

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2011

The third regular meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 1, 2011, 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 4, 2011](#), were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Zoller (Art and Design), Terrian (Medicine), and Wilson (Nursing).

Alternates present were: Professors Harris for Williams (Allied Health Sciences), Tisnado for Godwin (Art and Design), Evans for McFadden (Education), Loy for Cooper (Health and Human Performance), Jose for Novick (Medicine), Paynter for Lounsbery (Political Science), Cope for Brown (Psychology), Ding for Smith (Technology and Computer Science), Frank for Sanders (Technology and Computer Science), and Dixon for Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance).

B. Announcements

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

#11-67 Curriculum and academic program matters contained in the [April 14, 2011](#) and [April 28, 2011](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

#11-69 Curriculum and academic program matters contained in the [June 29, 2011](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes.

Letters concerning unit elections for 2012-2013 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 6, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting will be held on West campus in the Banquet Room A of the East Carolina Heart Institute at ECU Building, 115 Heart Drive (not Moye Blvd). Senators are instructed to come to the front building entrance, walk through doors past 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.

Editorial revisions have been made to both the [Fall 2011](#) and [Spring 2012](#) University Calendars as a result of the closing of the University for 10 days (December 24 – January 2). In order to complete the administrative processes associated with the functions at the beginning of a semester, the dates noted below needed revisions.

- Changing the SAAC Appeals deadline from Friday, December 23 at 5 pm to Tuesday, December 20, at 5 pm.
- Changing January 2 to January 4; without this change, ECU would be assessing a late fee on a day when the University is closed, and preventing students who pay in person, from doing so.
- Changing January 2 to January 5 (fees accepted with late processing fee) related to the closing of the University for 10 days during the holidays.
- Changing January 3 to January 5, and the time from 4 pm to 5 pm (schedule cancellation);
to accurately reflect hours of the office, and time that Touch Net is available for online payments.
- Changing time on January 18, from 4 pm to 5 pm (second schedule cancellation);
to accurately reflect the hours of the office, and the time that Touch Net is available for online payments. Striking "late add" to clean up the calendar, as there is no longer a late add day on the calendar.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that he wanted to discuss four topics, with the most significant topic of campus-based tuition and fees. He stated that this is the most significant fiscal opportunity open to ECU in the foreseeable future, and that ECU is in dire need of new resources. The Chancellor stated that there were multiple steps to accomplish before a recommendation could be made to increase tuition and fees. The ECU Board of Trustees has to approve any recommendation that the Chancellor makes by December in order to be on time for sending proposed fee increases to the UNC General Administration.

The Chancellor stated that the topic of increasing tuition and fees is being considered by other universities in the UNC System as well as all across the country. The *Daily Tarheel* reported that UNC-Chapel Hill's Advisory Board recommended a forty percent increase of tuition and fees to be implemented over the next two to four years. Chancellor Ballard warned that this situation is a "sign of the times" since there have been huge losses in funding from the legislature. Very few options now exist outside of asking students to pay more. As state funding continues to decrease, all other sources including what students pay, must become a larger and larger portion of income to the university. ECU's tuition is in the bottom quartile of its peers, and it is the goal of ECU's Board of Governors for it to remain in the bottom quartile. The "headroom," or difference between ECU's ranking and the top of the bottom quartile, is close to twenty percent, allowing ECU to substantially increase tuition while maintaining the Board's policy.

Chancellor Ballard stated that the Executive Council had approved a tuition increase between six and twelve and a half percent. He stated that he felt that this is a reasonable frame with which to begin discussions with the Board of Trustees and with the UNC General Administration. Tuition increases of this magnitude could produce revenue for the campus of seven to fifteen million dollars if enrollment stays approximately the same. However, the Chancellor pointed out that even the maximum tuition increase being considered of fifteen million dollars is less than a third of the budget cut that the University endured last year. The Chancellor stated one real issue will be the impact on the students and their ability to afford higher education. Use of the revenue generated by a tuition increases is regulated by both the UNC General Administration and the N.C. State Legislature. The Chancellor stated that his highest priority is

compensation increases, since they have been frozen for the past four years. In order to accomplish the task of allowing pay increases, the State Legislature would need to reverse its legislation. The Chancellor stated that there are several other priorities, including financial aid that would absorb at least twenty five percent of any tuition package and the UNC General Administration might mandate that an even higher percentage be used for financial aid. Another priority that the Chancellor recommends is replacing the approximately 180 course sections that were lost last year because of the budget cuts by targeting the programs of highest need and demand. He stated it would be difficult to maintain a high quality of education by continuing to cut back on class offerings. The Chancellor stressed that fifteen million dollars could not come close to addressing these and other priorities. He stated that Erskine Bowles recently stated that he expects a six to eight year time period of severe budget restrictions at the state level. When federal expenditures are cut back, states' expenditures often follow suit. The Chancellor concluded by calling for feedback, ideas, and discussion concerning the tuition dilemma from members of the faculty.

The Chancellor cited that there were three other issues he wanted to address, including the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) process and that Ron Mitchelson could help answer questions concerning the PPC. He stated that valid questions involving quality, centrality, and productivity have already surfaced regarding this process, but the University still needs answers as to how to address low performing programs. UNC President Tom Ross has stated that low demand programs will be closed. The Chancellor believes that the ECU has the best system in place for determining what these programs may be when compared to other universities.

Next, Chancellor Ballard stated that the Provost and Academic Council have put money away for summer school funding since enrollment dropped creating one percent enrollment decline last year. He stated that Provost Sheerer would be available to further address this topic, and the University intends to give this money to colleges or programs for a one-time use to increase their summer enrollment.

Finally, the Chancellor stated that he is proud of research and graduate studies at ECU. Over the last six or seven years, research grants have increased, and he stated that the University is committed to continuing this trend. Research opportunities have become more and more competitive, but ECU has followed through with its strategic plan and created a good research culture. Graduate enrollment numbers are still a challenge, as well as the availability of research space.

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) asked, in reference to the need to raise tuition, if the UNC General Administration, considering what they have done in the past, would limit the amount of tuition increases allowed for ECU? Chancellor Ballard replied that the UNC General Administration might not decide until May or June 2012 about ECU's tuition request. He felt that the issue deserved a real vetting on how campuses are forced to raise tuition by rebalancing and reshaping the way the State legislature and students cover the cost of tuition.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his continued support of ECU faculty.

D. Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
Vice Chancellor Mageean stated she would begin her remarks by addressing how the recent budget cuts affected TAs, RAs, and start-up funds in particular. The Research and Graduate Study Division absorbed a 9.9% cut in funding last year. The division cut seven positions and eliminated the Research Creative Achievement Awards and the Research Development Awards. Just under \$300,000 was also cut from the budget for graduate assistants and \$210,000 that was asked for out of lapsed salary money was not made available. A certain percentage of the tuition increase money was set aside for merit awards and to create some out of state tuition admissions last year. These allocations were made in January; however, due to budget cuts, all of this money had to be returned. With the lack of any money set aside and a higher tuition in effect, out of state tuition admissions were compromised; thus, the Graduate School was lacking close to \$500,000. Since many accepting graduate students had made decisions to come to ECU based in part on promised graduate assistantships, Vice Chancellor Mageean decided that the only right thing to do was to honor these offers by “back-filling” the missing amount with a half million of F&A dollars. She said that it would have been morally wrong not to honor these offers and that not fulfilling these assistantships would have also effected ECU’s graduate enrollment. Another response to this issue was to “back fill” start-up funding. At the peak, there were three million dollars in funds used to entice new faculty with extensive start-up packages. Some of these funds were from money from the current budget while other funds came from lapsed salary_money. Since lapsed salary money was no longer available, the start-up funds were about \$950,000 below what was needed. Vice Chancellor Mageean’s division made the commitment to sustain the graduate assistant budget and the start-up funds this year and next year. The Vice Chancellor felt that these decisions were justified to sustain graduate enrollments and to ensure that ECU does not lose a whole generation of future faculty. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that she felt that this commitment could be honored over the next two years, but voiced concern about the future funding shortages.

Vice Chancellor Mageean addressed the issue of the proposed Bioscience Building saying that the University was not able to obtain planning money at the present time. Since new construction was not feasible, existing empty space was examined, including the empty fourth floor of the Heart Institute Building and all of the fifth floor and part of the third floor of the Science & Technology Building. Faculty members from several disciplines applied for funds from the American Recovery Act but were not successful, so the Vice Chancellor made the decision to use F&A money to obtain these spaces. In the case of the Science & Technology Building, two million dollars came from F&A money, while one million dollars from F&A money was used for the Heart Institute Building with the remaining funds coming from several other sources including the West Campus fund.

Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that she felt that all of these expenditures were justified, along with funds for the renovations to Howell Science Building, but these allocations have led to a very big decrease in the University’s F&A funds. The revenue for these funds has gone up every year, with the exception of last year. The University’s F&A collection rate for grant funding is 12%, which is less than the federally negotiated rate due to grants that receive reduced F&A rates. The university is currently in negotiations to increase the federal F&A rate. As the traditional sources for the revenue stream are and will be ineffective at effectively replenishing F&A funds, the University will need to rely more and more on external funding in her opinion.

The Vice Chancellor stated that she is also concerned about the University's funding situation in relation to its peers. The UNC General Administration data collected for 2010 put the mean award at twenty nine thousand per faculty member and placing ECU fifth from the bottom of sixteen campuses in terms of funding attracted to the university. Campuses with higher research awards per faculty member include the University of North Carolina Charlotte, Fayetteville State, Winston Salem State, North Carolina Central, University of North Carolina Wilmington, University of North Carolina Greensboro, Elizabeth City State, NCA&T, North Carolina State, and University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. Vice Chancellor Mageean called for discussion of why ECU's mean award per faculty member is so much lower than these other universities.

Vice Chancellor Mageean reported that faculty workload was discussed at the most recent Chief Research Officers meeting. She stated that is relatively easy to explain the faculty's teaching work load to the state legislature, while the amount of time research takes is much more difficult to explain. She concluded that there is a need to constantly tell the legislature about faculty research; however, this discussion should not be allowed to "drive a wedge" between teaching and research. The Vice Chancellor said that a solution is to do a better job at explaining to the state legislature, the Board of Governors, and the Board of Trustees what the interfaces are between teaching and research and she called for the senate members to share stories of their successes. VC Mageean referenced information on the University of North Carolina Research and Sponsored Programs [Report](#) to the President.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked how General Administration counts their faculty numbers and suggested that perhaps our data somehow varies from the other schools on the list that the Vice Chancellor Mageean referenced earlier. VC Mageean replied that the figures that she reported on were from UNC General Administration; however, the numbers are tweaked; the bottom line is that, on a per capita basis, ECU is low in terms grant productivity when compared to other universities in the UNC system.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked in reference to \$29,000 per faculty member, how does that relate to the ratio of faculty to students and are clinical faculty included in the data? VC Mageean replied that ECU is below the norm, meaning that the University has fewer students per faculty being taught, making the issue of low per capita production even more perplexing.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked if all of this data was available for review? VC Mageean replied yes that the information was on the General Administration's website. [Link included here to the University of North Carolina Research and Sponsored Programs [Report](#) to the President with the research portion located in the Faculty chapter (section 6.2. Research Productivity).

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) asked how are graduate students were accounted for in reference to FTE's. VC Mageean replied that it is important to look at how teaching assistants and graduate assistants are used in the classroom. Another reason the Vice Chancellor felt compelled to honor the agreements made with incoming graduate students was to maintain the workload of which they relieve from the faculty. One difference between ECU and other universities such as UNC and NC State is that ECU has comparatively few PhD programs. The Vice Chancellor also stated that she is proud of the university for investing in its PhD programs. She feels ECU is competitive, but that we do under-perform when writing graduate students into

the university's grants. She stressed that this a highly important practice for ECU researchers to remember.

Chair Walker thanked Dr. Mageean for her continued support of faculty research.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Walker provided the following comments to the Senators.

“Academic self-reflection in a new era.

I have been asked to comment on the activities of the Program Prioritization Committee (or PPC). As stated on the PPC website –

‘Our view of program prioritization is a positive one which emphasizes the importance of self-study and reflection that yields deeper understanding of our academic and service programs and the resources needed to support them. The process will identify opportunities for longer-term reallocation that will enable us to better achieve our mission. The intent is for this important process to be as inclusive and transparent as possible.’

Thus far in both department and college self-studies, three primary areas have been addressed, including productivity, centrality, and quality. Although these self-studies have been challenging and may have caused some angst, the resulting documentation and narratives have been truly exceptional! The department narratives (which are accessible to the entire university via the PPC website) document the quality of curriculum and scholarly productivity, in addition to other factors (over 100) showcasing the centrality to the university strategic directions, interface with other academic programs (as providing foundations), interdisciplinary degrees and research, as well as service activities and outreach to the community and beyond.

While this self-reflection may have been burdensome on some, ECU is the only university in the UNC system that has encouraged faculty and individual departments to engage in self-analysis and in detailing their connections to the university as a whole. In a climate where many do not understand the connections with certain majors and the impact of our degrees on society, we all must communicate with outside constituencies, including future students, the relevancy of how what we do impacts lives and our world.

I'd like to share with you examples of productivity matched with the commitment to quality, and connections to the strategic mission of the university.

Centrality

Our civilization is based upon and its future is dependent upon the acquisition and wise development of natural resources such as oil, gas, coal, minerals, ores, and water. ... Clearly, the geology and oceanography that we teach in Foundations and majors courses, and as we involve undergraduate and graduate students in our research activities, have an essential centrality to the university's mission and beyond. Our programs provide ECU students with an understanding of earth materials and earth processes, the interactions and interconnectedness of the lithosphere, biosphere, atmosphere, hydrosphere and cryosphere, and the implications of humankind's use and misuse of natural resources. The education and training that our students (majors and non-majors) receive in the earth sciences truly allow them to contribute to society meaningfully and with a global-scale understanding. (Geological Sciences)

The department places emphasis on applications of knowledge through specialized programs that accent the importance of the development and education of young children and their parents, the unique needs of hospitalized children and their families, community agencies that serve families, and therapeutic strategies to the biopsychosocial influences of mental health. (Child Development & Family Relations)

Society badly needs citizens who really can think critically. The essence of undergraduate instruction ... (in philosophy and religious studies) enables students to discover what “thinking critically” means and how it is done in the context of searching for knowledge and making value-judgments that address social, political, professional, personal, religious and other fundamental dimensions of each student’s life. ... Further, the department’s majors will make their choices informed by a critical understanding of things that matter to the quality of a life worth living, in this case, their life. (Philosophy and religious studies)

Foundations for other majors

This discipline “is often referred to as “the central science,” and rightly so. A thorough understanding of foundational chemical principles is central and critical to all of the STEM disciplines. At ECU, at least 19 different majors and degree programs require one or more courses in chemistry. These majors and degree programs include but are not limited to: *pre-medicine, pre-dentistry, pre-pharmacy, nursing, biology, physics and engineering* ... The department educates, on average, 750 nursing students per semester, in addition to a large number of pre-medicine and pre-dentistry students. (Chemistry)

This discipline “is a core social science discipline that makes active use of tools developed in other disciplines, in particular mathematics, statistics, psychology, political and social analysis, and geography. It provides analytic skills that contribute to success in the workplace, support the University’s duty to produce informed citizens with a broad understanding of the critical economic issues facing our nation and region, and are essential to leadership in the new century”. (Economics)

Degree Programs

At the advanced level, our degrees in language, literature, culture, and linguistics provide students a deep understanding of foreign cultures that turns any major into a degree with global reach. According to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), a Bachelor’s degree in a foreign language is the minimum educational requirement necessary to provide students with the language skills and cultural competence needed to communicate in another language in a professional context, and to understand the world views and values of other cultures... It also provides exceptional writing and critical thinking skills. (Foreign Language and Literatures)

Research Quality and Engagement

All tenured/TT faculty members are affiliated with a lab in our department (Activity Promotion Lab, Biomechanics Lab, Developmental Motor Lab, Human Performance Lab Visual Motor Lab, Teacher Behavior Analysis Lab). Their efforts in those labs as well as affiliations/collaborations with other units ... including in HHP, ECDOI, Center for Health Disparities (Research), Pediatric Healthy Weight Research and Treatment Center, and Leo Jenkins Cancer Center are focused on increasing external funding for health related research

that integrates basic, clinical, translational, and community work. (Kinesiology, formerly – Exercise and Sport Science).

Academic history & creative activities

Most of the extraordinary creative productivity of the School of Theatre and Dance is closely aligned with the School's core mission "... to offer professional quality theatrical production for the University community and the greater community of eastern North Carolina." That is the very charge upon which the unit was founded in 1963. It makes production and public performance coequal to the School's teaching mission. The School emphasizes the values of teamwork and community, as we must in order to achieve the mission charge. Each production requires the participation of 10 faculty at minimum to as many as 16 (typical musical). It is policy and practice that individual faculty creative agendas first must serve the core mission. Once the mission has been served fully, faculty may strike out on their own to external sites. (Theatre & Dance)

The visual arts have been a major component of instruction at ECU since the first faculty class was hired in 1909 (Kate Lewis). ECU has always believed that knowledge of and participation in visual art and design preparing graduates to deal with the complexity, diversity, and ambiguity of human societies, qualities required of strong leaders. Graduates will lead and inspire, understanding complexity, finding creative solutions to problems, and navigating the richness of human culture while advancing the arts and humanities. (Art & Design)

Opportunities

As indicated under "Societal Need," opportunity is currently knocking hard on the door of Biology departments. Our discipline is essential and ascendant: societal need is joining with technological advances in DNA sequencing, computational biology, remote sensing and other areas to create something of a golden age in biological research. Moreover, with just two public R1 campuses, a rapidly growing population (currently ranked 10th among states and rising) and a strategic emphasis on biotechnology, our state has a growing need for more biology programs with heightened research ambitions. ECU is an obvious candidate for such growth in light of our campus' strength in health professions and a research emphasis on environmental issues. (Biology)

Due to the changing nature of technology, (this) degree is a constantly evolving one. The major was substantially redesigned 5 years ago and is subject to redesign in the coming year. A particularly valuable opportunity lies in the collaboration between the MIS area and other departments both inside and outside the College. In the College, potential collaborations with the Accounting and Finance departments could create technology-based specializations in each area. Outside the unit, collaboration with units such as Technology Systems could prove fruitful. In addition, since the health care field is a growing one expanding our collaboration with the Health Informatics program would seem ideal. (Management Information Systems –Business)

Unique & top ranking academic programs

In 2008, the program was nominated by the lead site visitor to present the ECU model for program assessment at the international meeting of the Council for Interior Design Educators. The program has received two awards from NKBA for annual submission requirements, ranking in the top seven kitchen and bath design programs in the nation. (Interior Design & Merchandising).

Productivity

The demand for highly competent graduates who are prepared to practice in the rapidly evolving and highly complex health care arena requires clinically competent and seasoned faculty who can guide students through experiential situations based on the synthesis and application of sound nursing science. While the need for nurses in the United States escalates, there is a profound, nationwide, nurse faculty shortage which resonates in the productivity data displayed here. . . With over 1000 undergraduate and graduate students, including those pursuing the doctorate, it is clear that the College of Nursing's role of preparing the nurses of tomorrow is central to our University's Strategic Direction, Health and Medical Innovation.
(Nursing)

Reflections

As historians, we tend to take a long view of things. We are not resistant to change, but our work teaches us to be skeptical of claims that any particular change will have the impact its advocates imagine. Universities have been the centers of teaching and research in the modern world for five hundred years. The discipline of history, practiced since Herodotus, has been at the heart of the modern university. We are confident that both will continue to thrive, even as they evolve. (History)

I encourage you to read the various department narratives, and thank the contributors in developing these rich narratives that demonstrate the excellence we have at East Carolina University. I encourage all to take the opportunity to familiarize you with the data and use it to showcase and advertise what we do at ECU. We must communicate with those who challenge what it means to get a degree in higher education. This self-analysis provides a wealth of information at our fingertips. Let's use it!"

No questions were posed to Professor Walker following her remarks.

F. Approval of the Fall 2011 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. There was no discussion and Vice Chancellor Horns moved approval of the Fall 2011 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. **RESOLUTION #11-83**

G. Question Period

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked, in reference to the units' self studies and centrality, productivity, and quality, if all faculty units were together in their analysis how the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) would balance the three main themes in their discussions.

Professor Mitchelson (Chair of PPC) stated that the group viewed the three areas are viewed as equally important differently with the narratives playing a critical role. He noted that the narratives have been very useful and he was impressed with the units' self analysis. He said that the productivity numbers are important but are not driving the committee independently of an analysis of the quality of the program based on the college self studies. Professor Mitchelson mentioned that the college self studies had identified 47 programs that could be combined or eliminated.

Professor Bauer (English) stated that she was worried about students who sign up for her classes then only attend one class if at all. She wondered how we allow them to enroll and not attend the class when the students have plenty of time to drop the class and register somewhere else. She noted that they were building student debt and failing her class and not completing a degree. Was there not something the University could do to stop this type of behavior?

Provost Sheerer asked if the Starfish program was being used and was told by Professor Bauer that this was happening; the Provost replied that she would look into the situation.

Professor Theurer (Music) asked if there was a policy on cell phone use in the classroom? Professor Sprague (Physics) replied that some departments have a policy to address this and that they are asked to reference the policy in their syllabi. He noted that the Disruptive Academic Policy (Part V of the *ECU Faculty Manual*) could address this matter and noted that there were times that cell phones were useful in a class. Professor Sprague concluded that something could be put in the syllabus regarding classroom disruption.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that he had seen the use of cell phones play a role in the need for academic integrity hearings and that faculty should clearly state in their syllabus that cell phones cannot be used while taking exams. He pointed out that they can be used for cheating during exams.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that she allows the students to use cell phones for at times for other things, such as clickers and that she does not think that the University has such a policy.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked about financial aid and how financial aid was awarded without any reference to the student's need.

Provost Sheerer replied that all families have to complete particular Federal applications (FASCA) She suggested that Julie Poorman come to describe the entire financial aid application process

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that in the past summer school was self-funded and asked how it worked now? Provost Sheerer replied that her office has created a pot of money for the DE summer school funding and that regular summer school classes are still receipt driven, with Clayton Sessoms overseeing the process.

The Provost noted that the University was having difficulty getting students to come to campus in the summer since it cost students more to come on campus for summer classes versus taking DE classes wherever they may reside over the summer months. Distance education is on the normal funding model; Clayton Sessoms also manages offering summer session and it is more expensive and is self liquidating. She concluded her remarks by saying that students are preferring to take on line courses in the summer at this time and not to come to campus and that this has led to reduced enrollment for the university.

Professor Ding (Technology and Computer Science) stated in reference to a policy on cell phones in the classroom that she had received an email from her department head referring to a mandate about information like this being placed in each course syllabus.

Dean White replied that he was not aware of such a college or departmental policy barring cell phones from the classroom and that the college did not have a policy on this particular issue. He stated that his college has not come up with a policy on the use of cell phones in the classroom.

Professor Sprague indicated that guidance for the regulation of cell phone use is found in Section 5.Y. of the *ECU Faculty Manual*.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees and Graduate Council

A. Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 7, 2011](#) and [September 21, 2011](#), including proposed revisions to the *Graduate Catalog*, relating to [Credit and Continuous Enrollment](#). Members of the Graduate Council were announced. The function of the committee is to consider policy and make recommendations to be passed on the EPPC and the alternate route for policy consideration is to the Director of the Graduate School and eventually to the Chancellor for approval. Appendix F of the Faculty Manual will be one of the immediate roles of the council. There will be public forums on the proposed changes to the manual. There is also a website for the Graduate Council. November 21st will be the first meeting Professor West invited participation in the work of the committee. The minutes for the last meeting were distributed to all the members of the Faculty Senate as a handout.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked that when the executive committee distributed the full agenda one week prior to the meeting, would this be a complete agenda with all reports like the Faculty Senate provides to all faculty? Professor West replied yes, he would make sure it was as complete as he could.

Professor West reviewed the current rules for continuous enrollment and the hours required for faculty level courses. An application for readmission is required if a leave is taken from the program is less than three years. These are changes to the graduate catalogue.

Following discussion, the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 7, 2011](#) and [September 21, 2011](#), including proposed revisions to the *Graduate Catalog*, relating to [Credit and Continuous Enrollment](#) were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #11-84**

B. Committee on Committees

Professor Catherine Rigsby (Geological Sciences), Chair of the Committee first presented terms for the elected faculty members to the new Graduate Council, as follows:

Elected Member	College/School	Term
Carmine Scavo	Arts and Sciences	2012
Cheryl McFadden	Education	2013
Carmen Russoniello	Health and Human Performance	2014
Charles Coddington	Technology and Computer Science	2014

There was no discussion and the terms for the elected faculty members to the new Graduate Council were accepted as presented.

Professor Rigsby then stated that earlier the Committee had 3 nominations for the open seat on the Appellate Grievance Board, however all three had turned down the seat due to other commitments and responsibilities. Professor Sprague (Physics) asked what exactly the Appellate Grievance Board did. Professor Stiller (Biology), a member of the Board, replied that Board's responsibilities were outlined currently in [Appendix X](#) of the *ECU Faculty Manual* and that they were currently meeting weekly to revise and update the process.

Professor Anderson (Education) then nominated Professor Karen Voytecki (Education) to fill this 3-year term. Professor Wilson (Sociology) moved approval by acclamation and Professor Voytecki was elected by the body to fill the 3-year open term on the [Appellate Grievance Board](#).

C University Curriculum Committee

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the [September 22, 2011](#) and [October 13, 2011](#) meeting minutes. Professor Kain provided a clear overview of the various curriculum items discussed within the committee meetings. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 22, 2011](#) and [October 13, 2011](#) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-85**

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee, presented additional proposed revisions to the Distance Education Professional Development Requirement. It was noted that the Faculty Senate acted on this requirement in March 2011 (FS Resolution #11-31) with the Chancellor requesting [additional revisions](#) in May 2011. The additional revisions noted in **bold** print include requested revisions to the proposed requirement.

Distance Education Professional Development Requirement

Professional Development Activities for Online Instructors

The following all qualify as professional development activity:

- ✓ Any of the following activities if it is related to online learning /teaching

- Attending an external conference session or webinar (e.g. *teaching of accounting online at a national accounting conference*)
- Presenting a research paper (e.g. *comparison of learning outcomes for course taught face-to-face and online, etc.*)
- Presenting a seminar (in-house or external)
- Publishing a paper or proceeding or other relevant professional publications
- Attending a seminar presented by the Office for Faculty Excellence (OFE) or ITCS (see examples in attachment) or individual units. To register for OFE programs, go to <http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/> or <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ofe/Spring11.cfm>. To register for ITCS programs, go to <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-itcs/faculty.cfm>.
- Being a finalist for a distance education award (e.g. Max Joyner, NCDLA, etc.)

Documentation of the above can include program listings, history of participation, tables of content from program, certificate of completion, etc.

- ✓ Occasionally, individual units will offer seminars and other programs related to online learning / teaching. As these are announced, they will be posted on both the ITCS website and the OFE website. *Documentation will be provided by the presenter(s). Please add it to your records.*
- ✓ Recordings of DE-related programs may be used to meet this activity requirement. To see a list of identified recordings offered by the OFE, go to http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/DE_workshops.cfm. After viewing the recorded program, you will be asked to complete a brief reflection and submit it (reflection template <http://core.ecu.edu/ofe/reflection/index.cfm>). Once the reflection has been reviewed, you will receive an email of completion for your records. ITCS will also provide recorded programs with a reflection for completion of this DE activity.
- ✓ Faculty in any program who teach courses related to online learning / teaching (e.g. the COE certificate program) must show evidence of continued study in the field. Attending a seminar on a new technology or software that ECU or a college might adopt would qualify.
- ✓ If there is a specific seminar or topic or activity that you think may qualify but you are not certain, or if you have questions or require further information, you can complete the below Petition for Alternative Activity to Meet the ECU Distance Education Professional Development Requirement **and submit it to your unit administrator. This form will be placed online once it has been approved by the Chancellor.**
- ✓ *Note: A drop down for DE Professional Development has been added to Sedona under Professional Development for your input of this activity. Please enter it and provide your documentation in your annual report submission.*

Petition for Alternative Activity to meet the
ECU Distance Education Professional Development Requirement

Faculty can petition to have an activity other than those identified by the university meet the DE Professional Development requirement. To petition, complete this form, save it, and **email it to your unit administrator.**

Name _____ email _____

College _____ Department _____

Activity Title:

Date of Activity:

Description of activity and time Invested in its completion:

What insights, tools, strategies, or information gained in this activity can you use to enrich your teaching in distance education?

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) stated that he found the required DE professional development requirement presumptuous, discriminatory, and ineffective. He stated that assuming only DE faculty were in need of training and not requiring some type of periodic training of face-to-face faculty was unfair. He stated that he would rather see improvements in Blackboard in order to aid faculty who teach DE classes. Professor Wolfe replied that the Committee was charged with this task more or less to address a SACS requirement.

Following brief discussion, the additional proposed revisions to the Distance Education Professional Development Requirement were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-86**

E. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee and Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee
Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology) and Professor Lida Cope (English), leaders on the Committees, presented the proposed Five Instructional Modules for Distance Education. Senators were reminded that they had been given Blackboard access to these modules.

Professor Wolfe noted that the Committees were again charged with this task to address a SACS requirement in order to be in compliance with SACS prior to their visit in 2013. She noted that all faculty who teach DE classes would need to take the module quizzes and participate in yearly continuing education training in order to meet the SACS requirement.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) questioned how long ago did the Faculty Senators have access to the modules because she could not find them. Chair Walker noted that all Senators were given access in mid-October to the modules in Blackboard and that this was noted in the Senate agenda. Professor Rigsby stated that she agreed with Professor Ross' comments about how to really improve DE delivery.

Professor Cope (English) provided a list (below) of the SACS requirements that the training was designed to address and noted that the entire SACS Distance Education Guidelines document was available on the SACS website. Comprehensive Standard 3.4.12 is one of the standards that directly correlate to the modules.

- The faculty assumes primary responsibility for and exercises oversight of distance and correspondence education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction.
- The technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs and courses and expectations concerning the use of such technology are clearly communicated to students.
- For all degree programs offered through distance or correspondence education, the programs embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with the institution's mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education.
- An institution offering distance or correspondence learning courses/programs ensures that there is a sufficient number of faculty qualified to develop, design, and teach the courses/programs.
- The institution has clear criteria for the evaluation of faculty teaching distance education courses and programs.
- Faculty who teach in distance and correspondence education programs and courses receive appropriate training.

Following discussion, the Five Instructional Modules for Distance Education were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-87**

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented the Curriculum and Academic Program matters included in the [October 14, 2011](#) meeting minutes including the Request for a new [MAEd in Adult Education](#) (Distance Education format) in the Department of Counselor and Adult Education within the College of Education. There was no discussion and the Request for a new [MAEd in Adult Education](#) (Distance Education format) in the Department of Counselor and Adult Education within the College of Education was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-88**

Professor Gordon then presented a report on both [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Biology and [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. He noted that the Committee reviewed the 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.

G. Faculty Grievance Committee

Professor Tim Romack (Chemistry), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix Y. Grievance Policies and Procedures. Professor Sprague (Physics) asked if the revisions were so much that we could not display the changes in the current appendix. Professor Romack replied yes.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked if Professor Romack could tell her what was changed due to General Administration's directives. Professor Romack replied by stating that there were no places within the new policies and procedures where they took any rights away from the faculty member.

Following brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix Y. Grievance Policies and Procedures were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-89**

H. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, first presented the proposed action of removing Part IX. ECU Organizational Charts from the *ECU Faculty Manual*. It was noted that currently these charts are included in the manual as a link to the Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research Office as follows: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/research/OrganizationalCharts.cfm>. There was no discussion and the proposed removal of Part IX. ECU Organizational Charts from the *ECU Faculty Manual* was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-90**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed action to maintain Appendix U. Policy on Improper Relationships Between Students and Faculty in the *ECU Faculty Manual* with no changes. There was no discussion and the proposed action to maintain Appendix U. Policy on Improper Relationships Between Students and Faculty in the *ECU Faculty Manual* with no changes was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-91**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to Index of *ECU Faculty Manual* Interpretations, stating that all manual interpretations dating from 1990 to 2010 had been incorporated into various revisions of policies and procedures included in the *ECU Faculty Manual*. Therefore, the index was being revised to reflect only current interpretations still pending incorporation into revised University policies and procedures. An archives copy of past incorporated manual interpretations would be maintained on the Faculty Senate website. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Index of *ECU Faculty Manual* Interpretations located in the *ECU Faculty Manual* were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-92**

Professor Bailey then presented a proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual* entitled Statement on Professional Ethics. Professor Roper (Medicine) moved to replace in 3. "Professors acknowledge academic debt" with "Professors give proper acknowledgement to the ideas and data of others" with the full sentence reading as follows: "Professors give proper

acknowledgement to the ideas and data of others and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues.” There was no objection and the revision was accepted as presented.

Following discussion, the proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual* entitled Statement on Professional Ethics was approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #11-93**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty. Professor Reisch (Business) asked if the peer review instrument for faculty who teach face-to-face classes being revised. Professor Bailey replied yes that Professor Mike Brown (Psychology) was charged with the task and was to report to the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee later in November.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that he felt slippery concepts were being proposed and asked if shouldn't there be a set of guidelines relating to faculty performance and evaluation. He asked for examples that caused this to rise to the occasion that a policy on professional ethics had to be drafted. He wondered if actions were random and if faculty had asked for such a policy to turn to when handling problems within academic units.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) replied that the Committee had been talking about this for over a year and that the Committee could have been forced to draft a code of conduct policy if they had not addressed the request from the Chancellor this way. She stated that the Committee thought that the Professional Ethics statement, seen as a philosophical goal and not a prescriptive policy, was more easily acceptable by academic colleagues. Professor Walker also stated that the Professional Ethics statement sounded better as an overall academic statement than a Faculty Code of Conduct.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-94**

I. Calendar Committee

Professor Charles Lesko (Technology and Computer Science), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on the proposed Adverse Weather/Conditions and Emergency Closings Regulation by adding additional text under 6.4 Activities Affected by Class Cancellation or Classes Held Under Adverse Conditions to include an earlier Faculty Senate Resolution (#06-14) that details [make-up policies governing class cancellation](#).

Professor Wilson (Sociology) stated that the current Faculty Senate approved policy states that partial days would not be made up. If the class only met once a week and the class was canceled (due to the University being closed all day or a partial day) he wanted to allow faculty the option of making up the missed class if they wanted to. He then asked why the Calendar Committee did not allow faculty to make up missed days due to a partial closing. Professor Lesko replied that the Committee did not review the earlier approved policy but would be happy to address this and return to the Faculty Senate with information about their discussion. There was a chance that the earlier approved make-up policies could be revised.

Professor Lesko stated that the Committee did think that the entire proposed Adverse Weather PRR should be reviewed and that the Committee looked at entire class days missed and how best to address those in relation to the [required 750 instruction hours](#) required by General Administration. They were not in a position to address how partial class days would be addressed since that would require adjusting other class schedules. He stated that all on the committee agreed for the most part that the section above in the proposed PRR needed additional work but they did not feel that that was a part of their charge, i.e. adverse weather procedures 6.4.2. fell under another group's purview.

Professor Christian (Business) stated that if a half day of classes were canceled, the current policy as written supports it. Professor Lesko replied that he still felt that various other aspects within the proposed PRR should be addressed by someone or some group.

Professor Stiller (Biology) asked if it would be possible to strike the sentence about partial missed days. Professor Howard (Communication) asked if the current make-up day policy could be changed to state that partial missed days would be required to be made up. Professor Boklage reminded the Senators that the Calendar Committee did not have any way to address partial make up days.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) stated that at time a partial day occurs and that faculty need clarification for how class work will be made up. He stated that that current make-up class day resolution should be clarified so that a partial missed day would be made up at the discretion of the faculty member.

Chair Walker clarified that there were two issues being discussed concurrently. The first being the current make-up classes resolution from 2006 and the second being the proposed adverse weather PRR. Professor Sprague (Physics) moved to send the Committee's report back to allow them to consider updating the 2006 resolution on missed class days and to revise their recommendation for the Adverse Weather PRR.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) spoke against the motion because faculty can lose control of curriculum matters if they allow someone other than faculty to make the decision if classes are to be made up. She thinks that the Calendar Committee should review the entire proposed Adverse Weather PRR for further revisions, including sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 written clearer and stating that faculty should make up partial class days. This would, in turn, require the Committee to also address the 2006 resolution on missed classes.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) supported the motion to return the report to the Calendar Committee since it references a possible outdated procedure for making up classes. Professor Christian (Business) also spoke in favor of returning the report to the Committee for further discussion since the proposed Adverse Weather PRR was not clear and should be reconsidered and rewritten for clarity in reference to partial days.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that the 2006 resolution could not be changed so he would like to see the Calendar Committee consider revising the resolution to account for partial days and include the revised text in the proposed PRR.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that since classes are scheduled at certain days and times faculty could not just make up their class work at their own discretion when it may interfere with other faculty members' classes. Professor Popke (Geography) stated that he didn't see a problem with the current wording reminding the body that the Calendar Committee did not have a ½ day at their disposal for half day make up days and that he thought the current wording was fine as it. Professor Stiller (Biology) stated that he thought the wording of the 2006 resolution still needed to be revised.

Donna Payne (University Attorney) stated that initially the Adverse Weather PRR was developed with the idea that it was going to be an interim policy prior to Hurricane Irene. She noted that this PRR, although distributed to SPA employees via an email from John Toller in Human Resources, has not been posted on the Official UPM website nor distributed to the University community. Since the procedures included in the PRR are useful for the University community so administration may, if not approved today by the Faculty Senate, be forced to post this as an interim regulation until such time that the faculty provide formal advice to the Chancellor and a final decision is made.

Professor Romack (Chemistry) asked if wouldn't the current 2006 Senate Resolution be in place even if this PRR was considered an interim. Chair Walker replied yes.

Following discussion, the motion to send the Committee's report back to allow them to consider updating the 2006 resolution on missed class days and to revise their recommendation for the Adverse Weather PRR failed.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) moved to accept the Calendar Committee's formal faculty advice on the proposed Adverse Weather/Conditions and Emergency Closings Regulation by adding additional text under 6.4 Activities Affected by Class Cancellation or Classes Held Under Adverse Conditions to include an earlier Faculty Senate Resolution (#06-14) that details [make-up policies governing class cancellation](#). It was also suggested that the Committee continue to review the 2006 Senate Resolution and entire Adverse Weather PRR in light of the discussion today and report back to the Faculty Senate in December. She noted that this would address the University Attorney's immediate concerns and allow the Committee to update the way partial days should be handled. There was no discussion and the motion was approved as presented.

Following discussion, the formal faculty advice on the proposed Adverse Weather/Conditions and Emergency Closings Regulation to add additional text under 6.4 Activities Affected by Class Cancellation or Classes Held Under Adverse Conditions was approved.

RESOLUTION #11-95

VI. New Business

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 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 1, 2011, MEETING

- 11-83 Approval of Fall 2011 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-84 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 7, 2011](#) and [September 21, 2011](#), including proposed revisions to the *Graduate Catalog*, relating to [Credit and Continuous Enrollment](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-85 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 22, 2011](#) and [October 13, 2011](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-86 Revised Distance Education Professional Development [Requirement](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-87 Five Instructional Modules for Distance Education.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-88 Request for a new [MAEd in Adult Education](#) (Distance Education format) in the Department of Counselor and Adult Education within the College of Education.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-89 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Appendix Y](#). Grievance Policies and Procedures.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-90 Removal from the *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Part IX](#). ECU Organizational Charts.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-91 Retain in the *ECU Faculty Manual* with no changes [Appendix U](#). Policy on Improper Relationships Between Students and Faculty.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-92 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, Index of *ECU Faculty Manual* [Interpretations](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- 11-93 Proposed New section in the *ECU Faculty Manual* entitled Statement on [Professional Ethics](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

11-94 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Appendix C](#). Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty.

Disposition: Chancellor, Board of Trustees

11-95 [Formal faculty advice](#) on proposed Adverse Weather/Conditions and Emergency Closings Regulation by adding the following additional text under 6.4 Activities Affected by Class Cancellation or Classes Held Under Adverse Conditions:

“6.4.3 Make up policies governing class cancellation are established by Faculty Senate Resolution#06-14, which state:

Policy for making up missed class days

Partial missed days should not be made up. Entire missed days should be made up (in keeping with the 750 minutes per credit hour requirement set by the UNC General Administration)

Designated make-up days for Fall Semester

Make-up days should be used in the following order: Reading Days at the end of the semester; Tuesday of Fall Break; Monday of Fall Break; Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

Designated make-up days for Spring Semester

Make-up days should be used in the following order: Reading Days at the end of the semester; Good Friday.

If additional make-up days are needed, the Executive Council in conjunction with the Calendar Committee will decide how to make them up.

Suggestions on how to make up missed time

By meeting at the usual class time on the designated make-up days (avoid giving tests on these days) or by some activity relevant to the class (outside the usual class time, but not necessarily on the designated make-up days, as decided by the instructor following whatever procedures have been adopted by the unit).”

Disposition: Chancellor