East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2017

MEDIASITE LINK

The seventh regular meeting of the 2016/2017 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 28, 2017, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Great Room.

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 December 6, 2016 and January 24, 2017 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Sorensen (Criminal Justice), Robinson (Mathematics), Lawson and Chen (Medicine), Justiniano (Physics) and Holloway (Business/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Durant for Hoover (Academic Library Services), Zeng for Stokes (Allied Health Sciences), Reisch for Fay (Business), Ryan for Hodge (Education), Cortright for Nelson (Health and Human Performance), Moll for Gruber (Music), Whitley for Bowman (Nursing) and Pearce for Powers (Sociology).

B. Announcements
Reminder that NEXT meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 18, 2017 will be held in the East Carolina Heart Institute on West campus.

The Chancellor has acted on the following resolutions from the January 24, 2017 meeting.
17-01 East Carolina University Faculty Senate endorsement of UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-2 on Faculty Compensation (Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly January 06, 2017).

17-02 East Carolina University Faculty Senate endorsement of UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-3 on Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges Compliance (Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly January 06, 2017).

17-03 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council meeting minutes of December 5, 2016, including curriculum action items (GC 15-33) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 2, 2016 and November 16, 2016 which included packages submitted by the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies and the Department of Advanced Practice Nursing and Education. In addition policy matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council's meeting minutes of December 5, 2016, including (GC 15-34) Graduate Assistant eligibility policy revision for Admit by Exception (AE) students.

17-04 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of December 8, 2016, including curricular actions within the History, Criminal Justice, and Interior Design and Merchandising departments and the Construction Management, Engineering, English (Second Language), Science Education, Special Education (Adapted Curriculum), Special Education (General Curriculum) and University Studies BS programs and meeting minutes of December 15, 2016, including

curriculum actions within the English, Special Education, Foundations and Research, Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies departments.

17-05 Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee meeting minutes of December 13, 2016, including service learning (SL) designation for SPED 3003: Academic Instruction for Students in the Adapted Curriculum and MGMT 4272: Family Business.

17-06 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of December 9, 2016, including request to revise MS in Rehabilitation and Career Counseling (increasing the required semester hours) in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; request to discontinue undergraduate certificate in Atmospheric Science and establish an undergraduate minor in Atmospheric Science in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences; request to establish new concentrations in the BS in Political Science: (1) Campaigns, Elections, and American Politics; (2) Pre-Law; (3) International Relations/Comparative Politics; (4) Public Administration/Policy & State and Local Government in the Department of Political Science within the College of Arts and Sciences; request to establish an undergraduate certificate in Professional Selling in the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management within the College of Business and a revised response to a program review of the PhD in Biochemistry in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology within the School of Medicine and meeting minutes of January 13, 2017, including requests to deliver existing programs via DE – MS in Sustainable Tourism and Hospitality within the School of Hospitality Leadership in the College of Business and a BS in Health Information Management within the Department of Health Services and Information Management in the College of Allied Health Sciences, approval of a new Dual Language Immersion (DLI) Administration Concentration in the Educational Specialist (EdS) in Educational Administration and Supervision within the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education and discussion of the revised Academic Program Review Guidelines and revised processes for curricular and programmatic changes. (Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual,* Part VI, Section VII. Curriculum Procedures and Academic Program Development will be brought forward to the Senate later in the Spring.)

17-07 Formal faculty advice on the Temporary Variable Incentive (TVI) Plan for Sponsored Activities with recommended changes.

17-08 Revised Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures and Department of Geological Sciences Unit Codes of Operation. (Received by the Chancellor with edits)

17-09 Resolution in Support of the University Wellness Committee's Efforts to Strengthen Tobacco Regulations at ECU. (Held by the Chancellor for further study)

All faculty are invited to the University Teaching Awards Recognition Ceremony scheduled for Thursday, April 20 at 5:00 pm in the Harvey Hall at the Murphy Center.

Every year the Classroom Technology Standards are reviewed and adjusted based on feedback received and changes in the field of learning technology. The goal is to provide easy-to-use technology that helps faculty deliver course(s) in a successful manner. Please consider taking a moment to provide feedback at http://survey.ecu.edu/classroomtechnology on any changes you

would like to see in the classroom(s) you use for instruction. The link below will be open for two weeks.

Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that annual reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by May 1, 2017.

FUNDED
2017 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY SUMMER STIPENDS, PROJECT EXPENSE GRANTS AND DUAL SUMMER STIPENDS AND PROJECT EXPENSE GRANTS

2017	Name	Academic Unit	Research Proposal Title	Type	Amount Requested
02	Krista McCoy	Biology	Reducing pollutant-induced hypospadias: is Nrf2 driving the rescue?	Summer Stipend	$6,250.00
05	Jessica Christie	Art and Design	Cultural landscapes and intangible heritage: The case of the Navajo in Canyon De Chelly	Project	$5,293.27
06	Charles Meadows	Communication	The effectiveness of virtual reality public services announcements in eliciting pro-health behaviors	Project	$6,250.00
07	James Loudon	Anthropology	Heavy metal toxicology of free-ranging vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus pygerythrus)* living among humans	Project	$2,560.00
08	Guglielmo Fucci	Mathematics	Particle creation in spaces with extra dimensions	Summer Stipend	$6,000.00

C. Cecil Staton, Chancellor expressed gratitude for the people who planned and participated in the Installation week events. He and Mrs. Staton enjoyed the events during the week.

Chancellor Staton discussed the searches recently completed and underway. Dr. Jay Golden will be joining ECU from Duke University as Vice-Chancellor for Research Economic Development and Engagement (REDE). ECU will benefit from Dr. Golden's experience and relationships. The Chancellor also expressed gratitude to Interim Vice-Chancellor Mike Van Scott for his leadership and effectiveness in that role. Dr. Van Scott will continue in a position in the REDE office. The Chancellor also mentioned Jon Rezik, the new Executive Director of Global Affairs. The Chancellor and Mr. Rezek recently met and talked about efforts to bring more attention to global affairs, study abroad, international students on campus, and global engagement. ECU is a gateway to the world for our students. ECU is in the final part of the search for the Dean of the BSOM. The Chancellor noted his appreciation for the hard work of that search committee and said he anticipates finalizing that search soon.

The Chancellor discussed the quiet phase of a major comprehensive capital campaign that started last semester and is the biggest campaign ever planned for ECU. The goal of $500 million is a lot of money and represents many big ideas. *The Chronicle* published a list of university endowments. ECU is listed at $170 million, and a number of schools in our system are ahead of us. The period for the capital campaign is six to eight years. The Chancellor noted that campaigns are about big ideas. The process of planning the marketing is under way. The marketing of the campaign is in the planning stages and the administration is looking for the big ideas. Campaigns are successful when donors see their own interests reflected in the institution. The Chancellor noted that sometimes those interests and priorities are not necessarily ours. Therefore, we have to get the word out about the

university and what we do. The quiet phase might take two to three years because about half of the campaign needs to be complete before the campaign goes public. The first steps have been to look at university resources and staffing in the advancement arm. There are several foundations, such as the ECU foundation, Heath Science Foundation, the Pirate club, and others. We need all the resources, personnel, and infrastructure in place to be successful. The Chancellor wants to engage the campus as we dream and go after the big ideas. Not every idea will end up in the marketing. Some things we want to do might be funded in other ways. However, we want to be as inclusive as possible. Vice Chancellor or Advancement Dyba, the Advancement Council, and the Deans will start working on encouraging engagement as fully as possible. They will also be looking at other groups associated with the university. The Chancellor encourages the faculty to participate and discuss our ideas with our unit chairs. He is seeking inclusive and broad participation.

The campaign will include some capital components, including naming gifts such as a medical education building and a performing arts center for the university and the community that will enhance the quality of life in the city and region. In addition, in thinking about resources, funding would support professorships, incentivizing faculty research, working with students, needs-based scholarships, and providing international experiences to more of our students. Not everything will end up on the list of ideas, but we will have an open and collaborative process. The Chancellor stated that he would like the faculty to be engaged and involved in the process. The campaign and our involvement may seem a little slow as it begins, but the process will engage more people as we get into summer and fall. This is an exciting time, but a lot of work. As the Chancellor has been talking to alumni, friends, and donors, he sees that they are excited about our aspirations as the next great American university.

The Chancellor noted that his mission with the capital campaign is externally focused, and he appreciates that ECU has leadership to allow him to do that.

Alice Arnold (Fine Art) asked where the performing arts center would be located and whether there are sketches. The Chancellor responded that he is aware that groups have been thinking about the center, but he does not have any specifics at this time. The process will probably include ECU, the city, and the county. The Chancellor's thinking is that a center would connect with Uptown Greenville, the planned new hotel, and other developments and amenities.

Stiller noted that he attended *Don Giovani* and encouraged people to go.

D. Mike Van Scott, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development and Engagement

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott discussed the reception for research, service and teaching awards, and making them meaningful to the faculty who are earning awards. Thus far, they have been well-attended and meaningful events for all the people who are being honored.

As part of the fiscal sustainability process, the university planned to diversify revenue streams and increase extramural funding. There has been growth over the last three years in proposals, awards, and expenditures. Proposals have grown from $180 million to over $206 million for the last year. This year, proposals are on target for a 20% increase for proposal submissions. On the expenditure side, we are headed for a record year that could be at $42 million by year's end. The outlook for awards has been interesting because of the change in the government. In the fall, people qualified for grants, and yet the letters have not yet been received. Everything is delayed. The current outlook is that the budget will call for drastic cuts in federal agencies. Why should we put in proposals if the funding

levels are going to be that low? We want a national reputation and for our faulty to have recognition. We should keep submitting because our ideas will be seen and we will receive constructive information. Eventually things will get better, and we will be better off if we stay in front of the people reviewing grants. The people engaged will be the ones that are remembered when the cycle changes, Stay in front of the reviewers.

No questions were posed to Interim VC Van Scott.

Following Interim VC Van Scott's remarks, Professor Andrew Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) offered a commendation recognizing his dedicated leadership and entire faculty of ECU, stated as follows:

Whereas, Professor Michael Van Scott has served as Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement of East Carolina University from Fall 2015 through Spring 2017; and
Whereas, Professor Van Scott has also served as Chief Research Officer from Fall 2014 until the present; and
Whereas, Professor Van Scott has worked tirelessly to support the research and creative activities of the Faculty of East Carolina University through his leadership and the financial support offered by his division; and
Whereas, Professor Van Scott has offered his respectful support and transparent communication with the Faculty Senate; and
Whereas, Professor Van Scott has been an advocate for shared governance at East Carolina University in his roles as member of the Governance Committee and Academic Council;
Therefore Be It Resolved, that we, the members of East Carolina University's Faculty Senate, hereby express our greatest appreciation to Vice Chancellor Michael Van Scott, for his dedicated leadership and support of the Faculty Senate and the entire faculty of East Carolina University.

The resolution was approved with a round of applause. **RESOLUTION #17-16**

E. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
Vice Chancellor Horns discussed Match Day at the Brody School of Medicine and provided an update on Project Unify. Match Day is one of the best days of the year for medical students who find out where they will be going to finish their training. In medical education, unlike most disciplines, students don't finish their degrees and then go on to work. They have another three to seven years of critical training and often relocate geographically for that experience. Vice Chancellor Horns invited people next time they are in the lobby of the Brody building to look at the map that shows where the students are going and the impact the BSOM has locally and across the U.S. ECU students are very successful in achieving their matches. Yearly about 400—500 medical students nationwide are not matched to residencies. ECU is working to develop more residency slots in North Carolina to continue the fine work the BSOM does in preparing primary care physicians who stay in the state and serve its people.

The college of Nursing received an award the National Guard for being a Supportive Employer of National Guard and Reserve Personnel. This is a very prestigious award. Vice Chancellor Horns congratulated our colleagues in nursing.

Vice Chancellor Horns discussed Project Unify, which has been underway for 15 months of very intense and complex work to integrate Vidant Medical Group and ECU Physicians. The medical school is not merging or transitioning to any other entity; the integration is focused on the clinical activities. In March, the Board of Governors discussed the project and passed a motion charging Chancellor Staton, President Spellings, and the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee of the BoG to undertake activities necessary to complete the negotiations by the May meeting of the BoG. Currently, the university is responding to questions about the arrangement from the BoG. The difficult issues involve governance, funding, and people. The most complicated are HR issues to make sure the needs of individual faculty and staff are addressed and at the same time meeting institutional goals. Questions have been raised about whether the BSOM is eliminating faculty. This is not the case. The complexities associated with faculty are tenure, benefits, and faculty roles. A group of faculty is working with HR and university legal staff to address the issues. Three different consultants have worked with the HR sub-committee, and they are currently waiting for reports from the consultants.

Professor Christensen (Biology) asked about concerns for the School of Medicine SHRA staff. Vice Chancellor Horns replied that the staff is concerned about issues including benefits, health coverage, retirement, longevity, to whom they will report. The changes are not insignificant for anyone involved. The fear that something catastrophic is being planned and not conveyed to those involved, but that is not the case. Discussions are ongoing with staff and others about the plans.

F. Rick Niswander, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

Vice Chancellor Niswander discussed the budget, beginning with a description of the State budget process. The State's biennial process includes a long session from January to about June in odd numbered years and a short session from May through about June in even numbered years. In the long session, a State budget for two years is passed. The fiscal year begins July 1. The political process begins with the Governor's providing a budget in February, often semi-ignored by the legislature, followed by the legislature's version, begun by the Senate in long sessions and the house in short sessions. After April 15, the legislature learns the income and expenses for the current year, which determines in part what they include budget bill. This year is a long session so toward the end of May, the Senate will deliberate and pass their bill to the House. The house usually drafts its own bill, and the two bills are reconciled. In about late May, the governor's budget proposal is available on the Office of State Budget and Management website. When the other bills are available, those are also posted. The budget is about 250 pages with about 30 pages on education.

Vice Chancellor Niswander discussed the budget surplus and outlook for education in the current budget process. Estimates are that the State budget will be about $550 million to the good for this fiscal year, which is about 2% of the State's $24 billion budget. The overage is one-time money for this year. The estimate of surpluses for next year is $490 million and for the following year one billion dollars, which is beyond estimates for the growth of the national economy. The surpluses will likely be applied to state priorities such as re-filling the rainy day fund at $100—300, reducing corporate and individual taxes about by an estimated $500 million, and covering increased Medicare and Medicaid health-care costs. Three things affect the UNC system include enrollment increases, which have historically been funded and will likely be funded next year at $3.5 million next fiscal year and $7 million the year after. The Governor's budget asks for 2% for raise; 1% is more likely is anything is provided. There is a reasonable likelihood of a cut of 1% to the system; however, don't believe all the noise; take a deep breath; turn off the TV.

Professor Gueye (English) asked about problems getting speakers paid and the need for a system such as the travel system. Vice Chancellor Niswander requested that she or our administrator contact staff in account payables. The Vice Chancellor commented that often problems with payments are caused by incomplete paperwork. He also suggested that Professor Gueye e-mail him about the problems, and he will connect her to the person who can assist her.

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

"Coming up in the report from the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee are proposals to finalize implementation and reporting of new mechanisms for student evaluation of teaching. At this point I want to acknowledge all the hard work that has gone into acquiring and implementing the Blue system and developing the SSOI instrument. The process has been an example of shared governance at its best, with too many faculty, staff and administrators contributing to thank individually. I do want to express my appreciation to Dr. Zhou and the team at IPAR, and to the hard-working members of the GEIC Committee for all their efforts in bringing us to this point.

Because I've been involved in this process from the beginning I've spent a good deal of time reviewing critical literature on the utility and shortcomings of student evaluations of teaching, or **"SET"** for short. Consequently, want to share a few of my views about how best to approach the use of SETs at ECU.

First, let me say that I personally find student feedback to be extremely useful, both for understanding how students perceive various aspects of my instruction, and for identifying areas for improvement in how I interact with them and deliver course material. This is particularly true of individual student comments. I don't think a year has gone by where I didn't modify my teaching in some way based on student feedback. This, I believe, is the ultimate utility of SETs, as instruments for formative assessment and improvement, and I urge all my colleagues to make the most of our new system; it is a vast improvement in this regard.

Problems arise, however, when we try to use SET results as a primary measure of teaching effectiveness, and are aggravated when such measures are used inappropriately in faculty personnel evaluations. There is an extensive literature on problems with such practices and, even as a complete novice in the field, I could easily spend an hour regaling you with the many issues that have been addressed through various studies. But such a lecture would represent ineffective teaching at its very worst.

Some of the problems can be fixed, at least to a reasonable extent. For example, the proposals coming from the GEIE committee address issues we've had with low response rates, which can result in biased and unrepresentative student feedback. Other issues are thornier, such as repeated findings that SET scores actually can be inversely correlated with independent measures of teaching effectiveness.

In my examination of the literature I came across one very interesting study published just last year. Researchers from the Berkeley and French collaborators undertook one of the largest and most rigorous studies of SETs to date. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the work was a randomized analysis of a male and female instructor teaching in an on-line format. They split the

course into four discussion groups, with the male and female instructors each taking two groups, but each switching their names for one of their two groups. When students evaluated teaching, the male instructor received consistently lower scores when using the female's name, and the female consistently higher scores when using the male's name. Remarkably, this was true even for straightforward, factual questions, like "does the instructor return graded assignments in a timely manner." The female name scored consistently lower on such questions, even though all assignments were returned by both instructors, and to all groups, at the same time. This result was supported by the broader French study of face-to-face instruction of thousands of students over multiple disciplines, and by numerous other studies over the years. The conclusion of these researchers was that SETs are a far more reliable indicator of gender than of teaching effectiveness, and that the gender biases are strong enough to swamp any correlations that may be present between SET scores and teaching effectiveness, as assessed by independent measures.

Why am I taking the time to point this out today? We are about to move forward with the new SSOI instrument and, as in the past, the results will be allowed to inform personnel evaluations and recommendations. And we move forward in the following context: Our recent salary equity study identified certain parameters, most notably for this discussion, rank and tenure status, as contribute substantially to an overall disparity between average male and female faculty salaries. Can we now begin to connect the dots?

For years, in the absence of clear broader criteria, many unit administrators used simple comparisons of SET score averages as their core metrics for evaluation of teaching in annual reviews and other personnel evaluations. That practice is what led us to the much-maligned SPOTS instrument we now are replacing. We also have clear gender biases in areas that were undoubtedly impacted by evaluation of teaching in personnel processes. Now I'm not saying biases in faculty rank are explained simply by misuse of SET scores in the past....problems leading to gender, racial and other disparities clearly go much deeper. However, we must now avoid, at all costs, slipping back into evaluation practices for teaching that are understood to be both inappropriate measures of teaching effectiveness, and that clearly are plagued by gender and other biases that can impact personnel actions.

I repeat what I said at the beginning. I value student feedback and find the new SSOI instrument to a useful mechanism for improving aspects of my teaching. I urge my faculty colleagues to take full advantage of the Blue platform. With respect to our evaluations of teaching effectiveness, however, we must not be seduced by all the ways this platform can be used for numerical statistical comparisons.

It is critical that we now improve substantially in two ways. First, we must work to develop the best possible overall criteria to guide our assessments of teaching effectiveness, and use those to inform improvements of instructional practices. We owe this to our students and it is the only way we will achieve our goal of maximizing student success. Second, we must institutionalize practices that do not permit misuse or abuse of SET data, either for evaluation of teaching effectiveness, or in faculty personnel evaluations. Such misuses have been shown to deteriorate rather than improve instructional quality.

There are excellent models out there, at Berkeley and elsewhere. As we move forward with SSOI and Blue, it is critical that faculty and administrators work together, in the best spirit of shared governance, and strive to make ECU the next great national model for how to most effectively assess

and improve classroom instruction. This is an exciting opportunity to improve teaching effectiveness at ECU and we should embrace the challenge wholeheartedly.

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

No questions were posed to Professor Stiller.

H. Approval of Spring 2017 Graduation List, including Honors Program graduates.
Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) moved approval of the Spring 2017 graduation list, including Honors Program graduates. **RESOLUTION #17-17**

I. Question Period
Professor Allen (Chemistry) asked the Provost about plans in Harriot college for unit Chairs to meet to discuss evaluation scores and asked about in place to protect privacy (for example, his unit only has two assistant professors). Provost Mitchelson replied that the privacy referred to—that only the chair see the evaluation material—would be violated. However, he is not sure that in general we're violating something more important such as the need to know or the need to calibrate. The Provost said that the system has recently undergone a calibrating process for SHRA employees as a best practice. He believes that this form of calibration, which is very common at other universities, is a good thing though it may not protect privacy from other administrators. He acknowledged that a change in the *ECU Faculty Manual* will be necessary before we can begin calibration of scores across units that he suggests is necessary as a safeguard against tremendous variation, biases, and the like. The tradeoff is privacy for improved evaluation.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if the issue remains that State personnel policy does not allow for the opening of a personnel file to someone that is not the immediate supervisor. If so, how can the University get around a state personnel issue? Provost Mitchelson suggested that the UNC state system views calibration as a best practice and will apply it to the SHRA categories. He does not believe the process violates any state personnel policy. Chair Stiller noted that the issue is before the Faculty Governance committee, which is discussing legal and faculty manual ramifications and will provide a report to the Senate. Provost Mitchelson added that more technical observations about the issue. The Provost reiterated that he was supportive of the calibration process.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business to come before the body at this time.

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council
Professor Denise Donica (Allied Health Sciences) a member of the Graduate Council provided curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of February 13, 2017, including curriculum action items (GC 15-36) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from January 18, 2017, which included packages submitted by the Department of Human Development and Family Science. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of January 18, 2017 were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included Discontinuation of a Degree: Career and Technical Education, MAED in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance. Policy action items (GC 15-37) within the February 13, 2017, Graduate Council meeting minutes, included an editorial revision to the Graduate Student Appeal

policy (Notice of readmission procedure); and a catalog change to the Integrated Bachelor's to Master's degree – minimum overall 3.0 GPA required for admission instead of 3.5 GPA and meeting minutes of March 13, 2017, including curriculum action items (GC 15-38) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from February 1, 2017, February 15, 2017, and March 1, 2017, which included packages submitted by the Department of Bioethics and Interdisciplinary Studies, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Department of Anthropology, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Mathematics, Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of February 15, 2017, and March 1, 2017 were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included two proposals within the Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences - New Degree: MA in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, and Integrated Degree Pathway: Bachelor/Master of Arts in Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics; two proposals within the College of Education – (a) Discontinuation of Existing Concentration: Business and Marketing Education in the MAT, (b) Business Education MAEd, (c) Business and Marketing Education MAEd in the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, and revision of an Existing Degree Title: Instructional Technology Education MAEd to Instructional Technology MAEd in the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education.

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 Graduate Council meeting minutes of February 13, 2017, and March 13, 2017, as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-18**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Professor Jean Luc Scemama (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the February 9, 2017 and February 23, 2017 meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Colleges of Allied Health Sciences, Education, Health and Human Performance; Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Geography, Planning and Environment and Biology; and the School of Music.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of February 9, 2017 and February 23, 2017 were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-19**

B. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Don Chaney (Health & Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of March 17, 2017 including request for discontinue degrees: BSBE Business Education, BSBE Business and Marketing Education, and BSBE Information Technologies; discontinue concentrations: MAT: Business and Marketing Education, MAED Career and Technical Education: Business Education, and MAED Career and Technical Education: Business and Marketing Education all in the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions within the College of Education; discontinue MAEd Career and Technical Education degree and BS in Child Life degree in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance; rename degree title: MAEd Instructional Technology Education to MAEd Instructional Technology in the Department of Mathematics, Science and Instructional Technology within the College of Education; propose new

minor: Disability Studies in the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education; revise BS Elementary Education degree in the Department of Elementary Education and Middle Grades Education within the College of Education; propose new concentration: Pre-Law in the BA in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy and Religions Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences; discontinue concentrations: Organ Performance and Piano Pedagogy in the BM in Music in the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of March 17, 2017 were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-20**

C. Service Learning Committee
Professor Marissa Nesbit (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of February 14, 2017 including service learning (SL) designation for KINE 3906: Physical Education for Special Populations (all sections).

There was no discussion and the curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee meeting minutes of February 14, 2017 were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-21**

D. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee
Professor George Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of February 20, 2017, including approval of Global Diversity credit for GLST1000: Introduction to Global Studies and Humanities credit (3 hours) for GLST1000: Introduction to Global Studies.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of February 20, 2017, were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-22**

Professor Bailey then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of March 20, 2017, including credit earned by ATMO 1300/GEOG 1300 be reduced from four credit hours to three credit hours and ATMO 1300/GEOG 1300 be approved for Foundations Science credit, credit earned by PHYS 1050 be reduced from four credit hours to three credit hours and the course approved for Foundations Science credit, approval of Domestic Diversity credit for NURS 4941 and PSYC 3221, and Global Diversity credit for NURS 4614.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of March 20, 2017, were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-23**

Professor Bailey introduced Ying Zhou, Associate Provost of Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research to present the results of the Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) fall 2016 pilot study. Dr. Zhou commended Kyle Chapman, the Blue administrator, for his work on coordinating the implementation of Blue, ECU's new course evaluation software. In the fall, 4096 course sections were surveyed in Blue with the new form. Total course enrollment was more than 119,000 total. BSOM clinical courses and dental medicine courses were not included. Team-taught courses were included for people with more than 20% of teaching responsibilities in those courses. The questions in the

survey are organized so that questions1-9 are instructor-related questions; questions 10-13 are course-specific questions. In team taught courses, the questions 1-9 were repeated for each instructor and questions 10-13 were asked once. Instructor reports were generated when there is at least one response. The total number of instructor reports was 3966 instructor reports.

On the first day of the survey, faculty received an e-mail with a link to response rates and were asked to check those regularly and encourage students to respond. Instructors who asked students do the surveys in class received high response rates. By the end of the survey, 52,000 responses were received for an overall response rate of 44%, the rate for the summer was 35% and for last spring 24%.

Dr. Zhou discussed the instructor report template, which includes sections for response rate, frequency distribution of each item, the mean comparison to course of the same level in the same department (1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000, and graduate). Student comments were included for instructor view only. Chairs and administrators did not receive comments.

Results show that:

- internal consistency was high for the first 11 questions for both grad and undergrad on a number of measures
- Student participation, effort, and grades had low correlation with first 11 items
- No significant differences in responses based on students' gender were noted.
- Results compared by faculty rank showed statistical significant differences in undergraduate courses only; instructors received the highest ratings, tenured faculty the lowest ratings.

ITCS is currently resolving a few technical issues before the spring survey opens in a few weeks.

Professor Treadwell (Medicine) asked what were considered the main biases. Associate Provost Zhou responded that in surveys in general there is non-response bias evident in lack of student comments. Students didn't read the questions and/or randomly marked answers or didn't finish. Professor Treadwell commented on the differences by rank, suggesting that those who students get close to receive the highest scores. Dr. Zhou responded that the higher the response rates, the more reliable the results.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked whether faculty members should leave the room during surveys as we used to while they complete the surveys? Associate Provost Zhou replied that the consensus of the committee was for faculty to leave the room. Faculty can check the link to results immediately and remind students again if not all students responded.

Professor Kain (English) asked whether results were reviewed based on gender of the faculty. Associate Provost Zhou responded no, because instructor gender isn't provided.

Professor Ryan (Education) asked whether race was considered for students or faculty. Associate Provost Zhou replied no.

Professor Venters (Engineering and Technology) asked, given the high correlation for consistency among items 1-11 and the acknowledgement that some students are not attending to the questions, whether anyone thought about adding a negative statement to try to get a consistency rating.

Associate Provost Zhou replied that they tried that with SPOTS and ended up with more questions than answers. The Committee decided on all positive statements for this version.

Following the discussion, Professor Bailey presented formal motions pertaining to the use of the Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI).

The first motion was to recommend the adoption of the new Survey of Students Opinion of Instruction (SSOI form) for use each fall, spring, and summer session terms, beginning first summer session 2017 (form provided in agenda).

Professor Treadwell (Medicine) asked if there had been an analysis of the survey, noting the challenges of developing an effective survey and recognizing issues such as ethnicity. Professor Bailey responded that many factors could be analyzed; the committee analyzed the factors that they were capable in the two years they worked on it. In terms of results, we don't have the capabilities under the present system to identify race. All surveys have some biases. The survey has shown internal consistency and the results have been found useful. The remaining concern is misuse of results by assigning them too much weight. The committee has a set of guidelines to recommend for using the surveys.

Professor Ryan (Education) asked about why the new form doesn't include space for open-ended questions. Professor Bailey responded that the committee went back and forth on the issue and compromised on how minimalist the evaluation for should be. The goal was to maintain structure. Everyone can give open-ended surveys to their students over the term.

Professor Gemperline (Dean of Graduate School/Academic Deans Representative) asked if student comments were going to be sent to the Chairs. Professor Bailey replied that this issue is in a separate motion coming forward.

Professor Goodwillie (Biology) asked why question #7, "My work is evaluated in ways that are helpful to my learning," wasn't written in a way that asks if students think their work is "evaluated in ways that accurately assess my learning"? Professor Bailey responded that this is an example of questions available in the database the committee and committee discussion of the wording of the questions chosen. They chose the questions that were also the most reliable.

Professor Treadwell (Medicine) asked whether the Committee looked at the 20 years of statistical analyses of the questions. Professor Bailey responded that all that information was available.

Following discussion, the adoption of the new Survey of Students Opinion of Instruction (SSOI form) for use each fall, spring and summer session terms, beginning first summer session 2017 (form provided in agenda) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-24**

Professor Bailey then presented a motion that the individual faculty SSOI report will contain quantitative results (a listing of individual student responses, frequencies and means) and qualitative results (student comments) and that the summary SSOI report will contain the frequencies and means for all questions for all sections of each course.

There were no questions and the motion was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-25**

Professor Bailey then presented a motion to use the linked Individual Instructor Report Form. There was no discussion and the motion was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-26**

Professor Bailey then presented a motion to use one or the other or both of the linked summary report forms (Version 1 and Version 2) He pointed out that these do different things, and the differences are detailed in the attachment to the minutes. The initial summary produced was shared, and the committee received feedback. Administrators had different responses about what they wanted. The committee produced another version. The committee is leaving it up to the Senate whether to use either or both.

Chair Stiller asked for an overview of the major differences.

Associate Provost Zhou provided an overview of the two templates being considered and discussed the strengths of Blue for generating reports for various audiences and for providing reports to administration that could be used for quickly looking at strengths and weaknesses of teaching at a high level, not the individual faculty level. Version 1 is an Excel sheet that includes all the sections and faculty, but only the means. The deans and chairs can create their own reports to share with faculty. Version 2 is a PDF file that department chairs cannot sort or do additional statistical reports. This version does include means, standard deviation, distribution, percentages, and total number of respondents. The first one is more flexible; but the second one includes more information.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) offered a friendly amendment to the motion that both versions of the forms can be used. Chair Stiller acknowledged that Professor Bailey accepted the friendly amendment, clarifying that the amended motion would read to allow both of the forms to be used at the discretion of the [department]

Professor Anderson (Education) asked whether, based on the determination of the [department] chair, faculty may only receive one of the forms. Chair Stiller clarified that these are only the summary reports to the unit administrators and added that neither report includes student comments.

Following discussion, the motion on type of report forms to be provided to administrators was passed as amended. **RESOLUTION #17-27**

Professor Bailey then presented a motion to adopt the proposed “best practices” for administering the Student Survey of Instruction (SSOI).

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) spoke in support of the motion, especially item K, which specifies providing training about how the results of the SSOI should be used. He commented that questions about abuse of survey results have been an issue, and training is the best way to make long-term changes in the effective use of SSOI for formative assessment.

Following discussion, the proposed “best practices” for administering the Student Survey of Instruction (SSOI) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-28**

Professor Bailey then presented a motion recommending that at end of each fall and spring semester and each summer session, the individual faculty report and the summary course sections reports of the results of the Student Survey of Instruction SSOI be reported to the faculty member’s course

coordinator (when appropriate), department chair or school director, and college dean. The provost may access reports. The report includes qualitative data (including comments).

Professor Maher (Philosophy and Religious Studies) offered a friendly amendment that the motion would refer to “reports,” based on the earlier motion, “summary report” sections. Professor Bailey indicated agreement.

Professor Christensen (Biology) stated that he didn’t know all the history of unit administrators having access to student comments and asked for clarification. Professor Bailey responded that this is an omnibus motion, and he would discuss that after this motion is determined.

Professor Christensen (Biology) stated that there is confusion on the floor that people did want to talk about administrators having access to student comments.

Chair Stiller clarified that we passed a motion to recommending the reports to be forwarded to the administrators, the last line of which reads that in neither case would student comments be included with those reports.

Professor Kain (English) asked for additional clarification and whether the wording about student comments should be a friendly amendment. Professor Bailey indicated that what he read was the motion and that the wording about the comments was commentary on the motion. He read the motion again.

Chair Stiller stated that we have clarification that the previous motion was passed with the explanatory text that comments would not be included on summary reports. This is a new motion that would that qualitative comments would be forwarded to unit administrators along with individual faculty reports.

Professor Christensen reiterated his request for history about the issue of student comments. Professor Bailey replied that in the past when student surveys were being developed, the consensus of the faculty was that they preferred not to have the student comments reported to the unit administrators or anyone else. After receiving feedback from everyone, the current committee revisited the issue and suggested that the senate re-think this issue. Students need to know whether anyone beyond the instructor sees the comments. Many students assume their comments go beyond the instructor. The goal should be to improve teaching and learning. The facts of bias in student opinion surveys are well documented and must be taken into consideration. Professor Bailey believes that administrators should receive comments to achieve that goal. Some faculty share comments; others share some comments, and some share no comments. This inconsistency doesn’t improve teaching. Sharing the comments received and changes made based on the comments would be part of building a culture of continuous improvement. If used properly, the comments provide context for the numbers. Administrators realize that missed review are common and should be used as one element of the instructors overall evaluation. One element of evaluation should not be more significant than others. The issue was raised that withholding comments might also be an indication of performance. Professor Bailey went on to discuss balance in the reporting provided and how it is used but recognized the need for training.

Chair Stiller clarified that we have approved the summary report forms that don’t include qualitative comments. We now have a separate motion, which includes that qualitative comments would also be

reported to administrators. Chair Stiller reminded the senators to keep comments to two minutes and wait to be recognized.

Professor Winterbauer (Medicine) asked about bias and how those translate in scoring. Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) responded that in the future the problem should be approached such that workshops should be provided for evaluators in which they would learn about issues including influences on decision-making. They would learn about studies of bias, reactions to comments and reliability. In the past, workshops just focused on how to do the survey. Faculty governance will come forward with recommendations about weighting different parts of the teaching evaluation, understanding how to use the data will be provided in workshops.

Professor Winterbauer (Medicine) asked a follow up question about how workshop information would be translated into scoring. Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) replied that using case studies might be the best way. Case studies would have to fit with scores and elements in the annual reports that bear on teaching effectiveness, and group would need to discuss how much weight things should carry and what kinds of reliability should be considered. Some studies suggest that no person should be regarded as different from anyone else unless their score is one deviation different from the mean. On skewed results, the results for an individual can't be one deviation about the mean, which is 4.3 on a 5 point scale. But a score can be one or more deviations below the standard. One thing to work out would be how to deal with that interpretation. At one point in the past, the suggestion was that the reporting be based on differences in standard deviation. More technical issues have to be worked out. Professor Bailey doesn't see an issue with using comments and mentioned comments on other tools such as Rate my Professor. Professors also need to talk to students about commenting.

Professor Gueye (English) expressed concern that we are not worried about biases in student surveys, that we appear to think they don't matter, and asked how we can educate our students that these issues matter.

Professor Chullen (Business) stated that he had solicited feedback from business faculty, and faculty mentioned biases against women and minorities and misuse of survey comments. Faculty were against sharing comments. Of all the unit chairs and directors, only one took the time to provide feedback. If we use comments for developmental purposes, faculty should get more feedback from people doing the evaluations.

Professor Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that we need to make it clear to students that their comments are not going to someone higher up and students should be direct to go see their department chair if they have a problem with an instructor. Text to this effect should be included in the comments for instructors to read to make sure that it is clear to students. She also noted that workshops tend to be poorly attended.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) stated that giving scores without comments leads to more misuse by administrators. Comments provide a context for the quantitative evaluations.

Professor Ryan (Education) stated that it was foolish to think that all comments would be useful for administration. We have to consider how students respond to being pushed to go beyond there

comfort zone. Comments can be useful, but should faculty be able to respond to comments, especially those that center on pedagogical choices?

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) stated that anonymous comments might be harmful if students believe they are going to the instructor only. Students shouldn't be led to believe that comments won't go to someone else.

Professor Stiller reminded Senators that the motion on the floor would mean this issue is moot since the comments would go on to administrators. By a hand vote and two standing votes, the motion to send student comments to administration failed by a vote of 24 in favor to 25 opposed.

Chair Stiller reminded the Senators that because the motion failed, the current practices with respect to both student comments and summer student evaluations remain in effect.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) asked for a motion to rescind the motion to recommend the use of the instructor report because the wording of that motion included that the comments would be submitted [to administrators]. The wording of the motion for the summary report did not include that comments would be included. The Senate passed both of those; Professor Bailey re-read the motion.

Chair Stiller clarified that the information about sending comments to the administrators was not in the motion, but in the text following the motions, which was contradictory. If Professor Bailey wanted to revise that motion and put it forward, he could. Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) did not choose to revise the motion as it is not necessary and clarified that the instructor [summary report would go up the line without the comments.

Chair Stiller commented that we dealt with those motions, but asked if there were any requirements to for us to pass any additional motions to move forward.

Associate Provost Zhou clarified that instructors will receive their reports, and administrators will receive those reports without comments. In addition, they will have access to two summary reports, one in Excel and one pdf. That is what Faculty Senate approved today.

Chair Stiller asked again if there were other aspects of the motion required for the process to move forward and the motion to go forward.

Professor Gemperline (Dean of Graduate School/Academic Deans Representative) stated that the second motion didn't indicate what would be done with the reports. The third motion read that the reports would go up the line, and since that motion was voted down, we have no format recommendation about what to do with the reports except to send them to the instructors. Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) responded that there is another motion to be introduced that does indicate what will be done with reports.

Discussion followed about the order of the motions presented, which had passed and which had failed, as there was confusion about two different versions of the order of the motions.

Chair Stiller clarified that we had voted down the motion that contained the information about forwarding individual faculty reports. However, we currently have a practice in place to report

quantitative results to administrators, which stands unless we change it. This was not changed as a result of the vote.

Associate Provost Zhou clarified that Blue is automated and doesn't require faculty to voluntarily "opt in" for SSOI in the summer. The reviews will be done for all summer courses but, based on the motion passed, SSOI comments will only be shared with the instructors, not the unit administrators. The instructors continue to have the option of sharing summer SSOI results with the unit administrator for evaluation purposes if she/he so chooses. However, the summer quantitative results will automatically go to the administrators.

Professor Cope (Psychology) asked for a clarification of what will be sent to administrators from summer evaluations. Associate Provost Zhou responded that only quantitative information will go to administrators. All courses that meet the eligibility requirements will be automatically surveyed every semester.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) commented that because the summer reports have been optional, they haven't been used in faculty evaluations. But now that summer SSOI will be automatic and that data will exit, the Faculty Senate should indicate whether that data will be included in evaluations or not.

Professor Mwarchofi (Medicine) asked whether data could be corrected for biases before submitting the SSOI results? Associate Provost Zhou replied that she did not think they could do that, unless the Provost would assign her two researchers to help.

Professor Grodner (Economics) stated that if we know the biases, we would design a mechanism to collect data to that addressed the biases. We know that there are biases, just know how big. It would be great if we could, but we can't.

Professor Mwarchofi (Medicine) asked whether, since we know there are biases, and faculty are evaluated by the reports, will administrators be informed about the biases? Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) reiterated the suggestion that training be provided to address biases and other issues. People need to learn how to use the data to evaluate teaching. One point noted earlier is how poorly attended workshops are. Solutions have been proposed to address that issue.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) moved that we follow the current practice, which is that while we collect data in the summer, we don't use those for promotion and tenure decisions. The students are often a different set of students, sometimes not ECU students, and not all courses are consistent. Since all faculty generally teach fall and spring, for consistency, we should use the data from fall and spring. Chair Stiller asked if the suggestion would apply to personnel actions. Professor Morehead responded that he would not include all personnel actions to that summer SSOI could be used for other actions, such as re-hiring someone for another. The motion he is making is about the PAD and only using the spring and fall data for that.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Francia (Political Science) asked for a point of clarification about whether faculty members would have the option to include summer SSOI results if they want. Chair Stiller responded that would

continue the current practice. Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) indicated that he is proposing to maintain the current practice.

Professor Francia (Political Science) followed up with the comment that in light of the small *n* problem in summer surveys, Professor Morehead's motion makes sense.

Professor Campbell (Allied Health Sciences) asked about how this would affect 12-month faculty. Chair Stiller asked about the unit's current practice with respect to summer teaching. The response was that faculty could opt out, which Chair Stiller noted maintains the current practice.

Associate Provost Zhou clarified that summer surveys are conducted, but only instructors would have access to those results.

Following discussion, the motion that we follow the current practice, which is that SSOI data collected in summer for eligible courses not be used for promotion and tenure decisions, was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-29**

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) then presented a motion to approve the revised Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching Effectiveness. Faculty in various units want to be able to complete reviews on tenured as well as tenure track faculty, to have everyone in the unit be eligible to conduct peer review, and to select reviewers for particular actions. The proposed procedures would require that information related to peer review be included in unit codes.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) asked if this would allow instruments to be put in codes that are different from the university instrument. Professor Bailey responded that any instrument approved by the Chancellor can be used.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked whether the motion meant that each faculty member is reviewed every year. Professor Bailey replied that it's up to the unit. Units can already do this. Some people thought mistakenly that this can't be done. To make it clear that units can do this, the suggestion is to put it the policy.

Professor Mazow (Anthropology) noted that there have been several versions of the information and asked how this would relate to unit codes versus the faculty manual. There are difference between the version in the agenda and Faculty Senate resolution #93-44 including several differences related to review of procedures. Is the proposal a revision of #93-44. Professor Bailey replied that the proposed revised procedures address ambiguities causing problems in some departments.

Chair Stiller indicated he would entertain a motion to return the proposal to the committee to address the issues raised.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry/Past Chair of the Faculty) moved to return the report to the Committee for clarification on proposed revisions. The motion was seconded.

The motion to return the report was approved without discussion. **RESOLUTION #17-30**

E. Calendar Committee
Professor Mark McCarthy (Business), Chair of the Committee presented first the proposed revisions to 2017/2018 University Calendars, relating to Final Exam Schedule and Reading Day.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-31**

Professor McCarthy then presented Summer 2017 – Spring 2018 Student Application/Processing Dates, for information only. There was no discussion.

Professor McCarthy then presented proposed Summer 2018, Fall 2018, and Spring 2019 University Academic Calendars.

There was no discussion and the Summer 2018-Spring 2019 University Academic Calendars were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #17-32**

Professor McCarthy then briefly discussed the results of faculty survey on changing MWF class times. The issue is that students have difficulty getting to and from classes, particularly when they have to come from Belk or Minges. The faculty in those buildings asked about changing their class beginning times to start on the half hour. The survey indicated that faculty is generally opposed to changing course start times. This report was for information only. Chair Stiller suggested senators forward any ideas or thoughts to the committee.

F. Committee on Committees
Professor Crystal Chambers (Education), Chair of the Committee present the first reading of proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee Charge having to do with membership. Chair Stiller noted that this is the first reading and no vote is required.

Agenda Item VII. New Business
There was no new business to come before the body at this time.

Chair Stiller noted that Lori Lee was honored with a University Centennial Award for Spirit. The Senate applauded this well-deserved award.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE MARCH 28, 2017 MEETING

Resolution #17-16

Whereas, Professor Michael Van Scott has served as Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development, and Engagement of East Carolina University from Fall 2015 through Spring 2017; and

Whereas, Professor Van Scott has also served as Chief Research Officer from Fall 2014 until the present; and

Whereas, Professor Van Scott has worked tirelessly to support the research and creative activities of the Faculty of East Carolina University through his leadership and the financial support offered by his division; and

Whereas, Professor Van Scott has offered his respectful support and transparent communication with the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, Professor Van Scott has been an advocate for shared governance at East Carolina University in his roles as member of the Governance Committee and Academic Council;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that we, the members of East Carolina University's Faculty Senate, hereby express our greatest appreciation to Vice Chancellor Michael Van Scott, for his dedicated leadership and support of the Faculty Senate and the entire faculty of East Carolina University.

Resolution #17-17

Spring 2017 graduation list, including Honors Program graduates.

Resolution #17-18

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council meeting minutes of February 13, 2017, including curriculum action items (GC 15-36) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from January 18, 2017, which included packages submitted by the Department of Human Development and Family Science. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of January 18, 2017 were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included Discontinuation of a Degree: Career and Technical Education, MAED in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance. Policy action items (GC 15-37) within the February 13, 2017, Graduate Council meeting minutes, included an editorial revision to the Graduate Student Appeal policy (Notice of readmission procedure); and a catalog change to the Integrated Bachelor's to Master's degree – minimum overall 3.0 GPA required for admission instead of 3.5 GPA and Graduate Council meeting minutes of March 13, 2017, including curriculum action items (GC 15-38) within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from February 1, 2017, February 15, 2017, and March 1, 2017, which included packages submitted by the Department of Bioethics and Interdisciplinary Studies, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Department of Anthropology, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Department of Mathematics, Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management. Programmatic actions within the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of February 15, 2017, and March 1, 2017 were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included two proposals within the Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences - New Degree: MA in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, and Integrated Degree Pathway: Bachelor/Master of Arts in Mathematics in the

Department of Mathematics; two proposals within the College of Education – (a) Discontinuation of Existing Concentration: Business and Marketing Education in the MAT, (b) Business Education MAEd, (c) Business and Marketing Education MAEd in the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions, and revision of an Existing Degree Title: Instructional Technology Education MAEd to Instructional Technology MAEd in the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education.

Resolution #17-19
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of February 9, 2017 and February 23, 2017, including curricular actions within the Colleges of Allied Health Sciences, Education, Health and Human Performance, Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Geography, Planning and Environment and Biology and the School of Music.

Resolution #17-20
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of March 17, 2017, including request for discontinue degrees: BSBE Business Education, BSBE Business and Marketing Education, and BSBE Information Technologies; discontinue concentrations: MAT: Business and Marketing Education, MAED Career and Technical Education: Business Education, and MAED Career and Technical Education: Business and Marketing Education all in the Department of Interdisciplinary Professions within the College of Education; discontinue MAEd Career and Technical Education degree and BS in Child Life degree in the Department of Human Development and Family Science within the College of Health and Human Performance; rename degree title: MAEd Instructional Technology Education to MAEd Instructional Technology in the Department of Mathematics, Science and Instructional Technology Education within the College of Education; propose new minor: Disability Studies in the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education; revise BS Elementary Education degree in the Department of Elementary Education and Middle Grades Education within the College of Education; propose new concentration: Pre-Law in the BA in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy and Religions Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences; discontinue concentrations: Organ Performance and Piano Pedagogy in the BM in Music in the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication.

Resolution #17-21
Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee meeting minutes of February 14, 2017 including service learning (SL) designation for KINE 3906: Physical Education for Special Populations (all sections).

Resolution #17-22
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of February 20, 2017, including approval of Global Diversity credit for GLST1000: Introduction to Global Studies and Humanities credit (3 hours) for GLST1000: Introduction to Global Studies.

Resolution #17-23
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of March 20, 2017, including credit earned by ATMO 1300/GEOG 1300 be reduced from four credit hours to three credit hours and ATMO 1300/GEOG

1300 be approved for Foundations Science credit, credit earned by PHYS 1050 be reduced from four credit hours to three credit hours and the course approved for Foundations Science credit, approval of Domestic Diversity credit for NURS 4941 and PSYC 3221 and Global Diversity credit for NURS 4614.

Resolution #17-24
Adoption of the new Survey of Students Opinion of Instruction (SSOI form) for use each fall, spring and summer session terms, beginning first summer session 2017.

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.

Exams/Grades/Evaluation
7. My work is evaluated in ways that are helpful to my learning.

Providing Feedback to Students
8. My instructor provides useful feedback throughout the semester.

Providing Help as Needed
9. My instructor provides individual assistance when asked.

Readings and Assignments
10. Course activities/assignments help me learn the subject matter.

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?

Additional Questions for Distance Education, Lab, and Field-Based Courses

DE Specific Questions

- My instructor encourages interaction among students.
- The course is organized to encourage interaction with the instructor.
- When I contact the instructor Monday to Friday, I receive a response within 24 hours.
- The instructional materials are accessible and easy to use.
- The design of this course is effective for online delivery.

Lab Course Specific Questions

- My instructor demonstrates how to apply concepts and methodologies in the lab.
- Lab procedures are clearly presented to me.
- Assistance is always available throughout lab sessions.
- Lab safety regulations are strictly enforced.

Field-Based Course Specific Question

- This course has challenged me to acquire skills related to my professional and academic ambitions.

Resolution #17-25
Individual faculty SSOI report will contain quantitative results (a listing of individual student responses, frequencies and means) and qualitative results (student comments) and that the summary SSOI report will contain the frequencies and means for all questions for all sections of each course.

Resolution #17-26
Use of the Individual Instructor Report Form for the Student Survey of Instruction (SSOI), including student comments (attachment 1).

Resolution #17-27
Use of both Department Level Summary Report Form Version 1 and Version 2 for the Student Survey of Instruction (SSOI) with neither summary report including student comments (attachments 2 and 3).

Resolution #17-28
Adoption of the below "best practices" for administering the Student Survey of Instruction (SSOI):

(a) Faculty members who have students in face-to-face classes will set aside time in class for students to complete the SSOI on their digital devices.
(b) Faculty members will leave their class during the times students are completing the SSOI.

(c) Faculty members teaching online courses are encouraged to remind online students to complete their surveys when they log into Blackboard.
(d) Faculty members are encouraged to remind their students of the value and importance of completing the SSOI, stressing the anonymity of student responses, the importance of the survey, how the university uses the results, and how the faculty member utilizes the results for improvement.
(e) Faculty members are encouraged to include information on their course syllabus on when the SSOI will be administered and to provide students with instructions on how to complete the SSOI.
(f) Faculty members are encouraged to use the "Announcements" page in Blackboard to remind students of when and how to complete the surveys.
(g) ECU will indicate in the University Academic Calendar the dates each semester that the SSOI surveys are available.
(h) During the times that the SSOI is available to students, ECU will advertise the SSOI via multiple media including social media and LED screens on campus.
(i) Faculty members are encouraged to promote the informal use of the survey question at mid-term to provide the mid-term feedback and to show students that their feedback is being utilized.
(j) ECU is encouraged to increase administrative commitment to appropriate use of SSOI information.
(k) ECU is encouraged to provide workshops for unit administrators on how to evaluate teaching and the proper use of the SSOI.

Resolution #17-29
ECU continue to follow the current practice in relation to student surveys, which is that while we collect data in the summer we don't use the data for promotion and tenure decisions.

Resolution #17-30
Revised Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching Effectiveness was returned to the Committee for clarification on proposed revisions and requested to be brought back again in April.

Resolution #17-31
Proposed revisions to 2017/2018 University Calendars include removing Chemistry from common exam times, changing back to a full Reading Day and moving 5 pm MW and TTh exams into common exam time slots as follows:

Fall Semester 2017

December 4, Monday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
December 5, Tuesday	Reading day ~~– 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.~~
~~December 5, Tuesday~~ **December 6, Wednesday**	Final Examinations begin
December 13, Wednesday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from Fall Semester 2016.
December 13, Wednesday	Exams for Fall Semester close at 4:30 pm.
December 15, Friday	Commencement.
December 15, Friday	Grades due at 4:30 p.m.

Fall Semester 2017

Examination Schedule

FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 - 7:30 Wednesday, December 6
FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 1003, GERM 1002	5:00 - 7:30 Thursday, December 7
MATH 1066	5:00 - 7:30 Friday, December 8
~~CHEM 0150, 1120, 1130, 1150, 1160~~	~~5:00 - 7:30 Monday, December 11~~
~~CHEM 1121, 1131, 1151, 1161, 2753, 2763~~	~~5:00 - 7:30 Tuesday, December 12~~

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Monday, December 11
8:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Tuesday, December 12
9:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, December 13
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, December 6
10:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Friday, December 8
10:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, December 7
11:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Monday, December 11
11:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, December 7
12:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, December 13
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, December 6
1:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Friday, December 8
1:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Tuesday, December 12
2:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Monday, December 11
2:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Tuesday, December 12
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, December 13
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, December 7
4:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Friday, December 8
4:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, December 6
5:00 MWF	~~7:00 - 9:30 Tuesday, December 5~~ **5:00 – 7:30 Monday, December 11**
5:00 TTh	~~4:00 - 6:30 Tuesday, December 5~~ **5:00 – 7:30 Tuesday, December 12**

Spring Semester 2018

April 12, Thursday	Undergraduate students last day to remove incompletes given during Fall Semester 2017
April 24, Tuesday	State holiday makeup day. Classes which would have met on Friday, March 30, will meet on this day so there will effectively be the same number of Fridays and Tuesdays as every other weekday during the semester; Tuesday classes will not meet.
April 24, Tuesday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
April 25, Wednesday	Reading day ~~– 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.~~
~~April 25, Wednesday~~ **April 26, Thursday**	Final examinations begin
May 3, Thursday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from

	Spring Semester 2017.
May 3, Thursday	Exams for Spring Semester close at 4:30 pm.
May 4, Friday	Commencement.
May 5, Saturday	Grades due at 4:30 p.m.

Spring Semester 2018
Examination Schedule

~~CHEM 0150, 1120, 1130, 1150, 1160~~	~~5:00 - 7:30 Thursday, April 26~~
~~CHEM 1121, 1131, 1151, 1161, 2753, 2763~~	~~5:00 - 7:30 Friday, April 27~~
FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 - 7:30 Monday, April 30
FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 1003, GERM 1002	5:00 - 7:30 Tuesday, May 1
MATH 1066	5:00 - 7:30 Wednesday, May 2

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Friday, April 27
8:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, April 26
9:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Monday, April 30
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 - 10:30 Tuesday, May 1
10:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, May 2
10:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, May 3
11:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Friday, April 27
11:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, May 3
12:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Monday, April 30
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 - 1:30 Tuesday, May 1
1:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, May 2
1:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, Apr 26
2:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Friday, April 27
2:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, Apr 26
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Monday, April 30
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, May 3
4:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, May 2
4:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Tuesday, May 1
5:00 MWF	~~7:00 - 9:30 Wednesday, April 25~~ **5:00 – 7:30 Friday, April 27**
5:00 TTh	~~4:00 - 6:30 Wednesday, April 25~~ **5:00 – 7:30 Thursday, April 26**

Resolution #17-32
Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 University Academic Calendars, as follows:

Summer Session 2018
First Session
(Actual days First Session: 5 Mondays, 5 Tuesdays, 5 Wednesdays, 5 Thursdays, 5 Fridays, 1 day for final examinations)

March 16, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 19, Monday	Registration for Summer Session begins.
May 11, Friday	New student registration; schedule changes.
May 14, Monday	Classes begin; schedule changes.
May 15, Tuesday	Last day of Course Adjustment Period (registration, schedule changes and drop/add) for first session by 5:00 pm.
May 16, Wednesday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm).
May 28, Monday	State Holiday (no classes).
June 5, Tuesday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades by 5:00 pm. Block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
June 18, Monday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
June 19, Tuesday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from first Summer Semester 2017.
June 19, Tuesday	Final examinations.
June 22, Friday	Grades due at 8:00 am.

Second Session
(Actual days Second Session: 5 Mondays, 5 Tuesdays, 4 Wednesdays, 6 Thursdays, 5 Fridays, 1 day for final examinations)

June 20, Wednesday	New student registration; schedule changes.
June 21, Thursday	Classes begin; schedule changes.
June 22, Friday	Last day of Course Adjustment Period (registration, schedule changes and drop/add) for second session by 5:00 pm.
June 25, Monday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm).
July 4, Wednesday	State Holiday (no classes).
July 13, Friday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades by 5:00 pm. Block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
July 26, Thursday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
July 27, Friday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from second Summer Semester 2017.
July 27, Friday	Final examinations.
July 30, Monday	Grades due at noon.

Summer Session 2018

11-Week Summer Session
(Actual class days: 10 Mondays, 10 Tuesdays, 9 Wednesdays, 11 Thursdays, 10 Fridays, 1 day for final examinations)

March 16, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 19, Monday	Registration for 11-Week Summer Session begins.

May 11, Friday	New student registration; schedule changes.
May 14, Monday	Classes begin; schedule changes.
May 15, Tuesday	Last day of Course Adjustment Period (registration, schedule changes and drop/add) for 11 week session by 5:00 pm.
May 16, Wednesday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm).
May 28, Monday	State Holiday (no classes).
June 19-20, Tuesday and Wednesday	Midsummer Break (no classes).
June 27, Wednesday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades by 5:00 pm. Block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
July 4, Wednesday	State Holiday (no classes).
July 26, Thursday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
July 27, Friday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from 11-week Summer Semester 2017.
July 27, Friday	Final examinations.
July 30, Monday	Grades due at noon.

Fall Semester 2018

(Actual class days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays.
Effective class days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays)

March 16, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 19, Monday	Registration for Fall Semester 2018 begins.
August 17, Friday	Faculty Convocation at 9:00 am; Faculty meetings.
August 20, Monday	Classes begin; schedule changes.
August 24, Friday	Last day of Course Adjustment Period (registration, schedule changes and drop/add) by 5:00 pm.
August 31, Friday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm).
September 3, Monday	State Holiday (no classes).
October 6-9, Saturday-Tuesday	Fall Break.
October 10, Wednesday	8:00 am - Classes resume.
October 22 – 26, Monday-Friday	Advising for Spring Semester 2019.
October 29, Monday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades by 5:00 pm. Block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
November 2, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
November 5, Monday	Registration for Spring Semester 2019 begins.
November 21-25, Wednesday-Sunday	Thanksgiving Break.

November 26, Monday	8:00 am - Classes resume.
November 26, Monday	Undergraduate students last day to remove incompletes given during Spring and/or Summer Session 2018.
December 3, Monday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
December 3, Monday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from Fall Semester 2017.
December 4, Tuesday	Reading day.
December 5, Wednesday	Final Examinations begin.
December 12, Wednesday	Exams for Fall Semester close at 4:30 pm.
December 14, Friday	Commencement.
December 14, Friday	Grades due at 4:30 p.m.

Fall Semester 2018

Examination Schedule

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one credit hour classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes. Clinical and non-traditional class schedules, including graduate level courses, may also adopt a modified examination schedule as required. A final course meeting during the exam period is required in order to satisfy the 750 contact minutes per credit hour required by the University of North Carolina Office of the President. Department Chairs are responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.

Classes beginning 6:00 pm or later are considered night classes. Examinations in classes meeting one night a week will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 5 - December 12). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning before 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 5 - December 12). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning at or after 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the second night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 5 - December 12). Distance education classes should give their final examinations in a timely fashion to allow submitting grades in time.

Classes beginning on the half hour or meeting longer than one hour will have their final examination at the time determined by the hour during which the classes begin (e.g., 9:30-11:00 am TTh classes will follow the examination schedule of the 9:00 am TTh classes; 8:00-10:00 am MWF classes will follow the examination schedule of the 8:00 am MWF classes).

Common examinations, including DE sections, will be held according to the following schedule:

FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 - 7:30 Wednesday, December 5
FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 1003, GERM 1002	5:00 - 7:30 Thursday, December 6
MATH 1066	5:00 - 7:30 Friday, December 7

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Monday, December 10
8:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Tuesday, December 11
9:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, December 12
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, December 5
10:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Friday, December 7
10:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, December 6
11:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Monday, December 10
11:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, December 6
12:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, December 12
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, December 5
1:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Friday, December 7
1:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Tuesday, December 11
2:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Monday, December 10
2:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Tuesday, December 11
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, December 12
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, December 6
4:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Friday, December 7
4:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, December 5
5:00 MWF	5:00 - 7:30 Monday, December 10
5:00 TTh	5:00 - 7:30 Tuesday, December 11

Spring Semester 2019

(Actual class days: 14 Mondays, 15 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 13 Fridays.
Effective class days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays.)

November 2, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
November 5, Monday	Registration for Spring Semester 2019 begins.
January 4, Friday	Advising and schedule adjustments.
January 7, Monday	Classes begin; schedule changes.
January 11, Friday	Last day of Course Adjustment Period (registration, schedule changes and drop/add) by 5:00 pm.
January 18, Friday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm).
January 21, Monday	State Holiday (no classes).
March 3-10, Sunday – Sunday	Spring Break.
March 11, Monday	8:00 am - Classes resume.
March 11-15, Monday-Friday	Advising for Summer Sessions and Fall Semester 2019.
March 20, Wednesday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades by 5:00 pm. Block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
March 22, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.

March 25, Monday	Registration for Summer Sessions and Fall Semester 2019 begins.
April 11, Thursday	Undergraduate students last day to remove incompletes given during Fall Semester 2018
April 19 - 20 Friday-Saturday	State Holiday (no classes)
April 23, Tuesday	State holiday makeup day. Classes which would have met on Friday, April 19, will meet on this day so there will effectively be the same number of Fridays and Tuesdays as every other weekday during the semester; Tuesday classes will not meet.
April 23, Tuesday	Classes end. Last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
April 23, Tuesday	Last day for faculty to remove Incompletes for Graduate Courses from Spring Semester 2018.
April 24, Wednesday	Reading day.
April 25, Thursday	Final examinations begin.
May 2, Thursday	Exams for Spring Semester close at 4:30 pm.
May 3, Friday	Commencement.
May 6, Monday	Grades due at 8:00 a.m.

Spring Semester 2019

Examination Schedule

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one credit hour classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes. Clinical and non-traditional class schedules, including graduate level courses, may also adopt a modified examination schedule as required. The final exam meeting is required in order to satisfy the 750 contact minutes per credit hour required by the University of North Carolina Office of the President. Department Chairs are responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.

Classes beginning 6:00 pm or later are considered night classes. Examinations in classes meeting one night a week will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 25 - May 2). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning before 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 25 - May 2). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning at or after 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-9:30 pm on the second night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 25 - May 2). Distance education classes should give their final examinations in a timely fashion to allow submitting grades in time.

Classes beginning on the half hour or meeting longer than one hour will have their final examination at the time determined by the hour during which the classes begin (e.g., 9:30-11:00 am TTh classes will follow the examination schedule of the 9:00 am TTh classes; 8:00-10:00 am MWF classes will follow the examination schedule of the 8:00 am MWF classes)

Common examinations, including DE sections, will be held according to the following schedule:

FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 - 7:30 Monday, April 29
FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 1003, GERM 1002	5:00 - 7:30 Tuesday, April 30

MATH 1066	5:00 - 7:30 Wednesday, May 1

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Friday, April 26
8:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, April 25
9:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Monday, April 29
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 - 10:30 Tuesday, April 30
10:00 MWF	8:00 - 10:30 Wednesday, May 1
10:00 TTh	8:00 - 10:30 Thursday, May 2
11:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Friday, April 26
11:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, May 2
12:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Monday, April 29
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 - 1:30 Tuesday, April 30
1:00 MWF	11:00 - 1:30 Wednesday, May 1
1:00 TTh	11:00 - 1:30 Thursday, Apr 25
2:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Friday, April 26
2:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, Apr 25
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Monday, April 29
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 - 4:30 Thursday, May 2
4:00 MWF	2:00 - 4:30 Wednesday, May 1
4:00 TTh	2:00 - 4:30 Tuesday, April 30
5:00 MWF	5:00 - 7:30 Friday, April 26
5:00 TTh	5:00 - 7:30 Thursday, April 25