



2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 17, 2017

([Video live stream](#))

The second regular meeting of the 2017/2018 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Rooms.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The [September 12, 2017](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Alves (Dental Medicine), Dotson-Blake (Education), Cuthrell (Education), Robinson (Mathematics), Grzybowski (Medicine), Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Deale (Hospitality Management and UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate) and VC Jay Golden (Research, Engagement and Economic Development).

Alternates present were: Professors Hoover for Wanucha (Academic Library Services), Zeng for Stokes (Allied Health Sciences), Eblin for Sias (Allied Health Sciences), Reisch for Christian (Business), Hackett for Gueye (English), Davis for Barber (Health Sciences Library), Domire for Cortright (Kinesiology), Baltaro for Gilliland (Medicine), Little for Greer (Medicine), Bowman for Bolin (Nursing) and Loy for Viren (Recreation and Leisure Studies).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor acted on the September 12, 2017 Faculty Senate resolutions listed below:

17-55 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council meeting minutes of [August 28, 2017](#), including curriculum action item (GC 15-40) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from [April 12, 2017](#), which included a package submitted by the Department of Public Health. [*Resolution was received.*]

17-56 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [April 13, 2017](#), including curricular actions within the School of Art and Design, College of Engineering and Technology and Departments of Psychology, Anthropology and History.

17-57 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the revised Service Learning Committee meeting minutes of [November 10, 2015](#) to correctly reflect approval of ENGL 2201 as SL* (selected sections).

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 2

17-58 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [April 10, 2017](#) including writing intensive designation (WI) for NURS 4614 and WI removal of SPED 5501, ICTN 4020 and ICTN 4022.

17-59 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of [September 8, 2017](#), including consideration of a [request for authorization to establish](#) a Joint PhD in Integrative Coastal and Marine Sciences (ICMS) between ECU and UNC-W and a request for authorization to establish a MA in Hispanic Studies (material available via Curriculog). *[Resolution is approved with the exception of the Joint PhD in Integrative Coastal and Marine Sciences (ICMS) between ECU and UNC-W, which is being held for further study.]*

17-60 Endorsement of ECU Student Government Association's resolution requesting the creation of a voluntary syllabus bank to assist students in registering for courses. *[Resolution was received.]*

17-61 Revised Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching Effectiveness.

17-62 Resolution in Support of an Ombuds Office at East Carolina University. *[Resolution was received.]*

The Teaching Grants Committee is now accepting 2018/19 Teaching Grant proposals. The submission deadline is 12:00 noon on Monday, November 6, 2017. Proposal guidelines are available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/tg/teachinggrants.cfm>. The purpose of these grants is to provide funding to improve teaching instruction at the University. Full time tenured, tenure-track, and fixed term faculty members are eligible to apply for these grants with preference given to projects that are creative and innovative or meet demonstrated needs. All monetary expenditures are tied to the current fiscal year and all monies must be spent by June 30, 2018. Questions may be directed to Professor Mark Sprague, Chair of the Teaching Grants Committee at spraguem@ecu.edu.

The annual ECU Scholarship Awarding Workshop is scheduled for Wednesday, December 6, 2017, from 1:00 – 2:00 pm in the Willis Auditorium. This workshop is for all faculty and staff interested in the annual awarding of student scholarships. Questions may be directed to Professor Stephanie Richards, Chair of the Student Scholarships, Fellowships and Financial Aid Committee at richardss@ecu.edu.

C. Cecil Staton, Chancellor

Chancellor Staton spoke about two subjects. First, negotiations regarding commitments we have made as a University have been negotiated with the GA and a performance agreement signed. In spring 2017, a new Strategic Plan, Higher Expectations, was approved. ECU is committed to increasing total extramural funding from \$44mil to \$60mil (36% increase), increasing research expenditures, increasing enrollment from 80 rural counties in NC from 10,032 to 10,915 (9%), increasing enrollment from lower income groups from 7,026 to 8,273, and increasing 5 year graduation from 61% to 70%. The Chancellor acknowledged that we are already working hard, but need to try to work smarter. Research agendas should be relevant to internal and external stakeholders—relevancy is smart. The rural initiatives program is smart, marshalling our resources to meet rural needs. Involving undergraduate students is important to prepare them for jobs and for faculty to meet our research needs. We are not trying to recreate Chapel Hill or Michigan here at

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 3

ECU. We are looking at worthy, targeted investments while achieving depth by bringing interdisciplinary teams together in the clusters.

Enrollment based funding formula will not likely fully disappear. Performance based measures will likely become more prominent in funding plans. We will be expected to accommodate our fair share of the growth of high school graduates over the next few years. A task force has been called to formulate a plan to accommodate expanded growth in enrollments. The current plan runs through 2019 with a 30,000 enrollment goal. Over the next decade, we will need to look at further expansion. ECU has been a leader at assessing and meeting the challenges of enrollment and programming. A second project focuses on course prerequisites and program requirements. In 2015, more than 15,000 course substitutions were addressed and several programs reduced total credit hours required to 120. Improving academic efficiency includes the finish in 4 initiatives. The second topic involves the Board of Governors in Chapel Hill. There has been a lot of attention on issues and actions taken by the BOG. Process issues are evident—meetings (timing, participation, location), relocation of the BOG in Chapel Hill (considering a move to Raleigh or RTP), staffing of the GA (asking questions as to how the GA relates to the campuses in the 21st century), and tuition and fees (BOG prioritizes reduction of tuition and fees or certainly reducing the growth in those seen in recent years). Additionally, there is consideration underway to remove the name General Administration and go with System.

ECU has great success in increasing rural and lower income enrollments. The Chancellor is committed to making sure our efforts “make it past I-95” and that the state and the world hears about the accomplishments. His opinion is that the BOG holds in their hands the crown jewels of the state (our universities) and we need to help them understand the tremendous job we do meeting needs across the region.

Professor Wolf (Physics) asked if ECU has support planned for new enrollment growth such as new classroom space and those spaces designed for active learning. The Chancellor reported that the Life Sciences Building should open in 2019. He reported concern over rising building costs that may require supplementing construction with other revenues. Revitalizing current spaces is being examined. Dorm space has been reviewed, considering if some converted to other uses will need to be returned to living space. Construction plans are about a 10-year process. He believes a new medical education building for the BSOM is needed. A new performing arts center is needed for the community but with instruction space. Repurposing of current space is expected.

Professor Klein (English) asked for examples of research those in Humanities can do that do not seem to fit in the current research clusters. The Chancellor hopes that by engaging students in our faculty's research or in collaborative groups, we will be doing what we need to do to create opportunities. Successful research funding likely comes from our strengths in sciences. It is a reality not unique to ECU. He values all research and said focusing on our strengths should not discourage us from any research.

Professor Kain (English) emphasized needs of first generation students and the time commitment in having undergraduate students involved in research. She asked if we are considering the faculty requirements to meet these needs. Are we working to maintain tenure track faculty who can meet these needs? The Chancellor has shared these concerns with the GA. There is another task force regarding funding. Our state appropriation is \$300 million; UNC and NCSU are around \$500 million. Their enrollments are not much more than ours (NCSU ~20% higher). Also, he asked why our

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 4

students are calculated as much less “value” than NCSU and UNC Chapel Hill, with values reported \$13k, 418k and \$23K, respectively. ECU has the greatest return on investment in the state (much applause from the senators). Resources we receive are going to have to be strategically utilized to meet the needs of the future type of student we wish to bring to ECU. We will have to compromise.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Vice Chancellor Horns reported on Project Unify and said there remains a lot of work to do. This project has been underway for more than five years. The goal is to have a better partnership plan with the medical practice group. This is not a merger of the BSOM, but an integration of the ECU Physicians medical practice with the Vidant Medical Group (VMG) and forms a distinct separate corporation. Initial integration agreement has been signed. It is very complex and many details are still being sorted. Dr. Mark Stacy, new dean of BSOM, is the chair of the board with representatives from VMG and ECU. A legal team and others are working on the umbrella issues that must be resolved. Four gates: payment limit (federal program helps to offset cost of nonpaying patients), debt collection act (as a state institution, we cannot collect from nonpayers), some issues with bond funded buildings (ECHI, Family Medicine center), physician clinical compensation model (rebranding/naming with intent for enhancing the execution of our mission with cost effective, quality healthcare while expanding the learning environment and enlarging research venues). Issues around HR, impact on employees, and research/clinical trial questions continue to be of concern. She believes the plan will be executed next year between January 2018 and December 2018.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked for the difference in a merger and an integration and why the new corporation is needed. VC Horns said it is a different type of working partnership and that issues with information sharing are better resolved with formation of a new corporation. Donna Payne reported the new corporation is a new associated entity with the sole purpose of meeting the BSOM mission. The Board of the new corporation has to meet the mission in their decisions. ECU will hold 49% share of the Board of Directors and Dean Stacy will be the chair of the Board.

VC Horns introduced Dr. Ying Zhou to explain the west campus faculty equity study report. Reports are available at <http://www.ecu.edu/salaryequitystudy/>. Six faculty groups (608 members) were reviewed: 295 Brody clinical, 86 Brody basic science, 71 Allied Health, 37 School of Dental Medicine, 78 CON, 41 Library. Salaries were adjusted to a 12-month salary value. The full executive summary may be found <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/oed/salaryequitystudy/upload/Salary-Equity-Study-Executive-Summary-Health-Sciences-posted-November-17-2016.pdf>

VC Horns reported that an outlier report from the study was provided to each Dean with faculty names so that they could review and determine if a salary adjustment was warranted. Compensation decisions in summer of 2016 were made in light of the outlier report. Of 65 outliers, 55 faculty are still here at ECU and received a salary adjustment (merit based) in 2016. Additionally, the health sciences division generates regular reports comparing national benchmarks with current faculty salaries.

E. Nkaze Chateh Nkengtego, Director of ECU Conflict Resolution and Mediation Programs and Wayne Blair, Director of UNC-Chapel Hill Ombuds Office.

Mr. Blair reported that the UNC Ombuds program began 12 years ago and has collaborated to assist the town of Chapel Hill to create an ombuds office. When begun in 2005, the ombuds program was for faculty and staff; however, in 2012, it expanded to include students, thus becoming a comprehensive ombuds program. Ombuds is not an acronym; it is a Swedish word, ombudsman,

from 1800's and is not meant to indicate gender. Because it is easier to say and less concerning about gender bias, the "man" is often dropped from the term and simply used as ombuds. There are ombuds programs in many agencies of the federal government. Standards and code of practice from International Ombudsman Association (IOA) are used. Four principals guide ombuds practice: confidentiality (while reserving the right to say "no" to requests, most will not "do anything" without permission. No records are maintained. They do not report names or record with whom they have met. They only break confidentiality for a legal reason: imminent risk of harm or abuse of child/elderly person suspected), neutrality (do not advocate for any one or any position. They are not adjudicators. Designated neutral for the university), informal (no formal processes/policies. The discussions are off the record. They help people access formal processes but do not participate in those processes. People access the informal process because formal processes are overwhelming and can destroy professional and personal relationships. Informal and formal processes are important and one is not better than the other. Tools are offered to help people move through highly sensitive situations and choose next steps. The ombuds program may move information between parties without the party's awareness and in some case may not know each other. They may help disputing parties meet and resolve differences) and independent (answer to the Chancellor by reporting broad, macro-level areas of concerns and aggregate information of trends and patterns. They are privileged with direct access to most records. Trends/concerns are reported to others such as deans, chairs, etc. No person is singled out – all macro-level reports.) 2500 people used the UNC ombuds program last year.

Professor Vail Smith (Health Education and Promotion) asked how large the UNC staff is and asked Mr. Blair to share a recent project or illustrate how his day goes. Mr. Blair reported they have three staff. He said people often work with them to verbalize a concern to help work through the issue without pursuing formal steps. Mr. Blair reports to the faculty council (like our Senate) twice a year and to the chairs/deans, staff forum, etc. as requested. He reports on trends. He has found in academics, we avoid conflict and make workarounds for personalities. People have trouble disagreeing or at least disagreeing respectfully. People feel slighted and hold onto that slight for very long times. Use of the ombuds program can help the person ventilate and move beyond those things they cannot control. It is conflict *management* rather than conflict resolution. It is hard for people to be direct and that may be cultural.

Professor Goodwillie (Biology) asked how he judges his own success. Mr. Blair said it is hard because they cannot talk about personal cases. They cannot prove how many lawsuits or grievances they prevented. They can see, however, changes in policies or procedures that reflect some of what they have heard and tried to help. It is hard to define success, but a good ombuds program should engage with the university, report trends, and assist in finding solutions without betraying confidentiality.

Professor Venters (Engineering and Technology) asked how they share information between staff without violating confidentiality. Mr. Blair stated that they have protocols for necessary communication (remembering they do not maintain records/names). They discuss strategies for patterns rather than specific cases.

Professor Neil (Nursing) asked about the background of ombuds staff. Mr. Blair reported varied backgrounds are common and qualities of integrity and the ability to keep confidential materials are critical. The ability to relate to anyone and be approachable is important. They do recommend some training but a varied background for staff is desirable.

F. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

"Over the last few weeks, you may have noticed that the Nobel Prize committee has been announcing its 2017 awards. This year, one of the awardees in Physiology or Medicine was Jeffrey Hall, in recognition of his contributions on mechanisms that control our internal biological clocks. What you may not know is that about 10 years ago Hall decided to leave scientific research. At the time, he explained why in an interview with the Journal *Current Biology*. He said, in part:

"US institutions (possibly also those in other countries) behave as though they and their PIs are entitled to research funding, which will magically materialize from elsewhere: 'Get a grant, serf! If you can't do it quickly, or have trouble for some years — or if your funding doesn't get renewed, despite continuing productivity — forget it!' But what if there are so many applicants (as there are nowadays) that even a meritorious proposal gets the supplicant nowhere or causes a research group to grind prematurely to a halt? What if the situation is worsened when the government at hand is anti-science and otherwise squanders its resources on international adventurism?"

I remind you he uttered these words 10 years ago, not in response to any current political trends or government policies.

Twenty years ago the same Nobel Prize was given to Stanley Prusiner for discovering that the infectious agent responsible for Mad Cow and related diseases was not a virus, as virtually everyone expected at the time but, rather, a transmissible protein. In fact, Prusiner's ideas were so heretical at first that he lost his major research funding and initially was denied tenure as an Assistant Professor. Prusiner's story exemplifies a common theme in great academic scholarship and creative activity, regardless of the field. We need only remind ourselves of the old adage that great artists are only fully appreciated after they are dead. Or consider the case of Franz Kafka, who felt underappreciated enough in life that he asked his friend to burn all his unpublished manuscripts upon his death. Fortunately, his friend published rather than burned what are now Kafka's most renowned works. As I always tell my research mentees, particularly when they receive gratuitous rather than constructive comments in peer-reviews, you can't make an important scholarly advance without pissing somebody off. The greater the potential impact, the more people will be threatened by it.

So why am I bringing all this up today?

Well, protection of scholars to explore new and potentially controversial directions lies at the heart of the Tenure system, and the academic freedoms it ensures. Coincidentally, we are all now engaged in revising our standards for Post-Tenure Review in light of new policies instituted by the Board of Governors, and requisite revisions of the Faculty Manual. You've all received guidelines for updated standards and one of the things you've been asked to check off is that your department's PTR process is not simply an averaging of scores on five annual evaluations. "And why shouldn't it be?", I've been asked on more than one occasion. In response, I'd like to pose two hypothetical questions of my own. I hope they will highlight why I think this issue is so important when evaluating whether any given individual is currently meeting expectations as a tenured faculty member.

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 7

I'll use the issue of external grant funding as the theme, given the growing importance we place upon it, and with recognition that pressures related to it have caused Jeffrey Hall and many talented young scholars to give up on careers in academic research.

First, let's say in year one of my current PTR period, I receive a five-year, \$1 million grant from the National Science Foundation. Certainly is noteworthy recognition of my previous accomplishments and future potential. Given current evaluation criteria in my department, I'll likely receive fairly good evaluations for research each year I am carrying that grant. What if, however, at the end of those five years I have effectively nothing to show for it? What if I basically wasted \$1 million of taxpayer money? Would you consider me to be meeting research expectations for a tenured faculty member?

On the other hand, let's say in year one I had an incredible new idea, something as heretical as Stanley Prusiner's infectious protein, and I wanted to retool my research program to pursue it. After five years, I've advanced this effort substantially, but not to the point of publishing papers or receiving grant funding. Given our emphasis on quantitative measures, I did this knowing I would take a hit on my annual evaluations, and on merit pay increases as a result. But the ideas were exciting enough to make that sacrifice. Under these circumstances, would I be meeting research expectations for a tenured faculty member at ECU?

Note that I've focused my remarks on scholarship, but could raise analogous questions with respect to quantitative rather than qualitative evaluations of teaching and service in our post-tenure reviews.

Quantitative measures clearly have a place in evaluating whether faculty are meeting job expectations. In fact, faculty must demonstrate a capacity for such productivity to be tenured in the first place, and must continue to do so to receive positive annual evaluations, further promotion, not to mention the respect of their colleagues and broader disciplines. My over-arching question is whether we as a faculty and institution want to be in the business of encouraging the intellectual freedom that produces the next Stanley Prusiner or Franz Kafka, or be known as the institution that put them on post-tenure probation? So as we go back to our departments and continue to update our PTR standards, I urge everyone to think holistically about the purpose and importance of tenure, and what we really mean by terms like "meeting" or "not meeting" expectations. Last month I spoke about holding to broader ideals and the higher mission of a University as we go about our regular, daily activities. Here is a concrete opportunity to put those thoughts into action."

No questions were posed to Professor Stiller at this time.

G. Michael Felts, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Felts provided a report on the [September 15, 2017](#) UNC Faculty Assembly meeting and stated that President Spellings spoke about the BOG initiatives as the Chancellor stated earlier (the purpose of the GA and the option of moving the GA location). Vice Chair of the BOG, Harry Smith, spoke about challenges of educating new board members and the sustainability of ECSU of which he now supports. V.P Gonzalez talked about student success (see PowerPoint attached). He cited metrics that measure student success, highlighting some from ECU. Finance report is also available. CapTrust, investment management firm, can be used at no charge available (see attachments). Rebranding of the University system was discussed with a new logo inspired by the NC State flag. Executive committee opposed change in centers and institutes.

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 8

The Assembly passed support for the resolution (below) urging NC congress to pass legislation to make DACA recipients legal citizens. Senators were asked to consider endorsement of UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution #2017-6, provided below:

"Whereas, UNC President Margaret Spellings has been public in her admiration and support for Dreamers and authored an editorial entitled, "Mr. President, don't break America's promise to dreamers;" and

Whereas, The U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) [reports](#) that nearly 800,000 people have been beneficiaries of the DACA program since its inception in 2012; and

Whereas, [USCIS reports](#) that of these 800,000 people, 49,712 have been beneficiaries of DACA with residence in North Carolina since the inception of the program in 2012; and

Whereas, [A 2017 national survey](#) of DACA recipients with a sample size of 3,063 respondents in 46 states as well as the District of Columbia shows that at least 72 percent of the top 25 Fortune 500 companies employ DACA recipients; and

Whereas, The same [2017 national DACA survey](#) shows that 97 percent of respondents are currently employed or enrolled in school; and

Whereas, The [2017 national DACA survey](#) shows that by all measures, DACA recipients are having a positive impact in the economy outpacing the general population in terms of business creation by 2% and by 5% among responders 25 years or older; and

Whereas, Previous research has shown that DACA beneficiaries will contribute \$460.3 billion to the U.S. gross domestic product over the next decade—economic growth that would be lost were DACA to be eliminated.

Resolved, That the UNC Faculty Assembly adopt and make public the following statement -

The Faculty Assembly supports the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients and is troubled by the potential loss of their opportunity to continue as students in our universities. These young people embody the ideals illustrated in the UNCGA Strategic Plan. Their presence contributes to the *Excellent and Diverse Institutions* which make-up the UNC System. Their motivation, tenacity and courage are characteristics we encourage all students to possess which foster *Student Success*. DACA facilitates Access to higher education and student diversity. Dreamers have a significant impact on our economy. They pay taxes which support our university system, because through DACA, they can work. Their contributions make an *Economic Impact* nationwide and specifically in North Carolina. They participate in all aspects of campus academic life and connect the universities of the system to various communities through *Community Engagement*. Our support for DACA recipients is directly aligned with the visionary approach to higher education embraced by the UNC System.

North Carolina and our nation are better because of their presence. We demonstrate our humanity through our commitment to these DACA youth. The university is a beacon of hope

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 9

for all who enter its walls and it is incumbent upon us, the faculty, to uphold the ideals that we hold true. Dreamers are an integral part of the fabric that makes our system the dynamic leader in higher education that it has been and continues to aspire to be. The Faculty Assembly implores our elected officials and all members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation to prioritize and move quickly to create a permanent legal status for DACA eligible youth."

Support of the resolution was put forth as a motion to this Senate with a second and was endorsed by the body without discussion. **RESOLUTION #17-63**

No questions were posed to Professor Felts at this time.

H. Question Period

No questions were posed from Senators at this time.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Paul Gemperline, Dean of Graduate School provided information on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 18, 2017](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, including policy action item (GC 17-2) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 6, 2017](#), which included a catalog change to the "Combined/Accelerated Graduate Program" to allow up to 12 sh of graduate credit count towards both the graduate degree and an undergraduate degree. Level I Curriculum action item (GC 17-1) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [04/12/2017](#) was reported prematurely to the Faculty Senate on September 12, 2017.

There was no discussion and the Faculty Senate approved, as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor, curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 18, 2017](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, including policy action item (GC 17-2) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 6, 2017](#), which included a catalog change to the "Combined/Accelerated Graduate Program" to allow up to 12 sh of graduate credit count towards both the graduate degree and an undergraduate degree. Level I Curriculum action item (GC 17-1) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [04/12/2017](#) was reported prematurely to the Faculty Senate on September 12, 2017. **RESOLUTION #17-64**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Andrew Morehead (Chemistry), member of the Committee presented a joint conditional interpretation of specific provisions in the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IX, Section I. Appointment, Tenure, Promotion and Advancement Policies and Procedures and stated that a faculty in their terminal year of tenure track shall not serve on unit personnel committees.

There was no discussion and the joint conditional interpretation of the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IX, subsection IV, third paragraph, (referenced in the 6/22/17 memorandum from both Provost Mitchelson and Chair Stiller) emphasizing the intent of Part IX. to exclude all probationary faculty from

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 10

service on Personnel Committees, once they have received notification of non-reappointment or non-conferral of tenure. The interpretation adds the following **bold highlighted** text to the paragraph: “*... the failure to submit the required PAD will be considered as notice that the faculty member is withdrawing the request for consideration for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure. The Personnel Committee and the unit administrator shall notify the faculty member in writing ... that failure to submit the required PAD for consideration constitutes withdrawal from consideration. From the time of this notification, the faculty member may not serve on the unit's Personnel Committee.*” was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-65**

B. Faculty Grievance Committee

Professor Chris Duffrin (Medicine), Chair of the Committee presented an overview of 2016-2017 Faculty Grievance Committee Activities. There was no discussion and the report was received with no further action necessary.

C. Writing Across the Curriculum

Professor Jen Scott Mobley (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 11, 2017](#) including removal of writing intensive designation (WI/WI*) for ADRE 4993, ADRE 4994, ADRE 4995, ADRE 4996, CMGT 4505, HSMA 4903*, HSMA 4904*, HSMA 4905*, HSMA 4906*, IENG 2020*, IENG 2021*, MGMT 4252, and MGMT 4262.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 11, 2017](#) including removal of writing intensive designation (WI/WI*) for ADRE 4993, ADRE 4994, ADRE 4995, ADRE 4996, CMGT 4505, HSMA 4903*, HSMA 4904*, HSMA 4905*, HSMA 4906*, IENG 2020*, IENG 2021*, MGMT 4252, and MGMT 4262 were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-66**

D. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [September 18, 2017](#) including domestic diversity designation for HLTH 3025: LGBT Population Health and Disparities, HLTH 3100: Latino Health, and RCLS 3131: Recreation for Diverse Populations.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of [September 18, 2017](#) including domestic diversity designation for HLTH 3025: LGBT Population Health and Disparities, HLTH 3100: Latino Health, and RCLS 3131: Recreation for Diverse Populations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-67**

E. Committee on Committees

Professor Nancy Winterbauer (Medicine), Chair of the Committee noted the need for an election of one regular member to the Appellate Due Process Committee. Professor Ed Treadwell (Medicine) was nominated by the Committee. Professor Ralph Scott was nominated from the floor. Following an election, Professor Ed Treadwell was elected to fill the one year open term.

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 11

F. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Jay Newhard (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented first a proposed addition of "NR" designation to the grading information in the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*.

There was no discussion and the proposed addition of "NR" designation to the grading information in the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog* was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-68**

Professor Newhard then provided information on a proposed removal of specific text regarding military credit from *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*.

Professor Kain (English) asked for clarification regarding how credit is awarded. Professor Newhard stated there is a procedure for determining credit.

Following discussion, the proposed removal of specific text regarding military credit from *ECU Undergraduate Catalog* was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-69**

Agenda Item VII. New Business

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

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Roberson
Secretary of the Faculty
College of Nursing

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 17, 2017 MEETING

Resolution #17-63

Endorsement of UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution #2017-6, as follows:

Whereas, UNC President Margaret Spellings has been public in her admiration and support for Dreamers and authored an editorial entitled, "Mr. President, don't break America's promise to 'dreamers;'" and

Whereas, The U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) [reports](#) that nearly 800,000 people have been beneficiaries of the DACA program since its inception in 2012; and

Whereas, [USCIS reports](#) that of these 800,000 people, 49,712 have been beneficiaries of DACA with residence in North Carolina since the inception of the program in 2012; and

Whereas, [A 2017 national survey](#) of DACA recipients with a sample size of 3,063 respondents in 46 states as well as the District of Columbia shows that at least 72 percent of the top 25 Fortune 500 companies employ DACA recipients; and

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 12

Whereas, The same [2017 national DACA survey](#) shows that 97 percent of respondents are currently employed or enrolled in school; and

Whereas, The [2017 national DACA survey](#) shows that by all measures, DACA recipients are having a positive impact in the economy outpacing the general population in terms of business creation by 2% and by 5% among responders 25 years or older; and

Whereas, Previous research has shown that DACA beneficiaries will contribute \$460.3 billion to the U.S. gross domestic product over the next decade—economic growth that would be lost were DACA to be eliminated.

Resolved, That the UNC Faculty Assembly adopt and make public the following statement -

The Faculty Assembly supports the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients and is troubled by the potential loss of their opportunity to continue as students in our universities. These young people embody the ideals illustrated in the UNCGA Strategic Plan. Their presence contributes to the *Excellent and Diverse Institutions* which make-up the UNC System. Their motivation, tenacity and courage are characteristics we encourage all students to possess which foster *Student Success*. DACA facilitates Access to higher education and student diversity. Dreamers have a significant impact on our economy. They pay taxes which support our university system, because through DACA, they can work. Their contributions make an *Economic Impact* nationwide and specifically in North Carolina. They participate in all aspects of campus academic life and connect the universities of the system to various communities through *Community Engagement*. Our support for DACA recipients is directly aligned with the visionary approach to higher education embraced by the UNC System.

North Carolina and our nation are better because of their presence. We demonstrate our humanity though our commitment to these DACA youth. The university is a beacon of hope for all who enter its walls and it is incumbent upon us, the faculty, to uphold the ideals that we hold true. Dreamers are an integral part of the fabric that makes our system the dynamic leader in higher education that it has been and continues to aspire to be. The Faculty Assembly implores our elected officials and all members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation to prioritize and move quickly to create a permanent legal status for DACA eligible youth.

Resolution #17-64

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 18, 2017](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, including policy action item (GC 17-2) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 6, 2017](#), which included a catalog change to the “Combined/Accelerated Graduate Program” to allow up to 12 sh of graduate credit count towards both the graduate degree and an undergraduate degree. Level I Curriculum action item (GC 17-1) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [04/12/2017](#) was reported prematurely to the Faculty Senate on September 12, 2017.

Resolution #17-65

Joint conditional interpretation of the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IX, subsection IV, third paragraph, (referenced in the 6/22/17 memorandum below) emphasizing the intent of Part IX. to exclude all probationary faculty from service on Personnel Committees, once they have received notification of non-reappointment or non-conferral of tenure. The interpretation adds the following **bold highlighted** text to the paragraph: “ . . . the failure to submit the required PAD will be considered as notice that the faculty member is withdrawing the request for consideration for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure. The Personnel Committee and the unit administrator shall notify the faculty member in writing . . . that failure to submit the required PAD for consideration constitutes withdrawal from consideration. **From the time of this notification, the faculty member may not serve on the unit’s Personnel Committee”.**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Department Chairs/School Directors, and Faculty
Divisions of Academic Affairs and Health Sciences

FROM: Dr. Ronald L. Mitchelson, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Dr. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty

DATE: June 22, 2017

SUBJECT: Interpretation of Specific Provisions of the *ECU Faculty Manual*,
Part IX, Section I, effective July 1, 2017

In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part I, entitled “Introduction,” this memorandum serves as a joint conditional interpretation of provisions contained in Part IX, effective July 1, 2017, which need additional clarification. This interpretation remains in effect until its provisions can be incorporated into the contents of the *Faculty Manual* through the normal process.

Specifically, Part IX, Section I, subsection II.C.2. entitled “Probationary terms” refers to conditions where a faculty member at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor is not eligible to serve on the unit’s Personnel Committee during his/her “terminal year” after a decision not to confer permanent tenure. Although there is clear intent to exclude probationary term faculty in a “terminal year” of employment from serving on the unit Personnel Committee, the issue of a terminal year following non-reappointment is not addressed explicitly.

This interpretation confirms the intent of each of these *Faculty Manual* provisions to exclude an otherwise eligible and duly elected probationary faculty member from serving on the unit’s Personnel Committee after notification by the Chancellor or his designee (specifically the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences) of a decision not to reappoint the faculty member, or not to confer permanent tenure.

An additional reference to a probationary faculty member’s exclusion from eligibility to serve on a unit’s Personnel Committee appears in Part IX, subsection IV, third paragraph, where it states in part, “ . . . the failure to submit the required PAD will be considered as notice that the faculty member is withdrawing the request for consideration for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure. The Personnel Committee and the unit administrator shall notify the faculty member in writing . . . that failure to submit the required PAD for consideration constitutes withdrawal from consideration. *From the time of this notification, the faculty member may not serve on the unit’s Personnel Committee*” (text italicized here for emphasis only). This provision further emphasizes the

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 14

intent of Part IX of the *Faculty Manual* to exclude all probationary faculty from service on Personnel Committees, once they have received notification of non-reappointment or non-conferral of tenure.

Questions concerning these provisions should be directed to the Chair of the Faculty or to the respective Division's Vice Chancellor. Thank you for your assistance in complying with this interpretation.

cc: Chancellor Cecil Staton
Vice Chancellor Phyllis Horns

Resolution #17-66

Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 11, 2017](#) including removal of writing intensive designation (WI/WI*) for ADRE 4993, ADRE 4994, ADRE 4995, ADRE 4996, CMGT 4505, HSMA 4903*, HSMA 4904*, HSMA 4905*, HSMA 4906*, IENG 2020*, IENG 2021*, MGMT 4252, and MGMT 4262.

Resolution #17-67

Curriculum and academic matters contained in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of [September 18, 2017](#) including domestic diversity designation for HLTH 3025: LGBT Population Health and Disparities, HLTH 3100: Latino Health, and RCLS 3131: Recreation for Diverse Populations.

Resolution #17-68

Add to *ECU Undergraduate Catalog* specific text to the grading information noted as follows in **bold print** regarding "NR" designation:

"Grade Points and Grade Point Average

A grade (quality) point system based on all hours attempted at ECU is used to calculate student scholarship. The following grade symbols are currently in use for all undergraduate courses:

Table 3: Grade Symbols

Grade	Meaning
A	Achievement substantially exceeds basic course expectations
A-	
B+	
B	Achievement exceeds basic course expectations
B-	
C+	
C	Achievement adequately meets basic course expectations
C-	
D+	
D	Achievement falls below basic course expectations

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 17, 2017

Page 15

D-	
F	Failure - achievement does not justify credit for course
I	Incomplete (granted for deficiency in quantity, not quality, of work)
N	Audited
NR	Faculty has not reported a grade"

http://catalog.ecu.edu/content.php?catoid=12&navoid=908#Grading_System

Resolution #17-69

Removal from *ECU Undergraduate Catalog* specific text noted as follows in **strikethrough** regarding military credit:

“Military Credit

Students who have satisfactorily completed basic military training may receive credit for the exercise and sport science and/or health courses required for general education upon submitting a DD-214, DD-295 or NOBE to the Office of the Registrar, Veteran's Affairs. Students who have completed service schools while on active duty with the military may request an evaluation prior to admission through the Veteran's Affairs office. Credit will be awarded in accordance with the American Council on Education recommendations provided that the credit recommended is at the baccalaureate level. It is applicable to the general education requirements, to the student's declared major field of study, or to the elective hours prescribed within the student's designated program of study; **and is comparable to courses offered at East Carolina University.**"

<http://catalog.ecu.edu/content.php?catoid=12&navoid=908#military-credit>
