

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2011**

The fifth regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of [December 7, 2010](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Miller (Geology), Jenks (History), Wilson (Sociology/Faculty Assembly Delegate) and Chancellor Ballard.

Alternate present was: Professor Farrell for Cooper (Health and Human Performance).

B. Announcements

1. The Chancellor has scheduled several budget forums noted below for faculty, staff and students. Forums will be scheduled for the remaining academic units as soon as possible.
 - Allied Health Sciences - Thursday, February 3.
 - Technology & Computer Science- Tuesday, February 8.
 - Fine Arts and Communication - Monday, February 21.
 - Education - Wednesday, March 2.
 - Business - Tuesday, March 15.
 - Nursing - Wednesday, March 30.
 - Arts and Sciences – Monday, April 4.
2. Letters concerning unit elections for the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate representation have been sent to unit code administrators. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.
3. Thanks to the following Faculty Senate Alternates who agreed to serve as Tellers during the meeting: Carolyn Willis (Academic Library and Learning Resources), Naoki Kanaboshi (Criminal Justice) and Linda Vangelis (Communication).
4. The Committee on Committees has been charged to seek volunteers to serve on the various 2011-12 academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. A faculty member may complete the volunteer preference form available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/callforvolunteers.htm> and forward it to the Faculty Senate office at facultysenate@ecu.edu or go to OneStop sign in using user name and password and click on "**Faculty Committee Volunteer Form**" under the Employee Section and complete the committee volunteer preference form. Deadline is February 18, 2011.

Faculty Senate Minutes

January 25, 2011

Page 2.

5. The Chancellor will host a reception for Faculty Senators, Alternates and Academic Committee members on Tuesday, March 1, 2011, from 5:00 to 6:30 pm in Spilman Gallery (lobby). Formal invitations will be forthcoming.
6. A Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Proposal Convocation is scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2011 from 3:00 - 4:30 pm in the Hendrix Theatre. All faculty, staff and students will be invited to attend. At this convocation, the finalist proposals for the University QEP topic will be presented. Information on the guidelines are available online where noted below. Following this event, the Faculty Senate will be asked to rank order and vote on the topics during their March 28, 2011 Senate meeting.
(www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/customcf/dl/Assmt/QEPConceptPaperGuidelines.doc)

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

The Chancellor was out of town meeting with legislators, which is crucial for the University in the face of a severe budget situation, and new leadership in the North Carolina Senate and House. We look forward to his remarks in February and his news on the budget situation of our University.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Provost Sheerer provided a brief report on faculty employment, which was originally to be presented by the Chancellor, that included longitudinal profiles of faculty tenure status and tenure status of permanent and temporary faculty with those reports noted and linked below.

Full and Part Time Faculty by Unit, Tenure, Gender

Faculty FTE by Unit, Gender, Full and Part Time Status

Longitudinal Profile of Faculty Tenure Status (all ECU Units included)

Longitudinal Profile of Faculty Tenure Status (excluding School of Medicine, School of Dental Medicine, and ROTC faculty)

Provost Sheerer began her comments with the report on employment of full time faculty. She reported that the number of full time faculty has had little increase ; in 2008 was 1,721 and this number had increased to 1,748 in 2010. The number of tenured full time faculty increased by 60 during these two years from 720 to 780. The percentage of tenure track faculty is currently 44.6% of the total faculty. The number of tenure track faculty was 478 in 2008 and is currently 435; thus, during this two year time period tenure track faculty decreased from 34.4% in 2008 to 27.8% of the total faculty in 2010. This means that full time fixed term faculty numbered 533 or 30.4% of the faculty in 2008 and is now 532 or 30.5% of our current full time faculty. The Provost concluded that these are not significant changes over the last two year period. The largest change is in the number of tenure track faculty

The Provost then stated that the questions that were proposed to Chancellor Ballard by the faculty officers were mainly related to the budget. The first specific request had to do with positions and how they can be filled; The Provost stated that currently only critical positions are being filled. The requesting unit must clearly establish that the positions are deemed critical for the function of the unit. This question has been posed at the unit level. Each dean and chair has been asked to manage the current resources in their area before beginning a job search for a new position.

The budget cut requires outlining critical positions only. Provost stated that the “picture” presented by the Deans and chairs to substantiate the need for hiring a new employee was then sent to the HR review group to see if there is justification in the opinion of this committee. . One question that has been asked by the faculty is whether the Vice Chancellor of Research is involved in the selection of new hires ; the Provost stated that the answer to this question is yes. Productivity reports are provided and discussed when a position is requested which relate to the following: how many faculty are in the unit and how many students are served, how is the position classified, current class size, how would research productivity be improved by a new hire, and is there anyone else who could teach the class? In addition, how does this meet the unit reduction? (do you mean budget reduction?) even if the position is approved? In terms of fixed term roles, the plan must show how teaching responsibilities might be shifted to avoid hiring another employee. Are there ways of having larger sections of courses? Changes are being considered to spaces like Hendrix Theater so they can accommodate larger sections. The hiring of a new position also has to be justified in terms of a 10% reduction in overall unit allocations in this budget year. The units must make their own analysis of fixed term versus tenure track positions. Many solutions may need to be made for larger class sizes that may not be ideal.

At the end of each month a list of vacant positions that ECU has been filled are sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) All of the positions that are seen as critical are sent to the Human Resources office by the HR review team. The Chancellor will approve each position monthly and the list will be sent to Office of Management and Budget.

The Provost indicated that a question had been asked about the master plan and current project planning. She reported that the new student center will be funded entirely from student fees and the basketball facility is to be funded by private donations. A space planning committee has been formed and currently is working co-operatively between the academic representative and facilities staff in debating the need for space. For example, the space committee is currently working to provide a facility for the mice is now being considered as well as research facility relative to Operation Re- Entry. The University Space committee also makes recommendations relating to academic units and is related to new faculty hires as well as space needs.

The Provost reported that that there had also been a question about the SACs QEP (the Quality Enhancement Plan) which is a major component of the SACs accreditation effort; at this time the university is involved in the collection of the information. The QEP will be written by a collection of faculty, staff, and students between September 2011 and October 2012. The current QEP proposals were developed by faculty. There will be a presentation of the QEP proposal on March 22 and there will be a vote on these proposals. Curriculum matters will proceed through the regular Faculty Senate committee process.

The final topic that the Provost was asked to report related to the UNC-GA program curtailment committee, which she chairs. She stated that this committee will merge into a new committee to be headed by former President Woodward

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that as a member of the University Space Committee he had participated in the discussion about requiring research

grant proposals to include space needs and that the cost for such facility improvements will now be included in the proposals. The Provost and Vice Chancellor Mageean responded that future grants must identify the facility needs of the research projects as part of the grant writing process.

Professor Van Willigen (Sociology) noted that the Office of Victim Services had been relocated from Student Health Services to the Mendenhall Student Center. She noted that there was no handicap access to the new office location and not enough room in the office for victims to bring a guest with them to meetings. The Provost indicated that she was not aware of this but that she would look into the situation.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked if the Provost would break down the list of those who would to be asked to vote on the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) plan. Provost Sheerer stated that the entire University community would be involved, which included faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

Professor Sprague (Physics) expressed faculty's concern that in tough economic times it was not appropriate to continue to raise funds for athletics. He noted that even if these were private funds, it diminished the possible ability of donors to support academics. Provost Sheerer stated that she understood faculty concerns but that fundraising went on all the time across campus and that it would be difficult to tell potential donors to give money to one aspect of the University versus another. She noted that the ECU Pirate Club did an excellent job of raising funds. Although it may look like a bad time to push for donations, in a multifaceted University like ECU, it would be difficult to pull it from one place to try and increase it in another area, noting that sometimes we don't know the whole fundraising picture.

Professor Bauer (English) asked for the Provost's thoughts on filling the open Honors Dean position. She asked if there would be an internal search? Provost Sheerer stated that she did not know right now and that the Faculty Advisory Committee has been formed that will help determine the selection of a new Dean of the Honors College. The Provost and the Chancellor have discussed an internal search. No decisions have been made but hiring a current faculty member given the current budget situation would be helpful.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) with SACS was ambiguous and it was worrisome to faculty that any plan even those that are dominated by curriculum, would not be include participation by the faculty. The Provost stated that administration should not place Quality Enhancement Plans in the hands of students, administrators, or staff. The Provost continued by stating that the QEP statements do not have to be curriculum related statement; she summarized by saying that she would look into faculty involvement in development of QEP statements

Professor Theurer (Music) stated that under the current budget climate, his school had begun the task of looking at how to handle a projected 12% budget cut and thought that the first method would be with a target approach. He asked if that was still the way that things would be handled. He stated that colleagues, who became aware of potential cuts were already taking action to try and change the process. So, the exercise was already affecting his School and he wondered why academic units could not have begun with a targeted type of approach. Provost

Sheerer stated that it gets tricky because everyone's area is deemed important. She thought it was best to have units first take a close look on how they could manage the cuts themselves. Then the Academic Council would take their recommendations into consideration as the budget crisis finalized. It would be hard to take targeted cuts without first having the faculty and those in academic units take a crack at meeting the budget needs. She suggested that faculty look at teaching loads, obligations within the arts, and make decisions with a collaborative effort. Any requests for critical positions should come forward in the recommendations. She noted that some units were stating that a 12% budget cut would be hard for them and she understood that and this internal evaluation will be ongoing through June 30. Chancellor Ballard was in Raleigh now fighting for ECU. She noted that as soon as units began talking about budget cuts, fixed term faculty were concerned and she understood that. There was no way that all fixed term faculty can keep their jobs and it is wrong for anyone to suggest that. Some academic units, like the College of Fine Arts and Communication, are ahead of others in their deliberations and she is pleased that they are thinking themselves what they can do.

Professor Novick (Medicine) stated that, in response to the targeted cuts versus across the board, critical positions within his School included teaching and fixed term faculty. He stated that the ability of make targeted or across the board recommendations was hard without strong leadership. Professor Niswander (Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance) stated that the issue of whether cuts will be across the board is something that we all of us need to work on. He stressed that there needs to be discussion on how to make this budgetary situation work and what makes sense within each unit. Just as your department has had discussions on what makes sense to you we must, as a University, have discussions about what makes sense for ECU and how we accomplish the needed budget cut backs. We do not know yet if every college should have the same budget cut. That has to be a broad discussion that we are already having probably six months prior to the budget being passed.

Professor Wacker (Music) asked if, that after this budget crisis will academic units see the numbers of faculty go back to normal and class sizes returned to what they were before the crisis? He asked if there was a plan that could be put into place to do just that so that we don't continue to suffer for years with the decisions made now to address the current budget situation? Can we prioritize the actions after this is over so that those lost faculty positions are addressed ahead of building new dorms, creating new administrative positions, etc. Provost Sheerer replied that that was a good idea and that she hoped to involve the University Academic Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) in all aspects of the decisions made in relation to addressing the current budget situation. The Provost stated that faculty input was needed because vacant faculty lines will not be returned. She hoped to get a decision making process in place, in terms of faculty involvement in decision making, so that all of this can be handled in a way agreeable to faculty. In response to prioritizing funding for faculty lines the Provost stated that funding for athletics and for housing could not be used for funding academic positions because they are restricted funds. A new growth formula would be needed in order to return the faculty positions that will likely be lost.

Professor Theurer (Music) again noted his concerns with across the board cuts in terms of quality to many academic units. He stated that he sees targeted cuts as a way of retaining the missions of the academic units in the best way possible given the dire situation. He noted that there will ultimately still be sadness and loss within units but stressed that across the board cuts

may hurt all parts of academic units. Provost Sheerer stated that she understood that this was very hard work and that the UNC GA committee had been given until March 15th to determine if duplication of programs existed in the system; she asked how will this be possible? Finding duplication across all UNC institutions by mid-March was a daunting task. However, hard decisions in relation to meeting the budget demands will have to be made. She stressed that EPPC would be helpful to the Academic Council in their deliberations since there is such an investment at the unit level. She understands that probably every Faculty Senator present at the meeting could detail how their particular academic programs would be best to keep.; the Provost stated that this is why EPPC' s involvement is so essential. The Provost also mentioned a grid that had been furnished by Professor Killingsworth that outlined ways that other universities had managed to make suggestions on targeted spending cuts.

Professor Spurr (Math) found all of the recently distributed budget information interesting, such as that a 20% cut of state appropriations equaled about half of the total revenues. Last year it was roughly 35%. State budget cuts at 12-15% translate into a 7 ½ % of total state revenue. If higher education is only 7 ½ % of the state budget expenditure then should ECU really be looking at a 7 1/2 % cut why were academic units told to plan at this time for a 10-15% cut. Vice Chancellor for Finance Niswander stated in response to this question that there are a number of different funding categories at the University some of which cannot be used for budget savings. . ECU Physicians funding money can only be spent for service to patients. Housing fees provide a service. In a similar way financial aid can only be used for housing students. Funding for specified uses cannot be used. The "headline cut" will be in the newspaper will say that the university will say that the university funding has been cut by x percent. This will transfer to about half of this "headline cut" having to be contributed at the unit level since some money can be made up with on campus tuition increases, the emergency fund and greater service unit efficiencies.

E. Tremayne Smith, President of Student Government Association

Mr. Smith began his remarks by saying that what he had to say would be a lot easier to deal with than the information on the budget. Mr. Smith introduced two of his fellow student government leadership: Mr. Louis Cameron, student senate parliamentarian, and Mr. Josh Carter, director of community affairs , who accompanied him to the meeting. He stated that he was curious to see how this body works so they can go back and make their body (SGA) work better. Mr. Smith said that for the students who will be graduating in May , we will allow our words to become deeds to meet the students deeds. He stated his awareness that in every dream you have to wake up to a reality. Mr. Smith sated that his version ,of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s concept of having a dream is to have high hopes, but to take big steps to bring the dream to reality Mr. Smith said was that we are all in this together to serve the purpose that is greater than our own. He said that he had been told by one of the Board of Trustees members that he heard an administrator say that when he was SGA president that "things would not be so bad if it were not for the students" .In response he said that we all have to "come together" to find solutions and build a bridge for mutual advantage Mr. Smith reported that 2.002 students meeting this weekend discussing budget cuts from the student perspective . Mr. Smith concluded his remarks by inviting the faculty to SGA meetings and his State of the Campus address in mid April . Every Friday at noon there is also a radio address on Pirate radio. He repeated his desire to build a bridge between faculty and students. Mr. Smith and his officers ended their remarks with their slogan "Lets do work- and so we will".

No questions were posed to Mr. Tremayne Smith.

F. Hunt McKinnon, Faculty Assembly Delegate
Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) provided an in depth report on the [January 21, 2011](#), UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting, including [General Fund Revenue Report](#) and [AAUP Budget Resources](#). No questions were posed to Professor Hunt McKinnon.

G. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty
Chair Walker (Allied Health Sciences) stated that, in the interest of time and desire to complete the entire agenda, she was going to summarize her comments with a promise to forward her full comments to the body. ([Link to comments distributed after the meeting.](#)) She discussed the faculty's involvement on committees to address the review of the *ECU Faculty Manual* and other important academic initiatives and stressed her appreciation to all faculty involved thus far on the committees and Faculty Senate. She recognized the positive relationship that faculty have cultivated with administration and that she will continue to nurture this positive working relationship. No questions were posed to Professor Walker.

H. Question Period
Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that NC State had formed a program elimination committee with faculty. At UNC Chapel Hill there were faculty worried due to the minimal input from faculty thus far on program eliminations and that the Chair of the Faculty there was working with administration on this. She then asked that if ECU was really going to have vertical cuts effecting students from across campus when would the faculty hear from administration about the way budget cuts were going to be handled. Provost Sheerer replied that the Academic Council had dinner plans with the Chancellor next week and knew that they were going to have to come up with a vehicle soon on the process that the administration will handle.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Jonathan Reid (History), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the [December 9, 2010](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-01**

B. Academic Standards Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee, presented approval of foundation curriculum courses for humanities: 1. RELI 2400 Religion and Film, 2. RELI 3796 Paul and His Letters and 3. RELI 3896 Life and Teachings of Jesus ([Link](#) to information on all three courses). There was no discussion and the proposed foundation curriculum courses for humanities: 1. RELI 2400 Religion and Film, 2. RELI 3796 Paul and His Letters and 3. RELI 3896 Life and Teachings of Jesus were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-02**

C. Calendar Committee

Professor Shanan Gibson (Business) explained she was bringing forward the proposed revisions to Spring 2012 University Calendar due to the earlier decision to have the University officially close between the Christmas and New Year holidays. The ramifications of this decision would cause a change in the Spring 2012 calendar, with classes starting on Monday.

Professor Fitzgerald (Medicine) asked if there were any cost savings with the closing between Christmas and New Year holidays. Professor Gibson replied yes there was a substantial cost savings and that she understood that to be the main reason for doing this. Following discussion, the proposed revisions to Spring 2012 University Calendar were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-03

D. Committee on Committees

Professor Catherine Rigsby (Geology), Chair of the Committee, first reminded faculty members of the need for committee volunteers. The Senate then addressed the election of UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate and Alternates. She suggested that the two nominees with the most votes would be elected UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates and the nominees with the least number of votes would be elected as UNC Faculty Assembly Alternates.

Following elections, Professors Mark Sprague (Physics) and Andrew Morehead (Chemistry) were elected to serve three year term (ending 2014) as UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates. Professors Ralph Scott (Academic Library Services) and V.L. Narasimhan (Technology and Computer Science) were elected to serve three year terms (ending 2014) as UNC Faculty Assembly Alternates. With Professor Morehead's election, this left a one year alternate seat open. Professor Sprague nominated Professor John Howard (Communication) and Professor Margaret Bauer nominated Professor Mark Taggart (Music). Following the second election, Professor John Howard (Communication) was elected to fill the one year term (ending 2012) as a UNC Faculty Assembly Alternate. [Link to the new UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation.](#)

E. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Glascoff first moved to add a new item of business to the agenda in order to include a request for authorization to establish a new B.A. in [Religious Studies](#), within College of Arts and Sciences as a new item of business. There was no objection from the body.

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance) then presented first a request to establish a [Distance Education Master of Arts in Education](#) in Physical Education, Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-04**

Professor Gordon then presented a request to establish a [Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision](#), Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-05

Professor Gordon then presented a request to [discontinue the BA in EXSS](#), Department of Exercise and Sports Sciences, College of Health and Human Performance. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-06**

Professor Gordon then presented a request for authorization to establish a new B.A. in [Religious Studies](#), within College of Arts and Sciences. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-07**

Professor Gordon finally provided a brief report on Unit Academic Program Reviews of the Department of Chemistry and School of Communication. He noted that the Committee reviewed an initial assessment and responses from both academic units and found nothing wrong and endorsed the materials as presented to the committee. There were no questions posed to Professor Gordon about this report.

F. University Budget Committee

Professor Scott MacGilvray (Medicine) provided an indepth report on the [current budget situation](#), including [2011-13 ECU Reduction Scenarios](#), [Reduction History](#) and the [Budget Gap](#).

Professor VanWilligen (Sociology) stated that ECU's reduction scenarios showed class size increasing and she understood how administration could come up with the numbers. However, with a typical Sociology undergraduate class it was 46 students and she understood that the reduction scenarios included graduate and independent study courses and that she did not think that the public would understand this. Because in actuality the current 46 student class size could go up as high as 60. Professor MacGilvray stated that the report was prepared in October 2010 by General Administration and that now work has begun to provide a more accurate picture for general administration. He also noted that ECU's administration had been very forthcoming with sharing the information with the Faculty Senate Academic Committee and that he felt that Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Rick Niswander was committed to working with the faculty committee on these budgetary matters.

Professor Sprurr (Mathematics) first thanked Professor MacGilvray for the report. He stated that in reference to the [current budget situation](#) he found the information very useful and noticed over an 8 year period student population went up by 40%. He asked if ECU was willing to take on more students to increase the enrollment growth funding would there be more savings and if so, how would ECU face the budget cuts. Professor MacGilvray replied that he doesn't really know and that he was hoping that the Chancellor's State of the University planned for February 2 would provide answers. He didn't think that general administration at the system level had those answers yet because it had to do with efficiencies and the cuts will probably not be across the board. Since ECU's enrollment has been going up we have brought more students in which increased the money we received however, the pace of infrastructure upkeep had not kept up and was suffering. He noted that there would be problems if the class sizes increased due to lack of larger classroom availability.

Interim Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that the fact that ECU has been more efficient and historically done more with less, with faculty stepping forward again and again are all in our favor when making these arguments. But at the end of the day, it was not going to make that much of a difference in reference to the current budget situation.

Professor Popke (Geography) asked for more information on the furloughs and who had the authority to enact them. Professor MacGilvray stated that in order for the Chancellor to institute an across-the-board furlough, the Governor of the State must authorize it. He did not know at what level that this would be considered. Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and

Merchandising) replied that, from his discussions in Chapel Hill, the governor was not interested in instituting a furlough; however, faculty across the State had heard that the Chancellors were interested in keeping that option on the table.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that the published average class size was deceptive and involved the mean and median and not the actual average number of students per course. It varied as referenced in Professor VanWilligen's comments.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that, from the material distributed, the total revenues had gone up over the eight year period and wondered had the University Budget Committee investigated if the revenue increases had been equivalent to the expenditures on the academic core or had the money been used elsewhere. Professor MacGilvray replied that the total revenue involved a huge chunk of money that went into the medical practice plan with the practice plan money going back into supplies and staff to support the medical growth on west campus. Interim VC Niswander added that an increase in State revenues was appropriate as it compared to an increase in faculty as it compared to an increase in students. All depended on the year someone was comparing the numbers but that he saw a reasonable relationship among all factors.

Professor Christian (Business) reminded Senators that expenditures have grown as much as revenues and that the problem was that only a small percentage of the revenues went to the academic core whereas the larger revenue amounts went toward infrastructure, salaries, etc.

Chair Walker stated for clarification that funding for Allied Health Sciences and Nursing came from the 16065 budget line within Academic Affairs and not from the 16066 budget line that covered Medicine and Dental Medicine. She also noted that the funding for the Master of Public Health and PhD in Life Sciences comes from enrollment increases. Chair Walker then thanked Professor MacGilvray and the Committee for their efforts in educating the Senators on the budget.

G. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Joseph Thomas (Academic Library Services) and Professor Wendy Sharer (English) lead the discussion on proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IV. Academic Integrity and to the online [Student Handbook](#).

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that he was inclined to ask to delete the third paragraph that read: "In some instances, a faculty member may deem it best to approach a potential matter involving academic dishonesty as a learning opportunity. In such cases, a faculty member may require that a student complete additional work in order to better understand the severe nature of academic dishonesty and to learn ways of avoiding future infractions. If at any point, however, the faculty member determines that a grade penalty is merited in the case, either as a result of the initial infraction or as a result of a student not sufficiently completing the additional work agreed to, she or he must follow the process outlined below, including reporting the situation to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) for its review and handling." due to the flexibility of a faculty member to handle cheating. Professor Sharer replied that this would allow for students to be educated on their misbehavior, i.e. example being plagiarism – rather educate the student than creating a record of penalty.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated that the proposed policy had received more discussion than anything else within her college. She noted that something had

happened within her academic unit with the faculty member following the current process all the way with the student set to be reprimanded. However, administration overturned the decision and the faculty member had to deal with the student who cheated in a different manner, imposing a less serious and different punishment than what was called for in the current policy. Professor Glascoff stated that faculty within her unit had shared many comments on the proposed policy with her and that she was happy to forward them to the Committee. The highlight of the faculty comments included a lot of people who did not like the idea of assigning extra work although she understood what Professor Sharer had said earlier. Extra work assignments put a burden on the faculty member and not on the student for the academic integrity. The policy on distance education courses refers to somewhere else and it needed to either be linked within the proposed new policy or included in the proposed new text. She noted that she thought that the most cheating took place in DE courses. A proctoring system helped but more needed to be addressed in relation to academic integrity and DE courses. Faculty were confused by the suggested ways to reprimand a student with an academic penalty ranging from giving an F on a paper or course to giving the student more assignments. They noted discouragement when having to complete the paperwork to form a record of penalty and thought many would just either overlook the problem or call it something else and not report every instance of misconduct. She noted that at the end of the policy, there was no appeal to the administration unless it was an appeal for expulsion. She noted that the policy took up to 45 days. Professor Glascoff stressed that academic integrity was very important and there needed to be a penalty that clarified when you get into the process because 45 days and a lot of reporting is time consuming. Also if a faculty member wanted to call a student on a cheating violation, he or she would have to notify the student in person or a method that ensured delivery. She noted that that particular text was probably left over from the old policy and should be updated to include ECU email since we have the capability to show that the email was received.

Professor Sharer (English) thanked Professor Glascoff for her thorough review of the proposed policy. She noted that, in relation to email and delivery of method, it really was not a leftover from the old policy that there was really not a way to guarantee that the student received the information. In reference to the extra work imposed on the faculty member, the way it was intended was to leave the faculty member the freedom to assign additional academic work and how and when they want to do it. It was not intended to give faculty more work but freedom to teach in ways that they wanted to teach.

Professor Thomas (Academic Library Services) also noted that if a faculty member sent an email to the student and he or she responded to that email then the next step of sending notification via registered mail was not necessary. He noted that since academic violations are important, face-to-face communication on the seriousness of the matter with the student on campus was the preferred method.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that University notices sent via email were fine but that it should not discourage faculty members from following through. Academic Appeals Board lists several things that they do so is there a reason why it cannot do a suspension? Professor Thomas replied no because only the Provost can suspend a student from the University.

Professor Brown (Psychology) offered to send Professors Thomas and Sharer additional comments he had received from faculty in his unit. He suggested that the Committee also try to

cut the proposed policy down to 6 pages so that all involved would actually read the policy. Professor Sharer (English) stated that the full policy needed to be lengthy in order to cover everything and that condensed guidelines could be provided along with a link to the full policy. She also noted that a flow chart would be beneficial.

Professor Christian (Business) reminded Senators that the academic responsibility of the faculty were important and that he had noted, through his work on the University Athletics Committee, that not all faculty on campus were as diligent with their duties. There were many faculty who were teaching face-to-face classes but giving tests without holding class. Tutors were helping athletes take exams online. He noted that this was being monitored through the University Athletics Committee and that faculty were setting students up to cheat and making it extremely easy to get away with it. He also noted that some faculty teaching face-to-face courses were skipping classes and giving online tests without using a proctoring system. Senators should encourage their colleagues to do what was right for the University and the students and strive to maintain strong academic standards for all.

Professor Howard (Communication) noted concerns by faculty in his unit about the inclusion in the proposed policy of the list of suggestions for faculty in handling the misconduct and didn't want the student to be able to use the policy as a way to force the faculty member to do something from that list. Professor Thomas replied that the policy just provided suggestions and that it was not up to the student to choose the penalty.

Chair Walker noted the time and hard work of the Admission and Retention Policies Committee with this task and thanked them for their service. She asked Faculty Senators to forward any additional suggestions to Professor Joseph Thomas, Committee Chair so that all could be incorporated into the final document that would come before the Senate later in the spring.

Agenda Item VI. New Business

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunt McKinnon
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Interior Design and Merchandising

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 25, 2011, MEETING

- 11-01 Curriculum matters contained in the [December 9, 2010](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-02 Three foundation curriculum courses for humanities, entitled RELI 2400 Religion and Film, RELI 3796 Paul and His Letters and RELI 3896 Life and Teachings of Jesus. ([Link](#) to information on all three courses).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-03 Proposed revisions to [Spring 2012 University Calendar](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-04 Request to establish a [Distance Education Master of Arts in Education](#) in Physical Education, Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-05 Request to establish a [Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision](#), Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-06 Request to [discontinue the BA in EXSS](#), Department of Exercise and Sports Sciences, College of Health and Human Performance.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-07 Request for authorization to establish a new B.A. in [Religious Studies](#), within College of Arts and Sciences.
Disposition: Chancellor