

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

The third regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 2, 2010, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

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 [October 5, 2010](#), were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors MacGilvray (Medicine), Willson (Medicine), and Peery (Nursing).

Alternates present were: Professors Hudson for Jones (Allied Health Sciences), Hegde for Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations), Kanaboshi for Morris (Criminal Justice), Dotson-Blake for Voytecki (Education), Mahar for Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Malek for Novick (Medicine), and Roper for Gilliland (Medicine).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 7, 2010, Faculty Senate meeting:

10-69 Revised University Scholarship of Engagement Award Procedures

10-70 Addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection V. Student Advising ([with minor addition](#))

Letters concerning unit elections for 2011-2012 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators in early January. 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.

The December 7, 2010, meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on West campus in the Banquet Room A of the East Carolina Heart Institute at ECU Building 115 Heart Drive (not Moyer Blvd). Senators are instructed to come to the front building entrance, walk through doors past the information desk. The Banquet Room A is down the hall on the right. Any faculty member with an A parking decal can park in the lot in front of the Institute. There will also be reserved parking in front of the Institute for those with B parking decals. This information will be included with the distributed December Senate agenda.

Next Tuesday, November 9, 2010 will be the second scheduled "Green Get to ECU Day", for this academic year. This is a day on which you are encouraged to travel to ECU using more environmentally friendly means than your personal car. It's a day to take a bus, ride a bike, walk, or carpool to ECU. "Green Get to ECU Day" seeks to reduce the production of greenhouse gases and promote healthier lifestyles for ECU faculty, staff and students. Please participate in making ECU a greener place! This initiative is sponsored by the University Environment Committee with the approval of the Faculty Senate and the ECU Chancellor.

Please direct any questions to Professor Tim Kelley, Chair of the Committee, at kelleyt@ecu.edu. People are also encouraged to complete the Bike/Ped Master Plan survey and submit ideas at www.greenways.com/greenvillenc.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that he wanted to welcome back Dr Schenarts who had just completed his forth tour of duty in Afghanistan. Dr. Schenarts nominated the University for the Freedom Award.

The Chancellor stated that an announcement will be made this the afternoon that Vice Chancellor Kevin Seitz will be leaving ECU to take a position at UNC Chapel Hill. An interim Vice Chancellor will be nominated within a week and a national search will take place for Kevin Seitz's replacement. This may be a difficult position to fill. Chancellor Ballard indicated that he appreciated Vice Chancellor Seitz's work for the university and that ECU is in a much better place financially than it would have been without his leadership during the last six years.

Dr. Ross is expected to assume the duties of the President of the UNC system in mid December. ECU administrators are attempting to learn more about Dr. Ross and to acquaint him with the unique characteristics of ECU and its special role in Eastern North Carolina. Dr. Ross is expected to visit the university in mid-February. Chancellor Ballard stated that it is not known if Dr. Ross will accept the UNC Tomorrow process, which turned out to be a great advantage to ECU during President Bowles' tenure. There will be a lot of turn over in the UNC General Administration staff, stated Ballard The President will need to be actively involved in the legislative process. The Chancellor indicated that the enrollment growth plan would be submitted to UNC- GA by 5:00PM today. ECU led the system in enrollment growth money last year; twenty one percent of the money that came to the university system for enrollment growth was allocated to ECU. This was more than the funding that was provided to NC State, UNC- Chapel Hill, UNC- Charlotte or any other university in the system and is an important source of funding. Enrollment growth money has yielded \$90 million over the last six years and approximately half of that money was used to fund seventy new faculty positions. By comparison seventy-eight positions were funded from last year's enrollment growth money.

The Chancellor stated that we were now an order of magnitude better in estimating and projecting enrollment growth than we were in the last biennium. The current efforts are to ensure that ECU does not grow too fast than we can honestly handle in terms of the academic experience that we give to our students. The projection is for slightly less than last year and if General Administration approves the plan and the legislature funds the increase as many as seventy new faculty positions could be created.

General Administration is also considering a performance model for enrollment growth and not just credit hours generated by the university. The question asked by the Board of Governors relates to what happens to the students when they arrive at the university; President Bowles wants to have the criteria for retention agreed upon before he leaves office. Performance based enrollment growth will be allowed as long as the university is meeting or exceeding certain standards equal to those of other universities in the peer group. Three indicators are now being discussed in this performance model: 1) Student academic performance is currently proposed to be measured by freshman returning to college as sophomores, 2) graduation rates and 3)

efficiency. Efficiency is currently being measured by the number of degrees produced per one hundred faculty members. The Board of Governors has accepted the concept although there is much work needed in determining the specifics of these measurement indicators. The Chancellor indicated that he expected that a performance based enrollment growth model would be approved by the Board of Governors in December and that details would be determined under Dr. Ross' administration.

The budget is still an unknown. What happens at the voting booth will determine a great deal about how much funding there will be for higher education; the Chancellor said that he was quite concerned about some of the predictions and estimates that he heard. The Chancellor encouraged everyone to vote and stated that the elections might be so close that the people in this room could determine who wins the elections. Two budget scenarios have been submitted about a week ago to GA as mandated by the Governor . One scenario was for a five percent base budget cut back and the other one was for a ten percent base budget cut. A ten percent cut is about \$30 million dollars, but it is so early in the year that these estimates cannot be considered final. ECU's budget submission scenario followed all the rules determined by the state; however, the rules could change several times before our funding is determined. The budget process started administrators thinking about tradeoffs and variations that might occur. The ECU administration is now working on a fifteen percent cut since we need to be prepared; some legislators and analysts are talking about potential cuts even higher than this. There is a soft hiring freeze at this time and there is a savings bank that Vice Chancellor Seitz has accumulated that amounts to \$10 million dollars. If the final cut is no more than five percent then no one on the campus would feel effected. If the required cut is higher some of the ways that funding could be raised would be supplemental tuition, a \$500 supplemental tuition increase is probably allowable. The Chancellor is considering half of that at this time. A \$200-\$230 increase would provide about \$6 million dollars to offset budget cuts. The concern with supplemental tuition is that ECU is already raising the total cost of education more than has been the case in the last eighteen years. This could also be adjusted according to resident and non-resident tuition increases. There is also an emergency fund; the Chancellor indicated that we might have to take \$5-7 million dollars out of this fund but that he was reluctant to take any money out of this fund since it would be doubtful that anything could be added to the fund over the next few years. If the overall budget cut for the university is more than 10%, then the budget cut for at the college level is likely to be 1-3% reductions. A hiring freeze will start with non-faculty positions and will probably extend and may include faculty positions depending on the total required cut. Service consolidation is also being considered as a way of saving money.

Proposals are also being prepared for campus based tuition increases that will soon be an item of discussion with the Board of Trustees. The maximum increase allowed is \$187 in tuition and a maximum of \$100 in fees and ECU is likely to ask the full maximum of \$60 for educational technology fees and \$40 for athletic fee increases. Tuition increases would fund financial aid so that students who are having a hard time affording college would be "held harmless". The legislature calls these campus based tuition increases supplemental tuition increases and there are different limits and constraints on this type of tuition increase. For the parents and the students, an increase in fees or tuition would have the same impact, since each of these raises the cost of education.

In the question period, Professor Sprague (Physics) stated, that as a Faculty Assembly Delegate Executive Committee, he had the opportunity to preview the enrollment growth performance based plan. As the Chancellor stated earlier, the three measures being discussed relative to enrollment growth are the six-year graduation rate, Freshman-Sophomore retention rate, and efficiency. He was concerned that some campuses may “dumb down” classes in order to meet the graduation demands. He expressed his desire to see some type of quality control on campuses meeting the graduation rates in order to ensure campuses do not make classes easier to increase graduation rates. He expressed his concern that the plan was forwarded to the Board of Governors without first gaining input through the UNC Faculty Assembly or academic campuses. Professor Sprague then asked Chancellor Ballard if he would agree to try and put in a “good word” with the Board of Governors about quality control.

The Chancellor agreed with Professor Sprague’s concerns and stated that he felt campuses should be careful in handling the performance plan and work slowly moving forward with determining enrollment funding. He stated that there are forces that he cannot control that are pushing the discussion in this direction. He also stated it would be helpful if Faculty Assembly and the Faculty Senate can slow down the discussion so the consequences of a decision to concentrate on these criteria can be evaluated. The Chancellor stated that more time is needed to work out the details of what the Board of Governors will probably agree to at a conceptual level.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his transparency and for making sure that shared governance was maintained on campus.

D. Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
Vice Chancellor (VC) Mageean stated she wanted to present the research and graduate studies annual report. This has become an annual event and the information has been made available electronically. VC Mageean indicated that she wanted to focus on trends in external funding and the success of the start up funds and research development awards. These have proven to be great returns on investment as have the undergraduate research awards. The undergraduate research awards begin to develop the faculty of the future. There are also statistics from the various centers and the graduate school.

Regarding budgetary planning ECU is still in need of the Biosciences building since research in this field continues to grow. In the mean while there is development of the Science and Technology building third and top floor as well as consideration of upfitting the top floor of the Heart Institute. An example of a project that needs to have a facility would be the particle accelerator. A temporary building is planned to be constructed at the West Research Annex for a blast simulator. An animal holding facility is also being planned.

Recently a \$500 million in F & A money has been put into graduate assistance funding. ECU is losing qualified graduate students to lesser institutions due to lack of funding to graduate students. At this time graduate student have a \$7,000 stipend but this must cover \$750 in health care each year as well as tuition expenses; this does not leave much money for the graduate students to live on. ECU needs to help the graduate students financially in order to be competitive; at this point graduate enrollment is increasing as well as undergraduate enrollment.

The Ramses program is now in place and modernization of the IRB process is taking place. These investments are to make life easier for researchers. There will also be a white paper, resulting from a two-day conference, on ECU responses to recent grant challenges. This plan should help take us forward by establishing a clear research focus.

Considerations of electronic formats for thesis and dissertations started last fall. ProQuest is now the database that allows open access to thesis publications. The work can be embargoed for six months, one year, or two years while work is being published. The copyright is awarded to the student so the student and supervisors must carefully work together on publication of the work. Workshops are currently being held to clarify this agreement and so far 200-210 have been published electronically here at ECU without incident.

Professor Sprague (Physics) expressed his thanks for the use of F&A funds for scientists and it sounds like ECU is making good investments. He understands that the F&A funds are contingent upon bringing in external funds and asked how ECU was doing in bringing in external funding and how we compare to their sister institutions.

VC Mageean replied that ECU was doing well but she worried that we are not doing well enough. Last year \$45 million of the ECU grants come from the federal government and that this was important as the State budget continues to dry up. She stated that a lot of funds came from the State and currently ECU's percentage was much lower compared to sister institutions. VC Mageean stated that ECU was doing well overall at \$49 million with State funds with others, such as UNC- Greensboro was \$47.7 million, A&T at \$60 million and UNC Chapel Hill over \$803 million. She stated what worries her was that some of those universities are excelling without a medical school. In relation to external funding, work was being carried on the shoulders of only a few people. At ECU 52% of the grant money comes from the School of Medicine There as an imbalance in funding and Vice Chancellor stated that she would love to hear from faculty as to what more they thought could be done and/or what was holding them back in terms of procuring research grants. She stated that she was very thankful for those who did help the University by bringing in outside funding support. She also stated that F & A funds were being made available to the Creative Arts programs since it was more difficult to attract funding in these fields and that part of her job was to balance this funding.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that she was thankful for the designated one million dollars from her Division and the Chancellor for increasing the Master's student support, to increase the number of stipends and the amount of money awarded. She noted that the Department of Geology (like many other academic units) was losing graduate students due to the low stipends offered.

VC Mageean stated that she had formed a Graduate Enrollment Task Force (chaired by Dean Steve Thomas) to address the various issues relating to Master's student support. She expected the Task Force to report on some issues soon, noting that the Division could not give more stipends with higher levels of money quickly. Enrollment growth pertained to finding the right students for ECU to accommodate the growth and that it would take years to get out of this situation. She noted that the current distribution of graduate assistantships did not fit into where the University was heading and where it was really needed. The number one area, according to VC Mageean, was Master's degrees in research fields. Further, the national trends are for

growth in students seeking Master's degrees. ECU's biggest problem was the lack of adequate graduate student stipends. Students in Departments like Geology were leaving for programs that were not as good due to money.

In the question period, Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that there is a new system for theses and dissertations and that professors were confused about the nuts and bolts of the system and checking the right boxes. She also noted that the various paper forms differ from the online form in ProQuest because some of the questions do not match. The questions in the ECU repository and ProQuest did not match and 2 weeks ago the questions were not online so that faculty could view them. Professor Rigsby wondered if steps were being taken to clear up this confusion. VC Mageean asked Paul Gemperline (Dean, Graduate School) to respond to this question. Dean Gemperline stated that his group was trying to be sensitive to faculty concerns and that the two sets of embargo forms have since been edited and published in both the ECU repository and ProQuest. He also noted that workshops were being held periodically to assist those with problems and all stood ready to respond to further inquiries.

Chair Walker thanked Dr. Mageean for the support she provides to faculty in the area of research and for her willingness to increase in the support to our master students.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker provided the following comments to the Senators.

“As many of you are aware, the direction of a thesis, dissertation or research project involves many hours of one-to-one teaching, reading, writing, editing including lab and field work that may or may not be “counted” toward research productivity in an annual report or PAD. However, these activities are extremely important as we strive to produce students with research-based Master's degrees, Ed.Ds., and Ph.D's. We foster their ability to carry out a research project, to conduct responsible and ethical research, to learn to write technically, design a study, collect data, engage in data analysis (often using statistics), and determine the outcomes of experimental questions. Of course, this varies with the degree and the independence of students.

Faculty need to be aware of a policy that was recently established by the Graduate School, which “finalizes” the process of directing and mentoring a thesis or a dissertation. As we just heard VC Mageean describe, the Graduate School has a policy that requires that our thesis and dissertations must be processed electronically – specifically via ProQuest, which is an Open Access database. That is, the student, upon completion of their thesis/dissertation, (following the defense and after obtaining signature of the director/advisor, committee members, and unit administrator), must submit directly to ProQuest, in a pdf. format. The student must obtain consent from the faculty advisor, including obtaining a signature, which allows the submission of this document an Open Access database or to place an embargo on the document for a period of two years. The student retains copyright on the document and exclusively has access to ProQuest in submission of the document.

Open Access databases and journals have many advantages including an unrestricted readership and immediate accessibility to the work. In many of our fields, as in my field of speech and language pathology, journals often do not publish research that has been previously

published, which includes publication in Open Access databases (such as ProQuest). In addition, many organizations will not allow submission for professional research papers that have been previously published. Faculty advisors should be aware of such limitations and should advise their students in selection of such options, particularly if the student is obtaining his/her doctorate and may need subsequent publications in seeking tenure in a new faculty position. I feel that if this study and data is part of a faculty line of research that may be later applied toward future intellectual property or subsequent publications, the faculty member may be signing away his/her copyrights as well.

It is imperative that all faculty directing and mentoring research with our graduate and doctoral students be aware of the current policy, the choices for submitting the dissertation electronically, and options for publishing selected chapters for publication in ProQuest, should this option be chosen. Also, if the embargo is chosen, the faculty member should be aware that the student will have to lift or extend the embargo on the thesis/dissertation if additional time is needed before being published in a scholarly peer-reviewed journal. Faculty should meet with a student and determine authorship and select possible journals for future publication and if such journals allow for publication if previously published in an Open Access database.

It is important for us to be engaged and understand the policies and procedures being designed at various levels. This happened to me this summer and since that time I have talked to the Dean of the Graduate School, members of the Graduate School Administrative Board, Graduate Assembly, and Professor Joseph Thomas, from Academic Library Services relative to the default policy of submission of the electronic thesis and dissertation to ProQuest and have learned about the options for submission of an electronic thesis/dissertation.

Faculty feedback from multiple constituencies, student faculty interaction, and unit involvement has prompted the policy to be reviewed and revised with the Graduate School Dean even proposing the establishment of an office to oversee electronic thesis/dissertations. This is a perfect example of the widespread feedback and input that is needed on university issues/policies, which affect the education of our students and the dissemination of our research.

We must not be too defensive in retaining policy that may not be reflective or broad enough to address the differences of disciplines and fields at the university. We must not be afraid to tackle contemporary university issues that may positively affect our teaching, scholarship, and service. We must all work together as one university.”

No questions were posed to Professor Walker following her remarks.

F. Lynn Roeder, Dean of Students
Dean Roeder discussed the University's [Involuntary Protective Withdrawal Policy](#) and [Faculty Guide](#) when assisting with disruptive or distressed students and stated that this was an anniversary of the tragedy at Virginia Tech. This was the deadliest peacetime shooting by a single gunman; K-12 institutions had experienced similar types of violence and the US Dept of Education had issued emergency standards and guidelines. Institutions of higher learning faced even more challenges; for example there are more than thirty-two entrances to the ECU campus. President Bush had commissioned a report to make recommendations in order to

prevent a similar tragedy in the future. The focus on improved awareness and communication is the topic that Dean Roeder wanted to discuss today. It was obvious that a number of people knew that the gunman at Virginia Tech was acting differently but no one knew what to do with this information. One of the poetry instructors knew that there had been a change in Chou's behavior, but she had no idea who to report the change in behavior to; in 2006 Provost Sheerer began to consider how ECU would respond to this situation. Dean Roeder took this challenge on in her new role and began thinking about how to "connect the dots". The results of this effort were presented to the faculty senate with the help of Professor Michael Brown. A faculty reference guide was distributed with a card the emergency phone numbers. A "ECU Cares" line was set up to allow a direct phone call to the Dean of Students. All calls will be investigated; a case was discussed regarding an international student as an illustration of how situations had to be managed.

In the question period, Professor Schenarts (Medicine) stated that as the University expands to off-campus housing, how would Dean Roeder and her staff handle the care and oversight of those students' well being? Dean Roeder responded that she had staff reporting to monitor their activities and when there was a crisis, the staff got involved.

Professor Sharer (English) asked where faculty should call about disruptive student behaviors, such as someone repeatedly making snide remarks. Dean Roeder encouraged faculty to call her to report everything. 737-5555 is the number to call when reporting safety issues and risks to the campus. The Student Life Judicial Committee handles disruptive students and sometimes the students just need assistance. The voluntary withdrawal policy was put in place to handle situations with students. She reminded faculty that she was there to consult with them about any matter and that she needed to be involved.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked Dean Roeder how she handled lower risk behaviors such as students sleeping all the time. The Dean replied that she would first get the student counseling, then maybe talk with the family if abusing substances. She stated that the students are not always lazy but maybe having problems with medication or overwhelmed with outside responsibilities

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that as the University worked with a possible 10% or perhaps 15% budget cut, he appealed to the Chancellor to consider including this enterprise as part of the "academic core" and to protect them from budget cuts. The Chancellor stated his agreement with this.

Professor Sharer (English) stated that there was a policy in the *ECU Faculty Manual* that dealt with disruptive behavior and asked how it related to the policies that her office followed. Were the procedures included in the manual the same? Dean Roeder replied that one is not part of the other and encouraged faculty to follow the procedures in the manual – verbally warn, send letter, meet with the Dean to discuss dismissing the student. The Dean reminded the Senators that she was not authorized to remove a student from the classroom. She wanted to always know about situations in case anything happened down the road with the student.

G. Approval of the Fall 2010 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Professor Sprague (Physics) moved approval of the Fall 2010 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. **RESOLUTION #10-74**

H. Question Period

It was noted that David Weismiller provided a [November update](#) on SACS activities prior to the meeting. No questions were posed to Professor Weismiller on the material at this time.

Professor Bauer (English) asked Provost Sheerer to provide details on how the 78 new positions would be distributed among the schools and colleges. Provost Sheerer stated that it depended on who produced what. She held back 15 in reserve (for budget reasons) and the other positions were given back to units depending on growth. Each Dean presented an hour long presentation to justify needed positions. The Council then debated the priorities to be as fair as possible. As a result 32 new faculty positions went to units that demonstrated the most growth: 1 position went to the College of Business (for a leadership initiative), 1 went to the College of Education (for a director of dissertations and methodology), 1 went to the College of Human Ecology (for nutrition) , 2 went to Nursing , 1 went to The College of Technology and Computer Sciences (for biomedical engineering) , 2 went to Health and Human Performance, and 2 went to Fine Arts and Communication (for math and Italian studies) . 4 positions went to Brody School of Medicine (basic sciences with the most potential for research growth). 10 positions were given for restitution, meaning the number of positions generated and those a unit already had with the difference generating the need, i.e. 4 new faculty positions went to Nursing and 3 to Arts and Sciences. Provost stated that the remaining 20 would go to priority units after qualitative decisions. (basic sciences with the most potential for research growth). 5 new faculty positions were also given to the Graduate School, and VC Mageean will oversee the distribution of these positions.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) was happy to hear that Hispanic studies was recognized by the administration. He asked Provost Sheerer about the Task Force she chaired. Sheerer stated that UNC Vice President for Academic Affairs Alan Mabe saw this first activity as an administrative task and they were looking at the difference in financial exigency and program curtailment. It was noted that in relation to cost savings there would be none for the first 3-5 years so the activity would not help the possible 10%-15% budget cut. She saw the work of the Task Force more as a long-term effort to educate the Board of Trustees and Board of Governors since academic campuses do not work like business models. She reminded the Senators that the past eliminations of the 5-year low performing programs did not show much cost savings. She stated that the Task Force would not convene again until January 2011 when collaborative efforts would take place on understanding what joint programs mean, the different categories of collaboration, etc. She stated that from her perspective faculty must be involved on discussion panels, etc. on how do campuses collaborate to save money and how would it work.

Professor Preston (Education) asked what the Academic Council would do with the 15 new faculty positions being held if not allowed to return to make up for budget cuts elsewhere. The Provost stated that she would have to find other areas to cut and that she had already heard two Deans state that they would cut the two new faculty positions first. Giving up 15 new faculty positions were better than other options of cutting a program or cutting everyone back.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked for an update from Vice Chancellor Horns on the hiring of faculty for the new School of Dentistry. With students coming in September 2011, she had heard that School of Medicine faculty would be teaching the students. VC Horns stated that there were dollars available to hire Dental School faculty and that they are now mapping out a couple of prototype courses to be offered first to the students. She stated that dental faculty see courses as research intensive versus case study models throughout the basic science curriculum. Leadership within the School of Medicine knows that the School of Dentistry has the money to hire the faculty prior to the Fall 2011.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

Vice-Chair Sprague (Physics) led the discussion on the Faculty Assembly Resolution on Academic Freedom and proposed resolution (attachment 1). There was a motion in the October Faculty Senate meeting to table the consideration of this matter until this meeting, to provide senators with extra time to read the proposed resolution.

Professor Sprague (Physics) then continued the discussion on the [Faculty Assembly Resolution on Academic Freedom](#) and offered the following resolution:

Resolution in Support of the UNC Faculty Assembly [Resolution on Academic Freedom](#)

“Whereas, academic freedom is fundamental to the successful fulfillment of the teaching, research, and service missions of East Carolina University; and

Whereas, there is concern that the constitutional protections of faculty are being abridged so there is now a need for more institutional protection of the academic freedom of the university; now therefore

Be it Resolved that, East Carolina University Faculty Senate fully endorses the *Resolution on Academic Freedom* that passed by the UNC Faculty Assembly on September 17, 2010; and

Be it Further Resolved that the East Carolina Faculty Senate requests that the Chancellors and Chief Academic Officers of the constituent institutions, together with the UNC Board of Governors, the General Administration, legal counsel, and Faculty Assembly delegates, convene a review committee to make recommendations for changes to the UNC Code that reflect an understanding of the “Statement on Academic Freedom” contained in the Faculty Assembly *Resolution on Academic Freedom*.”

Professor Sharer (English) asked what the discussion was like among the Faculty Assembly delegates? What were faculty perspectives for or against the issue? Professor Sprague replied that no one spoke out against academic freedom and the resolution. The resolution wording got changed several times and it was made clear that academic freedom did not protect a faculty member from peer review within their discipline. Peer review was different from academic freedom.

Following brief discussion, the resolution on academic freedom was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #10-75

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 [October 14, 2010](#), meeting minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-76**

B. Academic Standards Committee

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented a proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Section IV. Distance Education Policies. This was in response to the SACS review and the Academic Standards Committee placed quality control of distance education courses clearly in the hands of faculty and worked to meet the basic requirement of SACS while minimizing faculty intrusion.

The proposed new section in the *ECU Faculty Manual* would state:

“IV. Distance Education Policies

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

A. Distance Education Courses and Programs

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

B. Oversight of Distance Education

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

C. Courses Delivered by Distance Education

The faculty member teaching a distance education course shall have the same control of content and instruction as in face-to-face courses, consistent with university policies on instruction and academic freedom. Proposals for distance education courses shall be evaluated at the department or school, college and university level. The faculty member,

unit curriculum committees, and the unit administrator play a significant role in guiding the development and implementation of distance education courses. Only those proposals demonstrating suitable content and sufficient quality and rigor shall be approved.

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

D. Faculty Preparation

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

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

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

E. Quality Standards

Distance education courses shall comply with the ECU Standards for Online Learning.

F. Evaluation of Distance Education

DE Courses and faculty members teaching through distance education are subject to periodic review in addition to the faculty annual evaluation (at a minimum, once every three years). Faculty teaching multiple DE courses will submit only one course for review. Instruction in distance education courses shall be evaluated according to the instruction

evaluation procedures in effect for face-to-face courses with appropriate additions consistent with the delivery method, including use of the University Peer Review Instrument for Online Learning or an approved Peer Review Instrument developed by the academic unit. Units that wish to develop their own Peer Review Instrument must use the university instrument until their own instrument is approved by the appropriate vice chancellor. Peer reviewers will be selected based on criteria determined by the faculty of the college, school or department.

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

Each distance education academic degree program shall be assessed in the same manner and the same frequency as the unit's assessment of academic programs offered on campus. The unit administrator shall review assessment results with assigned faculty and the departmental faculty to facilitate the continual enhancement of the unit's distance education program.”

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Sciences) made a formal request for the Academic Continuing and Career Education Committee (on which he serves as the Faculty Senate representative) to be involved in any planning and review of teaching modules, etc. before they are reported to the Faculty Senate. He stated that this activity clearly fell within the committee's [charge](#).

Professor Bickley-Green (Art and Design) reported that there had been considerable discussion within her unit about the section on faculty preparation and that many felt that requiring training for faculty who teach distance education courses and not requiring some type of training for the remaining faculty who teach face-to-face was seen as unfair and placing a burden on one group of faculty and not another. Professor Brown responded that it was expressed to that Committee that this was a SACS requirement. So the Committee was involved to put something in place so that all faculty would have at least a minimal understanding of technology and that the annual training would not be seen as a burden on faculty who already teach distance education courses. It was important to the Committee to not make the training requirement onerous.

Professor Henze (English) stated his concerns relating to the proposed policy exceeding the SACS requirement in relation to faculty who teach distance education courses receiving annual appropriate training. His concern was the appearance of the University imposing specific training programs and not allowing faculty freedom to choose how to best stay up-to-date on their abilities to teach distance education courses. The policy being drafted should address outcomes and hold faculty accountable for teaching appropriately rather than burden them with onerous managed training. Professor Brown replied that the Committee had worked with what was originally drafted in order to pass SACS accreditation and did not feel that the proposed policies and procedures were a burden on the faculty. He also stated that by bringing this forward to the Faculty Senate, it was allowing the larger governing body to have control over instructional policy and not have it regulated from above.

Professor Christian (Business) spoke in favor of the proposed distance education policies and procedures stating that faculty within the College of Business wholeheartedly agreed to go through periodic training in addition to every three years having their class syllabi reviewed. Outside of SACS's review, the University has a product that we put out there to the public and unfortunately some students have the impression that distance education courses are easier. As a University, we have to assure the public that these courses meet the same rigor of the face-to-face courses. So if a faculty member is already monitoring his or her ongoing training then he or she just needs to document this. Professor Christian (Business) stated that the faculty within the College of Business already conduct self-reviews.

Professor Brown stated that the proposed policies and procedures reflect some of what the Business College is doing and the training and review system adds flexibility and is already in place and provided for in the proposed policy.

Professor Yoon (Social Work) stated that he offered distance education courses by way of traveling to different off-campus but face-to-face with the students. He asked how this policy would relate to these types of courses. What oversight/training is required?

Professor Brown responded that driving somewhere to teach face-to-face courses was not the same as distance education courses described by SACS as a "formal educational process in which the majority of instruction in a course occurs when students and instructors are not co-located. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. The course may use Internet, closed circuit, cable, fiber optics, DVDs, CD-ROM or other electronic means to communicate."

Professor Yoon (Social Work) replied that the courses are designated as "DE" but their courses really are not distance education courses if following SACS definition. They are courses being taught on an off campus site and not being delivered by the normal mode instruction solely through computers. So, Professor Yoon asked, what does that mean to the current distance education courses that are being taught within the School of Social Work? Professor Brown responded that they are managed like all other courses taught face-to-face.

Professor Seeman (Business) stated that the Peer Review Subcommittee of the SACS Online Quality Council has clear criteria for evaluation but there were no clear cut procedures for criteria established for distance education courses.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that his unit's distance education faculty thought it was reasonable that there were initial training for faculty wanting to teach distance education courses. They also supported the idea to provide periodic training but felt that every year was onerous on the faculty members. He asked if SACS required annual training? Rita Reaves, SACS representative replied no, that SACS does not require annual training.

Professor Bickley-Green (Art and Design) stated that one DE faculty member within her unit had been teaching for over ten years and questioned the need for annual training now. She agreed with Professor Henze that there should be fewer training sessions and ability for creative ways to maintain proficiency in DE, i.e. credit for think-in participation. Professor Brown stated that "one training activity" reference in the document means continuing education not specifically attendance in one class.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that members of the University Online Quality Council specifically addressed the notion that there was a smorgasbord of training opportunities since anything relating to educational technology gets old fast.

Professor Niswander (Business) stated that there were a lot of people who have been teaching DE in business since 1999. No one is teaching the same way that they were in 1999. He thought that conscientious faculty were going to want to stay up-to-date on the technology, etc. Faculty were going to want to participate in training and document at least one training activity a year. Faculty should learn about the advances in technology on a regular basis.

Professor Bauer (English) replied that the entire policy requires the same quality of teaching, whether it be distance education or face-to-face. If we are going to mandate training for distance education, then all faculty need periodic training. She felt that all should document training that they complete to be consistent across all faculty and disciplines.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) stated that, within her unit, faculty were required to have contingency policies in place in case a student could not meet face-to-face. As a faculty member who teaching online courses, she thinks that it would be helpful for all faculty to be required to stay current with technology, whether teaching distance education or face-to-face.

Professor Sprague (Physics) reminded the Senators that the proposed policy and procedures do not mandate the type of training. The Center for Faculty Excellence could come up with an hour-long training seminar for faculty like Professor Bickley-Green suggested

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that she was not in favor of the proposed distance education policy and procedures and was concerned that someone other than faculty would be charged with detailing distance education standards and training. She felt that all of this should be faculty driven and included in academic unit codes of operation.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) replied that faculty who engage in face-to-face instruction are trained and uphold very rigorous academic standards. It is a gross disservice to offer a face-to-face instruction without training. The proposed policy should state that there should be an initial training course for those teaching distance education courses.

Dr. David Weismiller (Associate Provost, IPAR) reminded Senators that SACS accredits the University at all institutional levels and that the challenge for ECU is developing policies as we are documenting compliance. SACS requires institutions to provide examples as to why we are in compliance and we need to document clear examples and artifacts. The proposed policy allows for academic units to provide the artifact.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) stated that in reference to "closing the loop" evaluation is done at the unit level, training is done at the university level, so why shouldn't the unit do the evaluation and provide DE training. Weismiller replied that "closing the loop" requires changes to be made to what faculty do according to the assessment conducted.

Professor Sharer (English) moved to delete the second sentence of the second paragraph under D. Faculty Preparation that read: *“All faculty teaching distance education courses will engage in at least one training activity each academic year that addresses advances in the methodologies and technologies used in distance education.”* She also included the deletion of the word “annually” in the last sentence of the same paragraph. She stated that the paragraph then still required documentation, etc. but left the judgment of when it happens and how it happens to the academic units. They would be responsible for creating the artifact.

Professor Brown (Psychology) noted that the current SACS activities do not address nor require training for faculty who teach face-to-face classes. He reminded the body of what SACS requires and of the administration’s concern about distance education because of the lack of quality control.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy) stated that there were so many issues being discussed and that the real issue at the moment involved addressing SACS guidelines that require ongoing training and development in place by Fall 2012. He reminded the group that the College of Business had a good training and a development tool that others could duplicate. Requiring that ECU documents that faculty are engaged in at least one training session a year was not an onerous requirement for faculty, although he stated that he did not like having administration through SACS tell him and other faculty how to teach. He sees this approach as proactive and ultimately allows each department and/or school to oversee how the training is done each year.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) spoke in favor of the motion to delete the sentence and word “annually”. She stated her support of what Professor Bailey stated and that she thought that all faculty needed to be ensured of training. When the faculty and administration moved to the next step of how to deal with the various kinds of training then faculty should be involved in the process and determination of training requirements. She did not like that the current SACS report tried to set distance education faculty apart from other faculty and held them to a different standard.

Professor Christian (Business) spoke against the motion to delete the sentence and stated that he understood that all faculty needed to be lifted. He suggested that the body not drop the teaching level of distance education until all other aspects of teaching are ready to be revised. He felt that some faculty thought they were above reproach and were good as teachers and did not want someone looking over their shoulder. He did not want to continue the misconception among some students that distance education courses were easier. He did not want faculty to think that teaching distance education classes were easier than face-to-face and that the same type of training was sufficient for both.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked for clarification: True or false, SACS would not pass the University if the proposed distance education policy was not passed, i.e. we would not be in compliance without this particular policy, as worded? Rita Reaves, SACS representative stated true, that SACS calls out distance education as a major area of review. She noted that there were 21 principles that ECU was at risk for being in compliance with the principles relating to faculty, library services, and distance education.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that in reference to the proposed policy and procedures, he wondered about the “ongoing training” and the quantification of it. The proposed amendment addresses two issues – professional development and number of training sessions without clarifying a number. Professor Paul (Business) asked if the body was alright about not being in compliance with SACS if the sentence was removed, as in Professor Sharer’s motion.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if we delete the sentence was the University out of compliance with SACS since we still have properly trained faculty teaching distance education. Reaves replied that the comprehensive standards of SACS require that the University demonstrate competency in curriculum and instruction and to her that meant more than one time training session. She also stated that 3.4.1 and 3.4.12 of the SACS document stated that faculty must assume responsibility for distance education ensuring both the rigor of the programs and quality of instruction.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) reiterated her support for Professor Sharer’s amendment and that she had heard nothing from the guest speakers to imply that deleting the sentence would keep ECU from being out of compliance with SACS.

Professor Niswander (Business) spoke against the motion because we are not recognizing that faculty need to be involved in all aspects of SACS accreditation. The faculty’s job was to ensure that ECU stood a good chance of meeting accreditation standards.

A vote was then held on the motion to delete the second sentence of the second paragraph under D. Faculty Preparation that read: “All faculty teaching distance education courses will engage in at least one training activity each academic year that addresses advances in the methodologies and technologies used in distance education.” The motion also called for the deletion of the word “annually” in the last sentence of the same paragraph. The motion failed.

Professor Christian (Business) then called the vote on the full report and language proposed for the *ECU Faculty Manual*. Following discussion, the proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Section IV. Distance Education Policies was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-77**

Professor Brown then presented a proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations. It was noted that the proposed text was first presented to the Faculty Senate in April 2010 (Resolution #10-52) and later rejected by the Chancellor. New additions to the proposed text are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

“Part V. Final Examinations

The normal expectation is that the completion of both face to face and online courses will include a final examination **or an alternate method of evaluating student progress**. Final examinations are required at the discretion of the faculty member and must be scheduled in the course syllabus made available to students. If a final examination is not given during the final examination period, the faculty member must meet with the class during the scheduled examination time and use the allotted time for an appropriate instructional activity.

~~Final examinations are held at the close of each term and a final examination schedule is determined each semester by the Calendar Committee.~~ **The University establishes a final examination schedule each semester to reduce conflicts in course final examination and to meet the UNC established course hour requirements.** There will be no departure from the printed schedule of examinations. Changes for individual student emergencies of a serious nature will be made only with the approval of the instructor. A student who is absent from an examination without excuse will be given a grade of F for the examination. An incomplete (I) for the course will only be given in the case of a student absent from the final examination who has presented a satisfactory excuse to the instructor.

No test intended to substitute for the final exam may be given during the week preceding the final examination period. Faculty may not give an examination or an assignment in lieu of an examination on Reading Day.”

There was no discussion and the proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-78**

Chair Walker then stated that the Academic Standards Committee was bringing the Interim Administrative Policy on Consequences for Faculty Who Fail to Submit Grades to the Faculty Senate to the faculty senate for formal advice. This administrative policy, originally proposed by the Academic Council, was sent by Chair of the Faculty to the Academic Standards Committee in October 2009. The Committee had reviewed the original draft policy and returned it to the Academic Council with suggested amendments. The administrative policy before the body now had been revised to reflect their concerns. The policy was established as an Interim administrative policy and posted on the PRR website in September 2010. The Academic Council, as the delegated authority for this regulation, has not yet received formal advice from the faculty, via the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate was now being asked to vote on the interim administrative policy as a way of providing formal faculty advice relative to this administrative policy. The Senate’s action would then be sent jointly to both the Chancellor and the Academic Council (Provost Sheerer, Vice Chancellor Horns, and Vice Chancellor Mageean).

Professor Brown then presented the Proposed Policy on Consequences for Faculty Who Fail to Submit Grades, as follows:

“1. Purpose

With the implementation of the Banner system, effective Fall 2007, faculty no longer have a 48-hour deadline (after the exam is given) to submit grades. The Office of the Registrar provides the deadline in the memo sent to ECU Official, and available on their website, by which all grades must be submitted.

Grades must be submitted electronically not later than the deadline established by the Office of the Registrar. This regulation outlines the consequences for faculty who fail to submit grades prior to the submission deadline.

2. Consequences

2.1 Upon notification from the Office of the Registrar, the unit administrator will determine why the grades were not submitted by the approved deadline.

2.1.1. If the unit administrator determines that the faculty member whose grades were not submitted by the approved deadline did not get his or her grades recorded due to circumstances outside his or her control, then no further action will be taken by the unit administrator.

2.1.2 If the unit administrator determines that the faculty member whose grades were not submitted by the approved deadline is at fault, the unit administrator will initiate the consequences as specified in this regulation.

2.2 First Offense - The Department Chair or Director will initiate a meeting with the faculty member within 30 days after the grade submission deadline, and a written summary of that meeting will be provided to the faculty member and placed in his/her personnel file. Emphasis will be placed on contractual obligations of faculty relative to submission of grades and professional neglect of duty or misconduct, as well as detailed information regarding the faculty member's failure to comply with such contractual obligations and professional standards.

2.3 Second Offense - The Dean will initiate a meeting with the faculty member within 30 days after the grade submission deadline, and a written reprimand from the Dean and appropriate Vice Chancellor will be provided to the faculty member and placed in his/her personnel file. This reprimand will be reflected in the faculty member's annual evaluation and consideration for merit adjustments.

2.4 Third Offense - The faculty member will no longer be eligible to earn additional compensation, including summer teaching, overload, etc., as well as the benefit of university sponsored travel for a period of two years.

2.5 Fourth and Subsequent Offenses - A faculty member who fails on four or more occasions to submit grades prior to the submission deadlines may be subject to imposition of serious sanctions in a manner consistent with Section 603 of The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina and Appendix D, Part VI of the ECU Faculty Manual.

2.6 If the faculty member appropriately submits grades as per established university policies and procedures for a period of three consecutive years, the consequences noted above will reset for any subsequent offense.

2.7 At the end of the academic year, the dean is responsible for generating a report which shall include the names of violators for the academic year and the consequence as defined in this regulation."

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that this administrative policy was developed to address faculty who do not turn in an entire class roster with grades. This is not to hurt faculty who accidentally forget a grade, etc. and noted that providing final grades was a faculty responsibility and hurt students when faculty failed to complete their duties.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) then asked why was administration so lenient with repeat offenders noting that the second time should be no pay raise. Professor Brown agreed and reminded the body that there were policies out there relating to faculty responsibilities and that all should work to meet the requirements of these policies.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked if the Faculty Senate was being asked to approve the administrative policy? Chair Walker responded yes. In keeping with the new shared governance structure when University policies and procedures are developed, a Faculty Senate standing academic committee has reviewed the draft policy and the drafting administrative committee accepted the informal input prior to this final document being presented to the Senate for approval. Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that faculty within his unit thought this was a good policy and did not need revisions. He then moved approval and following discussion, the Faculty Advice on Proposed Policy on Consequences for Faculty Who Fail to Submit Grades was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-79**

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Scott Gordon
Professor Gordon(Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, first presented a Request for Approval of a [Residential Construction Management Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.

Following discussion, the Request for Approval of a [Residential Construction Management Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-80**

Professor Gordon(Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, then presented a Request for Approval of a [Commercial Construction Management Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.

No discussion, the Request for Approval of a [Commercial Construction Management Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-81**

Professor Gordon then briefly mentioned another item of committee business that was not related to a formal report to the body relating to MAT in Mathematics Education. (Those interested may review the [October 2010 EPPC Minutes](#).)

D. Faculty Governance Committee, Puri Martinez
Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Co-Chair of the Committee, first presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-82**

Professor Martinez then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty.

Professor Sharer (English) stated that under #2 scholarship creative activity and innovation, the last sentence in paragraph addresses peer review materials found in unit codes and asked if peer reviews related to outreach and if so, how does it apply? VC Mageean replied that this was in keeping with the definition of engagement and that is was a part of the Carnegie document and the scholarship of engagement is being manifested in peer review.

Professor Given (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked if all assignments were governed by release time as noted in section 2C. VC Horns stated the regulation when finished would detail what was accomplished.

Professor Sharer (English) asked if outreach met these standards since it seems to be intended as it is written in Appendix C. Scholarship is implying publication in a way that does not mean necessarily in a journal with pages, for publication for the 21st century.

Professor Paul (Business) offered editorial amendments under D 2. Ranks of Probationary Term Appointments, for Assistant Professor and Associate Professor to make the wording consistent (amendments noted below in underline). Professor Martinez accepted these friendly amendments.

“Assistant Professor

- has qualifications of the previous rank
- holds the appropriate terminal degree, as evaluated by the academic unit and affirmed by the appointing officer and the profession concerned
- **exhibits**~~shows~~ evidence of potential for continued professional growth in teaching effectiveness, and **scholarship**. ~~creative activity/or research~~
- has demonstrated ability and willingness to participate in departmental, college, and university affairs
- has membership in professional organizations
- has demonstrated expertise in clinical practice in disciplines where appropriate

Associate Professor

- has qualifications of the previous rank
- has demonstrated teaching effectiveness has a record of **scholarship** ~~creative or research activity~~ resulting in publication or comparable productivity
- has demonstrated ability and willingness to participate in department, college, and university affairs
- has a record of effective service to the profession
- has a record of effective clinical practice in disciplines where appropriate”

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty were approved as editorially revised.

RESOLUTION #10-83

E. Faculty Welfare Committee, John Reisch
Professor Reisch (Business), Vice Chair of the Committee, first presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection B. Collection of Money.

Remove from Faculty Manual and place elsewhere in University Policy Manual.

B. Collection of Money

~~No individual or department of the university may collect any money without being authorized to do so by the business office, and reports of all such collections, when authorized, shall be made on forms provided by the business office. All money collected shall be turned in to the business office promptly for deposit. All disbursements are to be made by check drawn by the business office. The foregoing regulation by the board of trustees applies to university funds and does not apply to civic and charitable fund campaigns. Collections of funds for special instructional materials, such as magazines, should be made by a designated student and not a faculty member.~~

Professor Rigsby (Geology) made a motion to amend the document by instead of removing the text from the manual, the text would be revised and added to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V: Academic Information, Section I.L. Ordering Textbooks and Collateral Material as noted below in bold print.

“L. Ordering Textbooks and Collateral Material

All items, including textbooks and supplies, that the students are expected to purchase should be requisitioned each semester in a format provided by the Dowdy Student Stores. Book requisitions received on the requested due dates allow the store time to prepare buy-back lists used in purchasing from the students any book that they no longer need. This helps the students to keep the total costs of textbooks down as much as possible.

In a cooperative arrangement the Dowdy Student Stores provides an instructor publishing service for supplemental course materials. The store provides quality academic course materials that are sold alongside the textbooks for the course. The coursepack department of the store will obtain copyright permission, process orders, and calculate and collect royalties. This service is provided at no charge to your department. A complimentary desk copy of their coursepack is available to the instructors upon request.

Unit administrators or their designees will inform instructors when textbook and course supply orders are due. Instructors submit a requisition for each course providing the Part V-8 information needed to order the necessary books and supplies. If no textbook is required for a course this should be so noted. Unit administrators should retain a copy of the requisitions in each departmental office for future reference. (FS Resolution #10-53, April 2010)

When special instructional materials (e.g., magazines, field-related supplies, etc.) are required for a course, collections of funds for those materials should be made by a designated student, not by a faculty member.”

Professor Christian (Business) spoke against the motion stating that if we add this sentence somewhere else in the manual we are stating publicly two different policies. Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) spoke against the amendment because if it is to be deleted then it should be deleted all together. Following brief discussion, the motion to amend the report passed.

Professor Mahar (Health and Human Performance) asked if this move cleared up the matter of students getting money from other students. He then offered to make a motion to change the wording "by a designated student, not by a faculty member" to "by a designee other than a faculty member". There was no second to the motion.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection B. Collection of Money were approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #10-84**

Professor Reisch then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding.

Remove from Faculty Manual and place elsewhere in University Policy Manual with a link to the Board of Governors policy (see item 300.5

<http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>).

~~C. — Employee Involvement In Political Candidacy and Officeholding Policies adopted by the Board of Governors in 1976 and conforming policies adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1994 establish processes for resolving, in advance, questions about possible conflicts between a University employee's satisfactory performance of employment responsibilities and his involvement in political candidacy and officeholding. All University employees except those subject to the State Personnel Act are covered by the policies. An employee who intends to become a candidate for election or appointment to or to hold any public office is responsible for knowing the terms of and complying with the requirements of these policies. A copy of the full text of the policies along with instructions and forms to be used to comply with the policies may be obtained from the University Attorney. The instructions include deadlines which must be followed. Any petitions required by these instructions should be submitted as early as possible, but no later....~~

Professor Reisch noted that Professor Martinez, Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee had just told him that her Committee is also discussing this issue in relation to a different part of the manual. He then stated that that Committee should probably consider this report before the Senate acted on it. Professor Spurr (Mathematics) moved to table the report until the Faculty Governance Committee was consulted further.

Therefore, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding were tabled and the report would be forwarded to the Faculty Governance Committee for consultation. **RESOLUTION #10-85**

Professor Reisch then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy.

Revise and maintain in the Faculty Manual.

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

“VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/ Affirmative Action Policy and University Commitment to Diversity

East Carolina University celebrates diversity among its faculty, staff, and students, and is committed to fostering respect for human difference and equal opportunities for all, regardless of membership in a University protected class. To that end, the Office of Equity, Diversity and Community Relations develops and implements equal employment opportunity policies and diversity programs. Information about the Office of Equity, Diversity and Community Relations programs and policies, the University’s protected classes and related nondiscrimination policies and procedures may be found by visiting the Office’s Web site at www.ecu.edu/edc. “

~~VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy (Formerly Appendix K)~~

~~East Carolina University is committed to equal opportunity for all members of the university community. In addition, it will take affirmative action to increase recruitment and hiring of black and female faculty and staff. The following is the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy as it appears in the East Carolina University Affirmative Action Plan (1983-1986). East Carolina University is committed to equality of educational opportunity and does not discriminate against applicants, students, or employees based on race, color, national origin, religion, veteran’s status, gender, age, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or disability. (Faculty Senate Resolution #03-37, September 2003)~~

~~East Carolina University's policy on nondiscrimination and its affirmative action program are consistent with, and pursuant to, the guidelines set forth in Executive Order 11246 with its implementing....~~

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-86**

F. Libraries Committee, Robert Campbell

The discussion on library resources and faculty needs in relation to SACS reaffirmation was postponed until the December 7, 2010 Senate meeting.

VI. New Business

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 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 NOVEMBER 2, 2010, MEETING

10-74 Approval of the Fall 2010 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-75 Resolution in Support of the UNC Faculty Assembly [Resolution on Academic Freedom](#), stating:

Whereas, academic freedom is fundamental to the successful fulfillment of the teaching, research, and service missions of East Carolina University; and

Whereas, there is concern that the constitutional protections of faculty are being abridged so there is now a need for more institutional protection of the academic freedom of the university; now therefore

Be it Resolved that, East Carolina University Faculty Senate fully endorses the *Resolution on Academic Freedom* that passed by the UNC Faculty Assembly on September 17, 2010; and

Be it Further Resolved that the East Carolina Faculty Senate requests that the Chancellors and Chief Academic Officers of the constituent institutions, together with the UNC Board of Governors, the General Administration, legal counsel, and Faculty Assembly delegates, convene a review committee to make recommendations for changes to the UNC Code that reflect an understanding of the "Statement on Academic Freedom" contained in the Faculty Assembly *Resolution on Academic Freedom*.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-76 Curriculum matters contained in the [October 14, 2010](#), University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-77 New section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Section IV. Distance Education Policies.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-78 New section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-79 Faculty Advice on Proposed Policy on Consequences for Faculty Who Fail to Submit Grades.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 10-80 Request for Approval of a [Residential Construction Track](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 10-81 Request for Approval of a [Commercial Construction Management Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 10-82 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 10-83 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 10-84 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection B. Collection of Money.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 10-85 Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding were tabled and the report would be forwarded to the Faculty Governance Committee for consultation.
Disposition: Faculty Governance Committee
- 10-86 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy.
Disposition: Chancellor