space beyond that already managed at Levels I or II, then it must be approved by administrators at Levels I, II, and the USC. Given its authority, the USC will hear and reconcile any disputes that are not negotiated successfully at Levels I and II.
- 2.8. Sponsored Research. Sponsored research involves agreement of the University to provide adequate space. When additional research space is required to engage a sponsored project, the principal investigators shall inform all units involved and the USC (through IPAR). Negotiation of a solution to the space need should occur well in advance of any submission deadline.
- 2.9. Emeritus Faculty. Emeritus faculty may be provided with research space at the discretion of the units involved if space is available and the emeritus faculty member remains actively engaged in research

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

that is determined by the unit to be aligned with the programmatic needs and priorities of the University.

3. Considerations for Allocating and Reallocating Research Space
 - 3.1. New allocations or reallocations will bring research space into alignment with long-term University priorities as expressed in units' strategic plans.
 - 3.2. New allocations or reallocations will increase the productivity of individual, departmental/unit, or college research space utilization.
 - 3.3. New allocations or reallocations will make explicit the length of the research space commitment.
 - 3.4. New allocations or reallocations will consider associated one-time and recurring costs. If subsidies are necessary, funding sources will be specified by end-users.
 - 3.5. New allocations or reallocations will consider opportunities to co-locate similar types of research activity in order to share core or common space and equipment.
 - 3.6. New allocations or reallocations will consider the effects of space assignments (including equipment and other infrastructure) on health, fire, environmental, accessibility, and safety compliance.
 - 3.7. New allocations or reallocations will consider the primary reasons for a research space request and any possible secondary issues (indirect effects) that might result.
 - 3.8. New allocation or reallocation will occur without discrimination on the basis of the protected class status of the affected occupant, except and to the extent required by law, such as that required for reasonable accommodation of a disability as coordinated through the Office of Disability Support Services.
4. Research Space Productivity

To ensure that space is efficiently and effectively utilized, IPAR (as directed by the USC and assisted by units) will conduct biennial research space audits. Possessing quantitative and qualitative metrics, along with appropriate benchmarks, assists all management Levels (I-III) to optimize the use of research space. Productivity measures and benchmarks for research space are expected to vary between and among disciplines. Financial measures are expected to be one part of the overall assessment of research space productivity. Financial measures may include but are not limited to: total external research award dollars / per net assignable square foot (NASF), total external research expenditure dollars / per NASF, and indirect cost recovery dollars / per NASF. Non-financial measures of research productivity may include but are not limited to: number of refereed publications and books completed or in process, number of citations of published research publications in process, number of graduate students engaged, number of undergraduate students engaged, and other metrics as deemed relevant by the Unit Administrator. These and other factors may be weighted or un-weighted within departments and colleges. Because of expected inter-annual variability in research productivity, a five-year moving average will be employed as the unit of research observation.
5. Allocation/Reallocation Procedure
 - 5.1. Initial (and subsequently altered) productivity measurement schemes at Level I must be communicated to and approved by the Level II administrator and the USC. Productivity measurement schemes at Level II **and Level III** must be approved by the USC. This process is intended to provide effective communication and reasonable alignment of approaches. IPAR will assemble, aggregate, maintain, and communicate all necessary research space/productivity data. A five-year report of productivity of individual research spaces (for Level I analysis by chairs and directors), departmental/unit research spaces (for Level II analysis by deans), and college research spaces (for Level III analysis by the USC) will be prepared by IPAR with assistance from Levels I and II.
 - 5.2. All research space requests for allocation or reallocation are initiated through IPAR's existing Space Allocation Request Portal. These entries can include space requests for new research programming or a change of existing use (to/from research). These requests typically are initiated by Level I or Level II administrators and provide necessary communication of space use in order to keep the inventory current and accurate. The USC must approve Level III requests. The key considerations for space managers at each level are included above (see 3).
 - 5.3. Whenever a research space is deemed unproductive (falls below the 20th percentile of productivity at any space management Level (see 2.3) as a result of the five-year report, it is eligible to be reviewed

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016**

for possible reallocation at that Level. Each Level must document and communicate expectations and measures for productivity to the next appropriate Level and IPAR.

5.4. Reallocation at Level I normally involves a chair's reallocation between researchers within a department or unit. Reallocation at Level II normally involves a dean's reallocation of research space between departments. Given its authority, the USC will hear and reconcile any disputes that are not negotiated successfully at Levels I and II. Level III reallocations by the USC must consider financial and non-financial measures of research productivity. Before any Level III allocation/reallocation is accomplished, a site visit and hearing of affected units will be conducted by the USC. Current research space occupant(s) will be provided with at least a six months notice of intended reallocation, except as approved by the chancellor or his or her designee because of exceptional circumstances meriting more immediate reallocation, including but not limited to abuse or abandonment of the space by the space occupant, threats to health or safety, or when change is mandated to ensure compliance with applicable law.

6. Research Space Assignment Record Keeping:

6.1. Space allocations for research are subject to review for private business use in accordance with applicable IRS regulations and IRS Publication 4077. The Department, Unit, office responsible for assignment must maintain records that state how the space is being used so that private business use can be reviewed and analyzed on an annual basis by Financial Services' Office of Compliance Management.

Resolution #16-40

Changes in the Categories to Change Grades via Banner, as follows:

The Admission and Retention Policy Committee has reviewed the options available to change a student's grade via Banner and have suggestions for more appropriate names. We request changes of categories on the following change of grade options:

<u>Current option</u>	<u>Proposed Option</u>
Instructor Correction	Calculation Error
Entry Error	Entry Error
Late Reported (NR)	Late Grade Submission
Removal of Incomplete	Removal of Incomplete
Change of Grade	Other Reason

Please note the committee wishes the suggested categories to remain in the order listed above.

Resolution #16-41

The Academic Awards Committee is charged with recommending policies and procedures governing the granting of awards for meritorious teaching, research and scholarship of engagement. The Committee will review all awarding policies and procedures in the upcoming year and bring forward to the Faculty Senate in January 2017 revisions to both the process and submission requirements of each award. Prior to that undertaking, and in an effort to address ongoing concerns from faculty and administration about the number of faculty members awarded multiple awards in a given year, **the Committee requests approval of the below new policy that will go into effect immediately and involve 2016/2017 awards for meritorious teaching that the Committee oversees:**

"While faculty members may self-nominate or be nominated for more than one university teaching award (Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching, Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Awards, Max Ray Joyner Award for Outstanding Teaching in Distance Education, and East Carolina

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Alumni Association Outstanding Teaching Award and Robert L. Jones Teaching Award), faculty members may only accept nomination and submit a portfolio for one university teaching award in a given year.”

Resolution #16-42

Rename and add to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section IV. Student Privacy and Conduct, subsection III. entitled Student Complaints, as follows:

Rename Part VI, Section IV. Student Privacy and Conduct to read:
Student Privacy, Conduct, **and Complaints**

Add new subsection III. as follows:

“III. Student Complaints

East Carolina University (ECU) is committed to maximizing student success and providing the highest quality educational experience. In general, the investments that faculty and students make in assuring this excellence are part of ECU's academic culture and are carried out in a very positive learning environment. Occasionally and for varied reasons, the experience can be negative. While this is a relatively rare event, ECU will provide a respectful and responsive avenue for students to lodge complaints concerning the performance of an instructor. In addition, ECU must consider due process in notifying instructors of such complaints and in permitting appropriate responses.

Complaints from students whose identity is known by a chair, dean or other administrative officer of the University will be properly investigated. Confidential student educational records, including student complaints containing personally identifiable information, shall remain confidential to the extent required by applicable law, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). This may require disclosure of some or all of an otherwise confidential student education record when rights protected by Due Process are at stake, as in situations where the results of a disciplinary proceeding could adversely impact an instructor's property interests, such as potential loss of tenure or termination of an instructor on a fixed term contract prior to expiration of the term. Complaints containing personally identifiable information from students whose identities are known by a chair, dean or other administrative officer of the University shall not be considered part of a “secret file,” or “obtained from an anonymous source.” Evaluations of an instructor's performance may include supervisor opinions based on observations and investigations prompted by such student complaints, so long as the content of the complaint is disclosed to the subject instructor at the initiation of the complaint, to the extent allowed by applicable law.

These provisions apply to those complaints by students about instructors received by unit (or other) administrators that are not covered by specific institutional policies, rules and regulations, such as those relating to academic integrity violations, grade disputes, sexual harassment, or any type of alleged discrimination. In general, the types of complaints covered by these provisions relate to violations of the reasonable expectation of students for a respectful, organized, and productive learning experience.

These provisions apply when a chair/unit (or other) administrator receives a verbal or written complaint from a student whose identity is known to the chair/unit (or other) administrator. The complaint may come directly from a student, a group of students, or from the Office of the Dean of Students, which maintains a student grievances and inquiries policy. If the complaint is against a Chair/unit Administrator, then the next higher-level administrator assumes the role of Chair/unit administrator in this process. Each step should be executed in a timely fashion (generally no more than five working days).

If the complaining student is willing to be identified to the instructor, a FERPA/Buckley waiver should be administered. A copy of any signed FERPA/Buckley waiver should be forwarded to the Registrar for inclusion in the student's permanent file.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

If the student is unwilling to be identified to the instructor, but is known to the unit administrator, protection of personally identifiable information about the student will be maintained to the extent required by law.

Upon receipt of a complaint the Chair/unit administrator will investigate the complaint and engage in fact finding. The Chair/unit administrator will first meet with the complaining party and then with the instructor in question, but personally identifiable information regarding the student will not be revealed to the instructor at this stage unless the student has signed a FERPA/Buckley waiver.

If warranted, the Chair/ unit administrator will initiate other actions to investigate the complaint, e.g., visiting class, inspecting the syllabus, and examining grading records. The investigation may continue even if the student withdraws the complaint.

If the complaint is substantiated, then a form/letter documenting, to the extent allowed by law, the investigation and its resolution will be included in instructor's personnel file. Typically, a copy of the student complaint or an administrator's record of a verbal complaint, redacted to remove all personally identifiable information about the student, will be one of the items placed in the file. The instructor will receive timely notification of the addition to his or her personnel file and will be advised of his or her right to include a response in the personnel file, and of potential avenues for appeal as outlined in Part XII, Section I of the Faculty Manual. Disclosure of some or all of an otherwise confidential student education record may occur when rights protected by Due Process are at stake, such as those instances where the results of a disciplinary proceeding could adversely impact an instructor's property interests.

If the complaint is not substantiated, this resolution is communicated to the instructor and the complaining party without inclusion of any record in the personnel file. At the option of the instructor, documentation, to the extent allowed by law, of this resolution may be placed in the personnel file. The student may contact the next higher administrator (usually the dean) with concerns or questions."

Resolution #16-43

Postponed action on the proposed addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VIII, Section I. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of East Carolina University, Subsection III. entitled Faculty Presence until the September 6, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Resolution #16-44

Resolution of support for the current Nondiscrimination policy at East Carolina University, as follows:

Whereas, North Carolina House Bill 2 [1] states that Public agencies shall require every multiple-occupancy bathroom or changing facility to be designated for and only used by persons based on their biological sex; and

Whereas, North Carolina House Bill 2 defines biological sex as “The physical condition of being male or female, which is stated on a person's birth certificate;” and

Whereas, North Carolina House Bill 2 excludes sexual orientation, gender identity, and military status in the regulation of discriminatory practices; and

Whereas, the North Carolina Senate Judiciary IV Committee considering House Bill 2 could not agree [2] on the definition of gender identity, with one of the bill sponsors claiming that gender identity refers to one's biological sex based on the birth certificate; and

Whereas, The U. S. Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2013 prohibits covered entities (employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, or joint labor-management committees) from engaging in employment discrimination on the basis of an individual's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; and

Whereas, The U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [3] considers it discriminatory to deny an employee equal access to a common restroom corresponding to the employee's gender identity; and

Whereas, transgender youth have a high suicide rate that is exacerbated by lack of access to bathroom facilities corresponding to their gender identity [4], and in the Charlotte area there have been two recent suicides of transgender youth ages 16 and 18; and

Whereas, North Carolina may lose considerable economic benefits including the possible loss of federal funds due to violations of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and/or Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and

Whereas, East Carolina University, as an institution dedicated to the free and respectful exchange of ideas and the ideal that a diversity of experiences and perspectives enriches our community, has a moral mandate to protect our entire community;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the Faculty Senate recommends that in its Nondiscrimination policy, East Carolina University uses the definition of gender identity as one's inner sense of one's own gender, which may or may not match the sex assigned at birth, and

Be It Further Resolved That the Faculty Senate recommends that sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran status continue to be included as protected classes in the East Carolina University Nondiscrimination policy, which includes in part as quoted here:

“9.1.1. East Carolina University prohibits unlawful discrimination based on the following protected classes: race/ethnicity, color, genetic information, national origin, religion, sex (including pregnancy and pregnancy related conditions), sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, political affiliation, and veteran status.”

1. <http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2015E2/Bills/House/PDF/H2v4.pdf>
2. <http://www.wral.com/news/state/nccapitol/video/15596204/>
3. http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/enforcement_protections_lgbt_workers.cfm
4. Kristie L. Seelman, “Transgender Adults’ Access to College Bathrooms and Housing and the Relationship to Suicidality”, Journal of Homosexuality, Feb. 25 (2016).