

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2, 2012**

The second regular meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 2, 2012, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**

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

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of [September 11, 2012](#), were approved as presented.

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

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Zoller (Art and Design), Chen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Roper (Medicine), Julian (Nursing), Shinpaugh (Physics), Edwards (Sociology), and Taggart (Music/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Herdman for Gibson (Business) and Sorensen for Kerbs (Criminal Justice).

**B. Announcements**

Professor Heidal (Nutrition and Dietetics) a member of the Calendar Committee, notified the Senators that the Calendar Committee voted unanimously last week to move forward with the Senate's request to draft a 2014-2015 "academic" calendar and move all administrative references (i.e. last day to apply as an undergraduate student, etc.) to an "administrative" calendar overseen by the Angela Anderson, University Registrar and others within administration. She stated that the Committee would continue to provide formal faculty advice on any administrative matters relating to the new "administrative" calendar and noted that this change coincided with their committee charge, allowed them to draft additional "academic calendars" for future years, and eliminated the need to continuously address "editorial" revisions to administrative items. She noted that her goal in alerting the Senators to this now was to gain their support before the Calendar Committee began the arduous task of splitting the calendar formats apart and drafting two initial separate calendars for Senate consideration in March 2013. She also noted that internal guidelines for handling requests for changes to approved academic and administrative calendars would be formulated and presented to the Senate in March.

Faculty are reminded that most of the speeches given by the Chair of the Faculty are posted online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/speeches/Speeches.cfm>.

As the first year gets underway for the new University Academic Service Learning Committee, Faculty Senators are asked to share information with faculty regarding the process for service-learning course designation and upcoming deadlines in their respective units.

Deadlines for service-learning course designation submissions

October 15 of each year for designation in upcoming Spring semester

March 15 of each year for designation in upcoming Fall semester

Faculty members interested in obtaining a service-learning course designation are invited to submit to the Service Learning Committee an application form, course questionnaire, and course syllabus that includes a brief description of the course, learning objectives, and how learning will be assessed. The form and questionnaire are available on the committee's website in a downloadable Word format at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/sl/servicelearning.cfm>. Following approval by the

Committee, Faculty Senate, and Chancellor, courses approved for the "SL" designation will be listed as such in both the University undergraduate and graduate catalogs. Prior to the course submission deadline, faculty are encouraged to submit electronic pdf documents to members of the Service Learning Committee via [svc@ecu.edu](mailto:svc@ecu.edu). Faculty may also direct any questions to Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake, Chair of the Service Learning Committee at 328-5277.

The Committee on Committees is seeking nominees from the faculty for the election of one delegate and two alternates to the 2013-2014 UNC Faculty Assembly. Nominees should be full-time faculty, holding no administrative duties outside his/her department. A formal list of nominees will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for consideration in January 2013, with new terms beginning July 1, 2013. Information has been distributed to all faculty and nominations are due in the Faculty Senate office by November 1, 2012. A list of the current Faculty Assembly delegation is available online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/rosters/facultyassembly.pdf>.

Materials related to the UNC Strategic Planning process are now available on the General Administration's web site at: [http://www.northcarolina.edu/strategic\\_direction/meetings/index.php](http://www.northcarolina.edu/strategic_direction/meetings/index.php). The current materials include the meeting dates for the Strategic Planning Advisory Committee as well as materials from that committee's first meeting. All meetings are open/public meetings.

*ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II, Section II. subsection XII. Agenda of the Faculty Senate has been reviewed by the Faculty Governance Committee and editorially updated to coincide with the recently approved text found in subsection VI. Organization of the Faculty Senate referencing the inclusion of the elected Faculty Assembly officers.

#### C. Tom Ross, President of the UNC System

President Ross first thanked Marianna Walker, past Chair of the Faculty, for inviting him to the meeting. Identifying North Carolina's workforce needs for the coming decade will be the greatest challenge for the UNC Advisory Committee on Strategic Direction stated President Ross. This advisory committee was created by the Board of Governors in September at President Ross' request to update the UNC system's long-range plan entitled "UNC Tomorrow" which was adopted in 2007. Chancellor Ballard, along with four other chancellors from the UNC system, was named to the 24-member committee representing North Carolina's business and higher education communities. Catherine Rigsby, Chair, UNC Faculty Assembly is also a member of this committee. There will be a sub group of this advisory committee that President Ross referred to as an "internal" working group. He reminded the Senators that a 1972 state law required the UNC system to maintain long-range planning documents and to update these plans every five years.

According to President Ross, many of the underlying principles from UNC Tomorrow are still current but "it is a known fact today that things are different than in 2007," specifically the state's ability to adequately fund the UNC system. He said that the UNC system needed to look for more efficient ways to accomplish our goals and then go to the General Assembly for resources. President Ross commented that presenting this information to the General Assembly was vital because North Carolina will have a new governor and likely the election of many new legislators.

President Ross stated the long-range planning process needed to be guided by five strategic principles: new degree attainment goals, strengthening academic quality, serving the people of North Carolina, maximizing academic and administrative efficiency, and maintaining a financially stable and accessible university system. He commented that North Carolina was in a better position than most

states in terms of funding per student and low tuition costs. However, the UNC system needs \$2.5 billion in repair and renovation.

President Ross stated that the UNC system was training students for jobs of tomorrow that may not exist today and that we have to improve our graduation rate if we are going to produce the workforce of tomorrow. President Ross commented that North Carolina needs a half of a million new degree-holding citizens by 2018.

President Ross commented that after assessing the state's workforce needs, the UNC Advisory Committee would recommend degree attainment goals that were responsive to these needs and the changing demographics in the state by January 10, 2013.

President Ross discussed performance funding with the audience. He stated that when he came to the UNC system, the Board of Governors had just passed a performance-funding model, which he referred to as an "all or nothing model." If the campus met the goal, they could continue to grow and if they did not meet the goal, the campus could not grow. He said there were benefits to tying performance to growth but it was important to incentivize campuses rather than punishing campuses that need to grow in order to supply the workforce of the future by denying them enrollment growth funding. President Ross informed both the Board of Governors and President Bowles before he came to the System that he did not like the performance funding model they had adopted and that he would be looking to make some adjustments. President Ross stated that they have not totally separated performance funding from enrollment growth funding but have distanced the two areas from each other. If an institution were growing, the performance growth model would continue to be used. Additionally, there would be five performance metrics required for all campuses and five additional metrics determined by each campus from a longer list provided. A baseline in cooperation with each campus would be determined for each goal and the success of each goal would be determined using a 10-point system. If the campus received 0-3 points then growth would be restricted. If a campus received 3-7 points, then growth would be restricted in the area of concern. If a campus received 7 points or higher, then the institution would be allowed to continue to grow. He noted that even institutions that were not performing as high as other institutions would still get some enrollment growth funding and those institutions that were performing well, would get more funding when funding was available. The UNC system was seeking funding from the general assembly to reward growth on campuses. Currently there was no money for growth this year as there was only one million dollars in the fund and this would not be much of an incentive to campuses. This year the institutions were setting goals so that next year when funding was available, they would be rewarded.

Professor Maher (Philosophy) asked a question for Professor Taggart who was unable to attend the meeting. Professor Taggart stated, "In 2007, I was impressed by the thoroughness and transparency of the strategic planning process of the UNC system as executed by the President of the System and the Board of Governors. I believe that they held themselves accountable to the word 'public' in our public university system and engaged in the process in an open, inclusive and transparent manner. It was assuring to see not only community leaders and administration, but staff, faculty, students, and local citizens involved in the process. The result was not only a thorough review, but also resulted in good will generated by the participation of all of the constituencies involved. Everyone believed that their voices were heard. This time, it would appear that the Board of Governors has decided to engage in this process behind closed doors with a severely reduced time frame. As president of the public university system in North Carolina, what assurances can you give that the process will be as

thorough, and that all of the voices who have a stake will be given the opportunity to have their say in a transparent manner?"

President Ross noted that nothing was being done behind doors because they are required to have public notifications of the meetings. He noted that the process was faster than the UNC Tomorrow process because of time constraints. President Ross also noted that Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the Faculty Assembly was working to keep the Chairs of the Faculty Senates involved in the discussion. President Ross stated that he was operating in a transparent manner.

Professor Terrian (Medicine) asked if there would be consequences to the universities if there were no economic growth. President Ross replied that there would be real challenges ahead if the economy continues in its current path. He hoped for more revenue and saw the tax reform as an opportunity to benefit North Carolina.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services/Faculty Assembly Delegate) asked how important was the role of tenure for faculty? President Ross stated that although some people do not understand the competitive role of tenure, he thought that tenure was going to be protected.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures and Faculty Assembly Delegate) first commended President Ross for a clear grasp on the major issues facing the universities and that he represented the faculty perspective quite well. However, he noted that the UNC Advisory Committee had only one faculty representative and that educating the Board of Governors more input from faculty to help explain how research and teaching was important to the State. He then asked President Ross if he would support adding more faculty and student representation to the UNC Advisory Committee. President Ross replied that the UNC Advisory Committee was only going to advise him on matters dealing with how to improve the number of degrees granted through efficiencies and what type of degrees would be needed for economic growth and employment needs in the future. President Ross stated that he was going to appoint a faculty advisory group to work with them.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) urged President Ross to consider the role of foreign language education in preparing a student for living and being employed in a global society in a more explicit way than previously stated in UNC Tomorrow. Professor Given, as Chair of the University Budget Committee, was surprised to learn that campuses were not required to set aside a certain percentage of tuition increases for financial aid and asked if this wouldn't impact student debt.

President Ross stated that the past tuition plan contained a 25% set aside for increases in financial aid and there was a strong move among members of the Board of Governors to cap the set aside at 25%. There were a number of people who felt this was not a good idea. President Ross developed a plan that had a cap on the set aside which worked well for a period of time. He would not worry about campuses having less than 25% as the average is 35%.

Chair Sprague thanked President Ross for his support of faculty and his work for North Carolina.

D. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard began his remarks by first sharing a copy of the [UNC: Our Time, Our Future](#) document that was referenced in President Ross' remarks. He shared his impressions of the first UNC Advisory Committee meeting. This committee is only addressing statewide degree attainment

goals and comparing institutions to business needs and other states. Chancellor Ballard noted that the UNC system was behind top state produces such as Massachusetts. He feels that this is the driving force behind any member of the Board of Governors mind regarding strategic planning. The other goals, which he feels are more important, will be addressed by the “internal” working group. He has confidence that there is room for input on how to address these other goals. Chancellor Ballard said there was consensus among member of the UNC Advisory Committee that state appropriations and resources for higher education would be constrained for many years. Also, there was consensus that there would be rapid change and not incremental change. The importance of disruptive technologies and disruptive demographics are discussed every day with online learning or distance education being the most discussed. He noted that ECU is the state leader in distance education. He was concerned about disruptive demographics. Chancellor Ballard stated that the population, workforce and the classrooms would be different in the near future. It is important that ECU get “in step” with this new reality and be ready to change. He noted that ECU has been criticized in the System for being unwilling to change. Chancellor Ballard thought ECU looked good on four if not five of the goals. ECU needs to do more regarding academic quality, which is the key to everything ECU does.

In regards to the PPC process, Chancellor Ballard assured the audience that the vice chancellors were in the planning process only this year and they are sharing the input from the colleges with him. He thought it was unlikely that any actions would occur this semester with the possibility that some action would occur next semester. He welcomes suggestions from each college and hopes the Deans have a process for receiving faculty input. The impetus for implementing these changes is first, the 4.5 million dollar revenue that would come from the colleges. ECU has experienced an 83 million dollar loss in our base budget and Vice Chancellor Niswander has stated that 25%, approximately 20 million dollars has been lost in all flexibility. This money would have been used for academic departments, programs, and units. One area that ECU has felt this loss is in graduate education. ECU is not at the level it needs to be in graduate education. Chancellor Ballard stated that it was important to avert administrative costs to the academic core, which is the heart of ECU’s mission. The second reason for implementing the PPC actions is to plan for worst-case scenarios, such as the one last year where ECU had a 16% reduction. Chancellor Ballard noted North Carolina’s current economic situation and ECU’s 2.5 million dollar repair and renovation need.

Chancellor Ballard concluded his remarks by stating that shared governance was practiced at ECU, noting as examples the changes with the graduate curriculum, the lengthy process of revising the *ECU Faculty Manual*, and the Program Prioritization Committee process.

Professor Maher (Philosophy) asked if Chancellor Ballard would ever consider actually approving the earlier [Standards of Shared Governance](#) of the 16 UNC Campuses that the Faculty Senate approved in April 2005 (#05-28) and he had only accepted as information in May 2005. Chancellor Ballard replied that he would be happy to review the document again.

E. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies  
Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson began his remarks with an overview of Research and Graduate Studies in perspective of the other divisions. The academic core of ECU was made up of three divisions. Two were very large in comparison to the third. Academic Affairs (with COB, COE, CFAC, CHE, CHHP, CTCS, HCAS, and HONS) included about 1150 faculty FTE and the Health Sciences Division (with CON, CAHS, BSOM, and SODM) included about 633 faculty FTE. His view of the mission of the Division of Research and Graduate Studies was to serve these two large divisions with

effective service to their research/creative programs and their graduate programs. In serving these two divisions, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies also made every effort to bridge them. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson thought this was a particularly important function—to bridge east and west, noting, “You see some of this integration in the centers and institutes have been incubated within the Division, you see it in the grant programs that emphasize inter-disciplinarity, you see it in advocacy for new degree programs that transcend traditional boundaries like the proposed Master of Science in Biomedical Engineering.” The Office of Research and Graduate Studies took their service and bridging functions very seriously. In addition, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies housed ECU’s Office of Engagement, Innovation, and Economic Development. The Office attempted to align and provide access for our region and the state to the intellectual capital that resided at ECU.

Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson provided some empirical goals for the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, admitting the Office had been on a roller coaster ride, their record of securing external funding in support of our instruction, their research and creative activities, and their outreach had been on a positive trajectory. For example their external funding was just over \$33 million in 2004-05 and the 2011-12 total was over \$45 million (an increase of nearly 40%). Keeping track of these numbers was important in a number of ways. Their ability to capture F&A from these awards supported a host of programs including start-up packages and a number of humanities functions, like Downtown Dialogues in the Humanities and the Contemporary Writers’ Series. He noted that ECU chose one of its key performance indicators to be external research expenditures. ECU was one of a handful of campuses to select this measure and he was proud of ECU, noting that it sent a clear message to any listener that research and creative activities were important at ECU. Most campuses did not make this commitment. As a result, one of ECU’s clear goals must be the continued ascent of our externally funded research and creative activity programs. Another empirical goal was to reverse the downward trend of graduate enrollments. In the fall of 2009 the graduate headcount was 6,196 at ECU and the current census figure will probably be right around 5,650, representing a consistent decline of nearly 550 graduate students in just 4 years, about a 9% decline. This was a concern for all of ECU. Chancellor Ballard had indicated this as a priority for Dean Paul Gemperline and Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson noted that it would take a significant team effort to reverse this trend, which was witnessed at the national level as well. ECU would need to do a better job of marketing and recruiting but would also need to think more carefully about retention and noted that faculty would be hearing more about an organized approach in the near future. About half of ECU’s graduate students were on-line and part-time and that national statistics suggest the difficulties in retaining these students.

Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson concluded his remarks with noting several achievements. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies has focused a significant amount of effort on an appropriate response to the Chancellor’s Task Force Report on the Offices of Sponsored Programs (pre-award services) and Grants & Contracts (post-award services) that was received in July. The Office of Graduate Studies had addressed some leadership issues in these offices. Marti Van Scott assumed duties as Director of Offices of Sponsored Programs (OSP) recently. The OSP group had been hard at work in reforming its web presence to provide better content and functionality. OSP would be very interested in faculty reactions to this new web presence. Marti Van Scott and her group also are just starting to think about improved training for Primary Investigator (PI) and support staff at unit level, which would be an important step. OSP had engaged IPAR to lead them in visually mapping out the processes related to getting grants and spending the money once awarded. There are a number of issues in this regard and OSP hopes that by visually mapping them they would discover unnecessary redundancy and bottlenecks. There would be special focus on relationships between OSP, OGC, and

Human Resources along with improved processes for IRB and HIPPA approvals. He noted that he was hopeful that focus on these internal processes would improve efficiency and effectiveness in support of ECU's research and creative enterprise. He encouraged the audience to feel free to address any concerns in this regard directly to him.

Another aspect that had consumed a good bit of effort during Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson first few months in his new job was the creation and improvement of regulations that affect ECU's research and creative environments. Thus far the Office of Research and Graduate Studies had examined conflicts of interest, research conduct, and copyright. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson noted that there was much left to do and he was already very thankful to a host of faculty for valuable input and feedback. In addition to the obvious role for the Faculty Governance Committee, Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson was also hopeful that an enlarged mission for the Research and Creative Activities Committee would include a vetting function for the regulatory developments. He noted that he looked forward to assisting faculty as they grew their own research and creative activities along with graduate programs. He encouraged faculty to share any concerns with him regarding the Office of Research and Graduate Studies because they were always looking to improve.

Professor Shlapentokh (Mathematics) asked if there was a good chance that research would be listed as a part of the University's mission statement noting that it was clearly a part of the University's performance measure. Professor Shlapentokh noted that there was a real need to streamline the research/granting process because she felt there was little respect for the time and efforts of PI's and the current process was not convenient for those who do research. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson stated that the regulatory environment placed some limits on how the Division could make the process easier for PI's.

Chancellor Ballard provided some historical background on ECU's mission statement noting that research and economic development were part of the mission statement and that the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees were engaged to create ECU's last mission statement. He also noted that if ECU has the opportunity to revise it again, there would be forces who wanted to see the University's mission statement to be different than what the faculty may want. It is important for ECU to reflect on the history of the institution and remain authentic. Chancellor Ballard noted that the Board of Governors thought that ECU's mission statement was the best they had ever seen.

Professor Terrian (Medicine) stated that the IRB process was another onerous process for researchers and asked that it also be investigated. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson stated that the HIPA protocol was being reviewed and there was a group established between the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and the Health Sciences Division to try and address those problems. Vice Chancellor Horns stated that they were working to make things better and Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson stated that a new research analyst was being hired in the Brody School Office of Compliance.

F. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty

Below are Professor Sprague's remarks in its entirety.

"ECU has a strong tradition of shared governance. ECU President Leo Jenkins established the Faculty Senate in 1964 'as an organized voice for the faculty of East Carolina University to enable faculty to play a broader role in the decisional mainstream of the institution.' The ECU Faculty Constitution, the document that established the Faculty Senate, says:

The Faculty Senate shall ratify, amend, or remand all matters of academic policy or faculty welfare which have been recommended by any standing or special committee of East Carolina University, or initiate any policies in such matters which it deems desirable.

This original 1964 language is still in our Faculty Constitution today.

ECU faculty members were also instrumental in the establishment of the UNC Faculty Assembly in 1972, and Professor Henry Ferrell served as the second chair of that body. Five Chairs of the UNC Faculty Assembly – including Professor Farrell and current chair, Professor Catherine Rigsby – have come from ECU, more than any other campus. Other campuses in the UNC System look to ECU as a model of how the shared governance process should work.

That said, just what is shared governance? In 1998, Chair of the Faculty, Professor Don Sexauer discussed shared governance in this way:

Shared governance in an academic setting is a fragile balancing act that takes place between the administration of the university and its faculty. It is the attempt by the administration and the faculty to solve problems and implement policies in a manner that benefits all the constituencies of the university.

I like this statement because it emphasizes the essential aspects of the process. Shared governance requires the participation of both the faculty and the administration. It is about working together to do what is best for the institution.

In many ways shared governance is like a muscle. It will become weak and atrophy if we do not use it, but if we practice shared governance regularly, it will become a powerful force that can overcome significant obstacles. Faculty, it is easy to just let the administration handle things. After all they have to get things done. If you do not review that policy, serve on that committee, or ask that question, it will just be easier for you, right? No! Administrators, it would just be easier if the pesky faculty just lets us do your jobs. They are always butting in and asking about things outside their purview, right? No! That is not the way we do things at ECU. As I have elaborated, the faculty and administration have a long history of working together to solve problems and make policy. Why? The results are solutions and policies that benefit all constituencies of the university.

Today, we have a strong system of shared governance at ECU. Our *ECU Faculty Manual* houses academic policies pertaining to faculty, particularly policies relating to tenure and promotion, curriculum, degree requirements, instructional standards and grading, and faculty welfare. The standing academic committees, on which the administration has representatives, recommend faculty manual policies to the Faculty Senate. The chancellor and academic vice chancellors are ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate. The Senate recommends faculty manual policies to the Chancellor. Recently, our review of the faculty manual and our Program Prioritization Committee work included input from both faculty and the administration. We also have a system in which the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, can offer formal advice on administrative Policies, Rules, and Regulations. All of this is shared governance at work, and ECU is a better place for it.

What will happen in the future? Will ECU continue to be a model for shared governance? Much of this depends on the people in this room. Review those policies. Ask those questions. Participate in those committees. Bring matters to the standing academic committees. The future of shared governance depends on every one of us doing our part in the ‘balancing act.’”

There were no questions posed to Chair Sprague at this time.

G. Andrew Morehead, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Morehead provided a [report](#) on the September 21, 2012, Faculty Assembly meeting and presented several highlights from the meeting. Following his brief remarks, he offered the following resolution on the UNC Strategic Plan:

WHEREAS, The UNC System is initiating strategic planning process for 2013-18 to set current and future priorities, resource planning and allocation, program planning, review and refinement of academic missions reflecting the University's deep commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the UNC system have responsibility for developing, delivering, and assessing the curriculum, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty develop, pursue, and publish original research expanding the knowledge foundation on which our future depends, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty advise, mentor, and engage students in the activities that lead directly to their future occupations and improve their quality of life, and

WHEREAS, all these components contribute immensely to both current job creation and our citizens' preparedness for the future,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, the Faculty of East Carolina University fully endorses the Resolution on the UNC Strategic Plan passed by the UNC Faculty Assembly on September 21, 2012, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, to fully embrace the University of North Carolina mission "to discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society," the Faculty of East Carolina University request that the membership of the UNC Advisory Committee on Strategic Directions be expanded to include faculty representation from this university specifically and from the other UNC Institutions in general.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences/Chair of the Faculty Assembly) provided additional information about the proposed resolution and recommended that the Chair of the Faculty Senate ask Chancellor Ballard to reaffirm the resolution for shared governance.

There were no questions posed to Professor Morehead and the proposed resolution on the UNC Strategic Plan was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-85**

H. Anthony Britt, Director of Admissions

Mr. Britt began his remarks by sharing various tidbits about the incoming freshman class. He then provided Senators with the [Freshman Class Profile](#). There were no questions posed to Mr. Britt following his remarks.

I. Question Period

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) requested the Chair of the Faculty to send the Chancellor the earlier approved [Standards of Shared Governance](#) of the 16 UNC Campuses that the Faculty Senate approved in April 2005 (#05-28) and the Chancellor accepted as information in May 2005. Chair Sprague agreed to this request.

#### **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 Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council presented the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 5, 2012](#).

Professor West reported the election of the Graduate Council Officers for the 2012-2013 academic year. Professor West was elected Chair and Professor McFadden (College of Education) was elected Vice Chair. Four members of the Graduate Council were elected to the Graduate Council Executive Committee: Terry Atkinson (College of Education), Kathy Cox (Allied Health Sciences), Heather Ries (Arts and Sciences) and Paul Schwager College of Business).

Professor West summarized a report from an ad hoc group charged with investigating the plus/minus grading system at the graduate level. The Graduate Council decided to postpone a decision for one year to see how well it worked at the undergraduate level at ECU.

Professor West noted a report from Dean Gemperline on trends in graduate enrollment. Dean Gemperline was going to conduct further analysis of ECU's graduate enrollment with the goal to improve retention and recruitment. He also noted that the Graduate Assistantship proposals would be evaluated by the graduate school at the end of September. Professor West concluded his report with a summary of a report on graduate student orientation and the discussion of a revised graduate school appeals policy on probation and termination.

There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [September 5, 2012](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-86**

#### **Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**

##### **A. University Curriculum Committee**

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the [April 12, 2012](#) (I of II) and [September 13, 2012](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes. She noted that agenda item IX. of the April 12, 2012 meeting minutes were being deleted from consideration by the Faculty Senate at the request of the Department of Child Development and Family Relations. Professor Kain also briefly mentioned the committee discussion on the plus/minus grading scale and inclusion of a reference on the course proposal form that was approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2012.

Professor McFadden (College of Education) asked for clarification on whether the course proposal form states that the plus/minus grading scale "should" be included. Professor Kain stated that the form does use this language but that the University Curriculum Committee was not going to require the plus/minus grading scale to be included.

Professor McFadden asked if the University Curriculum Committee was going to remove this language on the course proposal form. Professor Kain replied that they would remove this language if directed by the Faculty Senate.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) asked for a clarification on whether the form required a faculty member to list their grading scale on the course proposal form with the specific delineation of the grades. Professor Kain replied that the form does ask for a grading scale to be included but does not specify the delineations of the scale.

Professor Henze (English) moved that that the University Curriculum Committee revisit its course proposal form and consider submitting a revised version that is more in line with its expressed policy.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures/Faculty Assembly Delegate) stated that in order to avoid sending the course proposal form back to the Committee, he offered a friendly amendment suggesting that an editorial change be made to the course proposal form. Professor Henze withdrew his motion. Professor Kain asked for clarification in that the course proposal form should not reference the plus/minus grading policy.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences/Faculty Assembly Chair) clarified that on the current online course proposal form, underneath the box, the editorial revision would be to simply remove the text that reads “*NOTE: Beginning in fall of 2012, grading scales should reflect the implementation of the “+/- grading scale adopted by the faculty.”*”

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked for clarification about how the members of University Curriculum Committee felt about including the plus/minus grading scale on the form. Professor Kain stated that there was a lot of discussion among the University Curriculum Committee members about including that statement on the course proposal form and at the same time, allow for faculty autonomy. Following discussions, the Committee decided that they would not require a plus/minus grading scale on each course proposal form. There were definite concerns among Committee members about what is in the catalog and what faculty are actually being required to do.

Professor Popke (Geography) asked for a point of order since the referenced course proposal form was actually approved in an earlier set of Committee meeting [minutes](#). Chair Sprague stated Professor Kain in reporting on a matter that was discussed in the University Curriculum Committee meeting and he felt that the Faculty Senate should continue the discussion.

Professor Kain offered to report back to the Committee that the Faculty Senate suggested that the reference to the plus/minus grading scale be removed from the course proposal form.

Professor Morehead asked if the Committee had ever questioned a faculty member’s grading scale that was included on a course proposal form. He noted that if faculty only use ABCD why does the Committee need the fine detail? What important role did the grading scale play in the review and approval of a course proposal form? Professor Kain responded that the course proposal form does require a grading scale and the Committee does review the scale.

Following discussion, the curriculum matters contained in the [April 12, 2012](#) (I of II) and [September 13, 2012](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION #11-87**

B. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Hector Garza (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee was not present to present the curriculum matters included in the [September 10, 2012](#) meeting minutes, therefore this item of business will be carried forward to the November Faculty Senate meeting.

C. Faculty Grievance Committee

Professor Gregory Lapicki (Physics), Chair of the Committee presented an overview of 2011-2012 Committee Activities. There was no discussion and the overview was accepted as presented.

D. Committee on Committees

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee presented the first reading of proposed revisions to the Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee Charge, stating that last year the Faculty Senate approved a proposed revision of the Research/Creative Activities Grants Committee charge which contained expanded responsibilities and activities beyond the screening of internal grant applications. The revision was returned by Chancellor Ballard for further revision. Specifically there was a concern about ambiguity with item 4. B. The Committee on Committees, with the Research/Creative Activities Grants Committee's helped, bulleted and clarified this section. It also reversed the order of the words "Policies and procedures" in section 4. A. It would now read "Procedures and policies." The Committee wanted to be sure that it was clear that they would be empowered to consider policies (lower case) as opposed to establishing "Policies" (upper case) as in those official policies and regulations sanctioned by the university system. Professor Theurer noted there were no changes to the charge as it was revised last year.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked if the proposed membership matched the present ratio of members detailed in the current charge. Professor Theurer replied yes.

There were no further questions and Chair Sprague noted that the Faculty Senate would be asked to act on the proposed revisions to the charge at the November 6, 2012, Senate meeting.

E. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed Student Perception of Teaching Survey Forms, including SPOTS Laboratory Course Form, SPOTS Field-Based Course Form, and SPOTS Distance Education Course Form, as companion forms to the previously approved SPOTS [Face-to-Face Form](#). He noted that these forms would be implemented beginning Spring 2013 along with the previously approved SPOTS Face-to-Face Form. He also noted that these forms needed Faculty Senate approval so ITCS could begin the work necessary to implement these forms.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences/Faculty Assembly Chair) stated that as she read the laboratory assessment form, it occurred to her that the same form might work well in a lower division courses but not as well in upper division courses. She noted that often upper-division lectures and laboratory courses were possibly separate course numbers but only one grade given. She asked how faculty would handle this in relation to the proposed SPOTS form. Professor Brown suggested that faculty who teach both upper division course and laboratory to only use the course evaluation form

and that the faculty member could announce to the students that they should only use one evaluation form. Professor Brown stated that he would bring this issue to the attention of Chuck Rich in IPAR who oversees the evaluation distribution process.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures) noted that in reference to the SPOTS Distance Education Course Form, #6 "*The instructional materials were accessible and easy to use*" is ambiguous. Professor Brown replied that this referred to the instruction materials.

Professor Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) thought that the Committee was trying to see if the students could find what they wanted. She then made a motion to revise the sentence in #6 to read "*The instructional materials were easy to find and to use.*"

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked why we were comparing DE courses to only other DE courses at ECU and not all other courses. Professor Brown replied so that students can compare similar formats of courses.

Following discussion, the Student Perception of Teaching Survey Forms, including SPOTS Laboratory Course Form, SPOTS Field-Based Course Form, and SPOTS Distance Education Course Form, as companion forms to the previously approved SPOTS [Face-to-Face Form](#), to be implemented beginning Spring 2013 along with the previously approved SPOTS Face-to-Face Form were approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #11-88**

#### F. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Marianna Walker (Allied Health Sciences), Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II, Section IV. Graduate School Organization noting on pages 13 & 14, the changes to the Graduate Council organization, the term limits of the councilors, and the addition of the Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee to the Graduate Council Executive Committee.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked what changes were made in section II.B. Graduate Council about allocations. Professor Walker stated that it would depend on the number of graduate faculty in the units. Chair Sprague replied that this was the initial allocations that was given to the Academic Council for consideration in relation to the distribution of how many faculty were in the College of Business, Fine Arts and Communication, Arts and Sciences, etc.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked for "SCH" stood for? Professor Walker replied that "SCH" stood for "student credit hours". Professor Reisch offered an editorial revision to spell "SCH" out in the document. Professor Walker stated that she would accept this as an editorial revision to be included as the formal faculty advice.

Following discussion, formal faculty advice on proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II, Section IV. Graduate School Organization was approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #11-89**

Professor Walker then presented an Interim Regulation on Promoting Objectivity in Research funded under Public Health Service Grants or Cooperative Agreements or Contracts noting that this PRR came to Faculty Governance as a result of ECU needed a conflict of interest policy for faculty funded under Public Health Service Grants or Cooperative Agreements or Contracts.

Following brief discussion, the formal faculty advice on the Interim Regulation on Promoting Objectivity in Research funded under Public Health Service Grants or Cooperative Agreements or Contracts was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-90**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McFadden  
Secretary of the Faculty  
College of Education

Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate

### **FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 2, 2012, MEETING**

12-85 Resolution on the UNC Strategic Plan, as follows:

WHEREAS, The UNC System is initiating strategic planning process for 2013-18 to set current and future priorities, resource planning and allocation, program planning, review and refinement of academic missions reflecting the University's deep commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the UNC system have responsibility for developing, delivering, and assessing the curriculum, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty develop, pursue, and publish original research expanding the knowledge foundation on which our future depends, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty advise, mentor, and engage students in the activities that lead directly to their future occupations and improve their quality of life, and

WHEREAS, all these components contribute immensely to both current job creation and our citizens' preparedness for the future,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, the Faculty of East Carolina University fully endorses the Resolution on the UNC Strategic Plan passed by the UNC Faculty Assembly on September 21, 2012, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, to fully embrace the University of North Carolina mission "to discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society," the Faculty of East Carolina University request that the membership of the UNC Advisory Committee on Strategic Directions be expanded to include faculty representation from this university specifically and from the other UNC Institutions in general.

**Disposition:** President of the UNC System via UNC Faculty Assembly Chair

12-86 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [September 5, 2012](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

12-87 Curriculum matters contained in the [April 12, 2012](#) (I of II) and [September 13, 2012](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

12-88 [Student Perception of Teaching Survey Forms](#), including SPOTS Laboratory Course Form, SPOTS Field-Based Course Form, and SPOTS Distance Education Course Form, as companion forms to the previously approved SPOTS [Face-to-Face Form](#), to be implemented beginning Spring 2013 along with the previously approved SPOTS Face-to-Face Form.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

12-89 Formal faculty advice on revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II, Section IV. [Graduate School Organization](#).

**Disposition:** Chancellor

12-90 Formal faculty advice on the [Interim Regulation on Promoting Objectivity in Research](#) funded under Public Health Service Grants or Cooperative Agreements or Contracts.

**Disposition:** Chancellor