

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2013

The third regular meeting of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 5, 2013, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. Patricia Anderson (Education) served as Acting Secretary for the day.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of [October 1, 2013](#), were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors McFadden (Education), Christensen (Biology), Robinson (Mathematics), Chancellor Ballard, Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson, Past Chair Walker (Honors College), and Faculty Assembly Delegate Taggart (Music).

Alternates present were: Professors Zhu for Summers (Biology), Herdman for Karriker (Business), Williams for Felts (Health and Human Performance), and Smirnova for Francia (Political Sciences).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 10, 2013 and October 1, 2013 Faculty Senate meetings:

- #13-66 Revised ECU Mission Statement
- #13-67 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the [April 17, 2013](#) and [August 21, 2013](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes
- #13-68 Revised [College of Nursing](#) Unit Code of Operation
- #13-69 Curriculum matters contained in the [April 11, 2013](#) and [April 25, 2013](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes
- #13-70 Resolution on online peer observations
- #13-71 Resolution on an academic integrity module for first-year students
- #13-72 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the [August 26, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes
- #13-74 Revisions to the Chancellor Survey Form for the Administrator Survey
- #13-75 Curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the [September 13, 2013](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes
- #13-76 Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [September 12, 2013](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes
- #13-77 Curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [September 16, 2013](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes

Email correspondences concerning unit elections for 2014-2015 Faculty Senate representation will be disseminated to unit code administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, elections are to be held during the month of [February](#). Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

The Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee will host their annual ECU Scholarship Awarding Workshop on [Monday, January 27, 2014](#), from 11 -12 noon in room 244 of the Mendenhall Student Center. This workshop is for all faculty interested in the annual awarding of

student scholarships. No registration is required to participate in this event. Questions may be directed to Professor Carolyn Willis, Chair of the Committee at willisc@ecu.edu.

The Committee on Committees is seeking nominees for three open delegate and two open alternate seats on the upcoming 2014-2015 UNC Faculty Assembly. Nominees should be full-time faculty, holding no administrative duties outside his/her department. In addition to attending the six yearly meetings of the UNC Faculty Assembly, the delegates are expected to attend the eight monthly meetings of the Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee. Charter of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina and objectives and functions of the Faculty Assembly available at: <http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/index.htm>. Please ask nominees if they are willing to serve and agree to the conditions stated above before submitting their name for consideration. Please forward names of any nominees to the Faculty Senate office via email faculty senate@ecu.edu or campus mail (140 Rawl Annex, 109 mail stop) no later than Friday, November 15.

Update on Strategic Planning Process

ECU Mission Statement - Addition of "the arts" to Mission Statement at request of Faculty Senate

Progress to Date - Goal teams have prepared a set of goals and strategies to seed the planning process that will be presented to Strategic Planning Committee on 11.6.13 for input. Note: Faculty representatives include two faculty officers, Mark Sprague, and Andrew Moorhead and other faculty.

Next Steps

- Executive Committee meets to review drafts - Six forums on campus
- Executive Committee meets to finalize drafts and timeline and to set agenda for meeting with Advisory Committee
- Strategic Planning Committee Advisory Committee meets to review drafts and to receive assignments regarding forums
- Executive Committee meets to approve survey- Survey sent to campus community
- Forum One: Public Service, Main Campus and Forum Two: Regional Transformation, Health Sciences Campus
- Survey returned and analysis begins
- Forum Three: Student Success, Health Sciences Campus and Forum Four: Regional Transformation, Main Campus
- Forum Five: Student Success, Main Campus and Forum Six: Public Service, Health Sciences Campus

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Steve Ballard was unable to attend today's meeting due to athletic conference meetings in Dallas. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, Rick Niswander was invited to speak to the Senators on the Affordable Care Act (General Administration's interpretation relative to part-time faculty and ECU's interpretation) and the ongoing activities of the University Fiscal Sustainability Committee.

Vice Chancellor Niswander explained that the University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability is working to gain knowledge about the myriad of university systems related to finance. The committee plans to work between now and the end of January to learn the operational and organizational

aspects of the university, especially as they relate to financial obligations of the university. The committee has already studied undergraduate enrollment and are currently considering the topic of graduate enrollment. In summary, this is a time of learning for the University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability.

Vice Chancellor Niswander also made comments about the Affordable Care Act. He explained that we are not certain how this will impact the university and its benefits provided to part-time faculty. In general, much of what ECU will be doing will be based on decisions by UNC General Administration which will be setting parameters for the entire university group. At the state level, there is a working group focusing on issues related to our state system such as a "look back" process. As the system defines their procedures, we will disseminate that information across campus. In the short run, we will continue with same hiring practices as we have used in the past. This can be extraordinarily expensive as we meet the parameters of the state system; we will be monitoring the additional expenses for additional health care for our university employees.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language) asked about benefits for full-time fixed term faculty members. Vice Chancellor Niswander responded that our university will continue with the same procedures currently in use as we are proceeding with hiring for the Spring 2014 semester. As changes are made at the state level and policies are changed locally to coincide with those changes, the university community will be informed as changes occur for health care policies for faculty and staff.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Provost Sheerer stated that the Search for the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has begun their work. Chaired by Dean David White, the committee is using the services of a search consultant for their national search. The committee has had an initial meeting with the consultant. The goal is to have a new dean in place by July 2014.

Provost Sheerer reported on a recent decision by Vice Chancellor Phyllis Horns and herself regarding the status of the two libraries on campus. On the same day (November 4, 2013), they had met with library faculty and delivered their decision about faculty status of librarians on our campus. She reviewed the history of the decision-making process, including a consultant study to review many models of library operations across the nation. Outside reviewers visited our campus and formed reports about library functions. During the last 6 months, faculties on both sides of the campus have asked for a decision about the status of the library faculty; both Vice Chancellor Horns and Provost Sheerer made visits to NCSU and UNC-CH to examine their library models. They announced today that they will use a faculty model without tenure at ECU, explaining that the work of the librarian does not align with faculty member responsibilities. Current tenured faculty in the libraries will retain tenure; tenure-track faculty members in the libraries will retain opportunities for movement toward tenure. Fixed-term contracts for newly hired faculty members will be offered, with the years of the contract varying from one to five years. There will be a faculty group look at the operational considerations from this decision; that group will develop the complete ECU model. Regarding a combination of the two existing libraries, the Chancellor has asked that the University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability review that aspect of the library model. The interim status of the current administrative structures will remain intact until there is a decision and plan in place for further transitions. Once these tasks are complete, a search for a leader(s) will begin.

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) asked if a tenured faculty member who wanted to advance to another position would have to give up tenure status to move to the other position if it

were a fixed-term position. Provost Sheerer stated that yes at this time, he or she would have to give up their tenure if they apply for a new position. Provost Sheerer responded that she will examine that possible situation and consider the status of both tenure and fixed-term persons in that scenario. Professor Reynolds also asked how many of the library faculty and/or staff had encouraged this change during the two year process to examine library structures. Provost Sheerer replied that the majority did not request change but there did have some private communications with faculty/staff who explained that tenure was not appropriate for faculty in the library.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language) stated that the separation between tenure and academic freedom has put tenure as a backseat to the academic freedom. She was surprised that no earlier discussions had included a focus on academic freedom. She asked Provost Sheerer why she decided to separate academic freedom and tenure for this group. How will you protect academic freedom on our campus and especially within the libraries? Sheerer replied that this is a debatable topic that is currently highly contested across the nation. There is no one mindset that supports a direct relationship between tenure and academic freedom. Professor Martinez also explained that multi-year contracts are currently limited to two years all across campus. She asked if libraries have different contracts than those used across campus. Provost Sheerer replied that recent budgets have driven the current status of multi-year contracts. Units are not operating all the same; there is a decentralized process for many operations across campus, and a different model may be appropriate for use at the library.

Professor Cable (Health Sciences Library) asked about the composition of the working group to define the ECU faculty model for library services. Provost Sheerer replied that she and Vice Chancellor Horns will consider the composition of this group very soon, but it will certainly include representation of the libraries, a representative from Human Resources, faculty representatives, and other members from the campus community.

Professor Rupp (Economics) asked if there were any other units where the question of removal of tenure is being considered. Provost Sheerer said, "Absolutely not." Rupp emphasized that the faculty throughout the university need to have stated rights of grievances.

Professor Rigsby (Chair, Faculty Assembly) asked about the process that would be used for approval of the faculty model for librarians at ECU. Provost Sheerer explained that she and Vice Chancellor Horns had gained important knowledge about other university models through recent visits to other state campuses. As they work on the continuing definitions of the ECU Library Model, that knowledge will contribute to the definition of the ECU model and will help guide the campus-based operations on our campus. Professor Rigsby urged the Provost to design a process that would create a unique code unit for the libraries where faculty status is clearly stated and defined. She urged the Provost to consider the library faculty as faculty and as a code unit that is important to the university.

Professor Morehead (Vice-Chair of the Faculty) asked if this is being treated as a code unit change. Are all tenure-track and tenured library faculty going to remain as they are? Sheerer replied, "Yes, definitely. Current fixed-term faculty will be reviewed for terms of new contracts. Current faculties will remain under their existing code." Professor Morehead asked if the new model would be formed with a provisional code. Provost Sheerer replied that she did not have an answer to that question at this time. Sheerer explained that the decision to phase out tenure status for librarians will bring the job of librarian into line with what their actual jobs are. Provost Sheerer stated that, when speaking to

librarians without tenure at other institutions (NCSU, etc.) they expressed willingness to serve as librarians and not engage in research, teaching, etc.

On another topic, Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked Provost Sheerer to clarify the topic of assessment at the university. She stated that there are mixed signals about how the university is viewing assessment. What is the university's vision of assessment—to do assessment OR to use assessment? Provost Sheerer stated that her view is that assessment is to measure student learning outcomes; faculty have a responsibility to define student learning outcomes and then measure them. IPAR should facilitate that process and help make that possible for the faculty within individual courses and programs.

E. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Sprague provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

Former Chair of the Faculty, Don Sexauer once said:

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

These are words that I have quoted several times before. I keep returning to them because they are insightful. Shared governance only works if there is a balance between the faculty and the administration. We must work together to solve problems and implement policies. This means the faculty must participate in order for the system to work.

Every time I attend the UNC Faculty Assembly, I am reminded that some of the universities in the UNC system do not have functioning systems of shared governance. There are institutions in our system without functioning faculty senates. There are institutions where the administration does not consider input from faculty leaders. There are institutions where faculty leaders have no formalized interactions with the board of trustees. We have all of these in place at ECU, but we must continue to use them or they will cease to function effectively.

I would like to point out two examples in which faculty participation has made a difference in administrative decisions. The first example is the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC). The PPC, which included representatives from the administration and the faculty, was charged to prioritize academic programs and recommend possible structural changes to the university. The committee considered many possible structural changes including splitting and combining various colleges. After listening to faculty feedback in forums, E-mail, and surveys, the committee recommended that no colleges be merged or divided. Faculty voices were influential in this decision. So, what was the real impact of the PPC? It was the prioritization. Each program was prioritized into one of three classifications: invest, maintain, or reduce. All new positions and budget allocations are based on a program's classification. The impact of this policy is slow, but over a long time, there will be significant changes to ECU as a result of the PPC.

Another example of the importance of faculty participation is the recent decision about the code changes to the libraries. Several different models for the ECU libraries were considered by the administration. Some of the models included non-faculty librarians, which is the case at many institutions including UNC-Chapel Hill. At ECU, we have a proud tradition of faculty librarians who are major contributors to our Faculty Senate committees. At every forum and in every opportunity to provide comments, the faculties of the libraries emphasized that their faculty status was important to them. I believe that this is why the administration has decided that librarians will retain faculty status.

Sometimes the faculty interacts with the administration, and we do not get everything we want. This has also happened with the decision on the libraries. Although the faculty of the libraries as well as other ECU faculty members advocated for retaining tenure in the libraries, the administration has announced that the new model will not include tenure for new hires. The model will include the possibility of multi-year contracts but no tenure. In my opinion there are some significant drawbacks to this restriction that could be avoided by a system that allows for tenure in some cases. One difficulty with the model could be hiring a new library director without tenure. This person would supervise tenured library faculty, which could create an awkward situation for the new director. Also, lack of the possibility of tenure could make it difficult to hire exceptional librarians into special positions at ECU.

We must continue to participate in shared governance for it to work. If we do not take part in the system and speak out, the administration will continue to do what they must do to operate the university, only it will be without faculty input. We must speak out, ask difficult questions, offer solutions, and participate in shared governance in order to make a difference.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language) asked if Chair Sprague was aware that there would be committees currently used in the Faculty Senate that would require variations based on changes to librarian status and how librarians without tenure would or would not be able to participate in the process of shared faculty governance. Chair Sprague replied that there will be a long transition and that for the present time, there will be tenured faculty members from the library remaining on committee structures across campus.

Professor Cope (English) expressed concern about the morale of faculty in the library and about the attractiveness of ECU to hire and retain high caliber potential hires in the library faculty positions that will not be tenure-track positions.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that there are clearly positions in the library that are not tenure-track worthy. There are other units that have recognized similar status positions, calling them clinical faculty and delineating job requirements that do not require the same things as tenure-track faculty. Sprague agreed that a similar position label would be considered for faculty members in the academic libraries.

Professor Rigsby (Chair, Faculty Assembly) explained that she is very concerned that the library could not be a code unit in the future. She urged that faculty on this campus insist that code unit status for the library would not be eliminated. Please fight to keep code unit status so that library faculty have a unit code.

Professor Henze (English) asked if Chair Sprague had a sense of whether the faculty view the administration as allies and if not, how can that happen? What can faculty do to create allies of campus administrators? Chair Sprague believes that the administration is our ally; "we are in trouble if they're not." There are always different points of view; that is always going to happen. It's the role of the Faculty Senate and its committees to continue to build a positive relationship and to include the administration in our deliberations and activities; we need to continue to engage the administration and the faculty to work together so that we have a balanced solution that works for everyone.

Professor Patton (Allied Health) explained that in her college for fixed-term faculty there are different levels of faculty appointments. Has that same kind of category system been considered for the libraries? Sprague replied that the current delineation of categories is available across the campus,

but that the discussion for the new model is not that far along yet. Professor Patton encouraged a system that would entice new candidates to library positions.”

F. Andrew Morehead, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Morehead provided a [Report](#) on the October 25, 2013 UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting, including consideration of resolutions on [System-wide Core Competencies](#) and [Communication](#) with Boards of Trustees.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) asked when the competencies would be implemented. Professor Morehead explained that the assessment program would happen beginning in Fall 2014, but that the Board of Governors would decide on the core competencies within the next two months.

Professor Fitzgerald (Medicine) asked how they were chosen and how they would be measured. Professor Morehead explained that best practices were being examined for assessment means and strategies; the endorsement requested will impact the entire process of assessment and the means of assessment. There were surveys, focus groups, and committee discussions that served as a source of core competencies. Professor Rigsby added that the Board of Governors had previously recommended a set of competencies. The Faculty Assembly worked to recommend competencies all across the system using faculty expertise in the creation of this set of competencies. The resultant competencies were from hard work by committee members with faculty input across the university system. Thus, approval across the system is critical. Sprague stated that the system-wide competencies would not limit additional competencies.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked for the definition of critical thinking. Professor Morehead responded that that was a critical question and gave chemistry examples of problem solving, synthesis of new ideas, and other components. He emphasized the need for each institution and each discipline to define broad applicability across the entire UNC system.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) explained that there will be two system-wide core competencies and even more system-wide measurements than student-learning outcomes at the discipline levels. Morehead explained that the competencies would not be assessed in every class, but would be proposed for explanation and examination within program areas and departments. This is a different approach to looking at system-wide competencies. Professor Rigsby added that the intent is to “do no harm” and that no assessments have been designed until the competencies are defined and approved. Critical thinking would be the most important competency. Morehead emphasized that the UNC system has a goal to be a national model for competency statement and measurement and assessment.

Resolution in Support of System-wide Core Competencies

Whereas, the five-year strategic plan, “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina” has defined as a major priority the implementation of system-wide assessments of academic core competencies; and

Whereas, the UNC Strategic Directions General Education Council has, after considered deliberation, recommended Critical Thinking and Written Communication as system-wide core competencies most appropriate for assessment; and

Whereas, [UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-11](#) endorses the core constituencies recommended by UNC Strategic Directions General Education Council and requests campus votes to approve the competencies; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has resolved that the University of North Carolina, under the imprimatur of its constitutive faculty, must offer a general comprehensive education (as articulated in Resolution 2012-06); and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has also resolved that an effective curriculum is essential to the development of critical skills necessary for students to become productive citizens and leaders of North Carolina, and that faculty recognize these core competencies as vital to student success (as articulated in Resolution 2012-07); and

Whereas, the core competencies of Critical Thinking and Written Communication are widely recognized by faculty as expressions of a general comprehensive education and as fundamental requirements for successful mastery in all academic disciplines; and

Whereas, economic leaders in North Carolina and nationwide agree that Critical Thinking and Written Communication are fundamental to career success as cited in the Listening Sessions Summary (Strategic Directions Initiatives 2013-2018, Appendices) and

Whereas, our regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), periodically and comprehensively examines and affirms the quality of educational programs and requires that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the ECU Faculty Senate endorses the General Education Council's choice of Critical Thinking and Written Communication as two system-wide core competencies for the UNC system; and

Be It Further Resolved That the faculty of ECU and other the constituent UNC institutions must have primary responsibility for the development and administration of assessment instruments consistent with the missions of their respective campuses.

Following discussion, the vote to approve the competencies passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION #13-78

Professor Morehead asked for support of resolution in support of UNC Faculty Communication with Boards of Trustees, primarily in an effort to support shared governance at other universities in the UNC system. Professor Martinez (Foreign Language) asked if there were institutions that complied with the recommendation that every committee in the Board of Trustees have a faculty representative on each committee, as recommended by American Board Associations. Professor Rigsby (Faculty Assembly) replied that the only campus where this occurs in part is UNC-CH. Professor Zoller (Art and Design) stated that she encouraged that the chair reports would also include reports back to the faculty from the Board of Trustees meetings and interactions.

Resolution in Support of UNC Faculty Communication with Boards of Trustees

Whereas, faculty communication is essential with every decision maker regarding the operations of each institution; and

Whereas, the faculty have established communication with provosts, chancellors, and UNC-GA administrators; and

Whereas, although the ECU Board of Trustees meetings include a report from the ECU Chair of the Faculty, some faculty governance bodies at UNC institutions do not have established avenues of communication with the Board of Trustees of their institution; and

Whereas, the Board of Trustees are key decision-makers regarding the operations of each institution; and

Whereas, [UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-09](#) calls for regular oral and/or written reports from campus faculty senate chairs to their boards of trustees.

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the ECU Faculty Senate endorses UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-09 that each UNC institution Faculty Senate Chair should present an oral and/or written report to the Board of Trustees on a regular basis.

Following discussion, the voting about the motion passed unanimously. **RESOLUTION #13-79**

G. Approval of the Fall 2013 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. There was no discussion and Professor Roper (Medicine) moved approval of the Fall 2013 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. **RESOLUTION #13-80**

H. Question Period

Professor Theurer (Music) asked Provost Sheerer about efforts to get a list of standing administrative committees that has not been available. Over the last several years, the Committee on Committees and Faculty Senate have made a real effort to understand the activities and responsibilities of the University standing administrative committee. Senators elect faculty to these committees on an annual basis. He asked was anyone involved in organizing this group of committees. Vice Chancellor Horns has been working on this project and replied that the list is coming and should be available shortly. She has been working to design a complete and thorough listing to share with the Faculty Senate after she gains information about just 3 more committees. She promised that the list would be available before the December Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) asked for an update regarding SACS. Provost Sheerer replied that ECU had submitted their revisions on student learning outcomes and that she will attend a SACS meeting in December in Atlanta; that's when a decision will be made about whether we met the standards or not.

Professor Richardson (Music) asked about the [UNC Memo on Adjunct Work Hours](#) and [Informational Table](#) and was anyone going to speak on this important issue. Vice Chancellor Niswander replied that the document had been distributed for information only.

Professor Yoon (Social Work) expressed concerns about health care policies. Since state employees are the biggest pool, have there been adequate efforts to research other policies that would result in

better rates for our employees? Vice Chancellor Niswander replied that we are a part of the larger state system; the RFP was considered at the state level. Professor Rigsby (Chair, Faculty Assembly) responded that the plan will be up for bid again next year and there is considerable discussion across the state about the current plan and policies. A statewide committee will be formed and will be examining new possibilities. Vice Chancellor Niswander recalled an effort several years ago for the system to divide itself off for the purposes of insurance; that never occurred. Professor Morehead explained that the General Assembly mandated that all state employees are in the same plan; there is a current panel in charge of looking at the plan options for the future. Professor Cope (English) encouraged that improved competitiveness of premiums be considered in these discussions.

Professor Henze (English) asked Vice Chancellor Niswander about the Affordable Care Act and how faculty have expressed concerns about allowing individual institutions to provide benefits without meeting the "spirit" of the law related to providing benefits for employees. He urged that the institution continue to participate in full-time hiring, not reduce the full-time positions as a result of new requirements for health care. Can the institution endorse the move to provide benefits to as many people as possible? Vice Chancellor Niswander responded that the institution will follow the law, as well as the spirit of the law; we should not modify our practices to avoid meeting the law. He expressed concern that the parameters have not yet been defined by the UNC system, but that we must be able to meet all fiscal responsibilities for health care as well as other budgetary concerns within the university's operations.

Professor Fitzgerald (Medicine) stated his surprise that ECU would consider the Affordable Health Care Act as a new expense. Vice Chancellor Niswander responded that if a new hire occurs for a single semester, they do not receive health care. Under the Affordable Care Act, this practice may be stopped, as it will be decided by the UNC system. In a nutshell, there is a fiscal impact that cannot be ignored. On our campus, it is not just one or two faculty members would be affected, but about 500 faculty members.

Professor Ding (Technology and Computer Sciences) asked about flu shot service. Vice Chancellor Horns responded that Brody 2West 50 will provide last flu shot November 6 as the final offering. Professor Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences) asked if a flu shot was expected for all students in that division. Vice Chancellor Horns replied that all workers and all students are required to get a flu shot unless they follow the exemption process that is available for students, faculty, and staff. It is just good health practice, and we know that these shots do work and cut down on the flu.

Professor Rupp (Economics) asked if there was a flu shot service planned on main campus; Vice Chancellor Horns explained that the shots were available in Student Health Services on campus at the Rapid Access Clinic. Professor Cope (English) requested an announcement about this process. Horns agreed to post information about flu shots immediately.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) explained that he had received a list of programs to be eliminated or reduced, taken from the Program Priority Committee (PPC). He asked if the campus has issued to any external body this listing or are you aware of any party that is distributing any list. Provost Sheerer was unaware of the publication of any list; she stated that we have not released any information about program recommendations for elimination.

Professor Henze (English) asked about the status of raises for persons who received tenure in this academic year. Increases have been provided in the colleges and schools where the unit had funds to provide raises. There has been inequity in this process.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor West received thanks from the Senate for his service on the Graduate Council; future reports will be provided by newly elected Chair of the Graduate Council, Professor Bob Thompson.

Professor Terry West, Chair of the Graduate Council presented first formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 16, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, including a request for time extension, discussion on a withdrawal policy revision and waiver of GRE requirement.

There was no discussion, and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 16, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes were approved and will be forwarded to the Chancellor as formal faculty advice. **RESOLUTION #13-81**

Professor Terry West presented formal faculty advice on curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [September 4, 2013](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including two new courses in the Department of Public Health and discussion on 5000-level SOP and annual graduate banked courses catalog cleanup.

There was no discussion, and the curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [September 4, 2013](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved and will be forwarded to the Chancellor as formal faculty advice. **RESOLUTION #13-82**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Committee on Committees

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee discussed the process required to address the vacancy on the Appellate Hearing Committee member. Following the moving up of alternate member Professor Natalie Stewart to the 2016 regular term according to the committee charge, Professor David Collier (Medicine) was nominated and elected to fill the open 2014 alternate term on the Appellate Hearing Committee. Link to [ECU's Faculty Assembly delegation](#).

B. Calendar Committee

Professor Mark McCarthy (Business), Chair of the Committee discussed the requested inclusion of MATH 1066 within the common final exam schedule in approved University calendars, excluding Fall 2013. This addition will include adding the following text to the Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015 approved calendars:

<u>Spring 2014</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, May 7"
<u>Fall 2014</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Thursday, December 11"
<u>Spring 2015</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, May 6"

There was no discussion and the requested inclusion of MATH 1066 within the common final exam schedule in approved University calendars (including Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015) and excluding Fall 2013 was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-83**

C. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Edson Justiniano (Physics), Chair of the Committee withdrew the report on the East Carolina University Regulation on Individual Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Including External Activities for Pay at this time. The controversial document is under review by multiple persons across campus and will be presented at a later time.

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Ed Stellwag (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the [October 11, 2013](#) Committee meeting minutes, including a request to establish [new undergraduate concentrations](#) within the Department of Biology, request to discontinue a [Certificate in Virtual Reality in Education and Training](#) within the College of Education, request to discontinue the [minor in Media Studies](#) within the School of Communication, and a request to establish a new [graduate certificate program in Health Communication](#) within the School of Communication.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the [October 11, 2013](#) Committee meeting minutes, including a request to establish [new undergraduate concentrations](#) within the Department of Biology, request to discontinue a [Certificate in Virtual Reality in Education and Training](#) within the College of Education, request to discontinue the [minor in Media Studies](#) within the School of Communication, and a request to establish a new [graduate certificate program in Health Communication](#) within the School of Communication.

RESOLUTION #13-84

Professor Stellwag then presented the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Geological Sciences and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

There was no discussion and the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Geological Sciences and [response](#) to the external review recommendations were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #13-85

Professor Stellwag then presented the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Technology Systems (within College of Technology and Computer Science) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

There was no discussion and the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Technology Systems (within College of Technology and Computer Science) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-86**

Professor Stellwag then presented the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Counselor Education (within College of Education) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

There was no discussion and the [Academic Program Review](#) of the Counselor Education (within College of Education) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-87**

Professor Stellwag then presented the [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Joyner Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

There was no discussion and the [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Joyner Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-88**

Professor Stellwag then presented the [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Health Sciences Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

There was no discussion and the [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Health Sciences Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-89**

Following these reports, Professor Stellwag mentioned the 2013-2017 [Schedule](#) of unit academic reviews (Seven-Year Cycle or Accreditation Cycle) being provided to Senators for information only.

E. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Hector Garza (Theatre and Dance) provided the curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [October 14, 2013](#) Committee meeting minutes, including first a proposed course cap of 25 students per section for Writing Intensive (WI) courses.

Professor Garza thanked the faculty across campus for their involvement and support for the committee becoming a Faculty Senate Committee. The committee has taken their charge seriously and gained significant amounts of faculty feedback regarding the definition and processes for writing intensive courses. Momentum from the QEP served as an impetus for the current status of writing intensive courses.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) expressed concerns about the recommendation to cap courses at 25 students per section. There will either be a backlog of students needing to take the courses or there will be a need for additional faculty. Professor Garza replied that the committee defines effective writing on the ECU campus and that limits in class size should be respected to ensure that writing intensive sections include effective writing instruction and feedback.

Professor Mahrer (Philosophy and Religious Studies) questioned whether there would be unintended ramifications from this set of motions. The result will likely be that fewer Writing Intensive courses will be offered across campus when we are simultaneously working to generate Student Credit Hours. Would the committee aspire for less writing across the curriculum? Professor Garza replied that there would be more effective teaching within courses even if there were fewer courses offered; the goal should be to be more strategic about where and how writing intensive courses are offered. He further explained that the majority of courses are currently following that cap and that the committee wanted to define the effectiveness of teaching writing.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) spoke in favor of the cap of 25, emphasizing that it promotes quality of instruction and provides the best instruction for students. He expressed concerns about the concurrent reduction of faculty research productivity that would be likely without such a cap across campus.

Professor Rigsby spoke against this motion, explaining that the implementation of the cap would eliminate some courses in her own department. She moved to amend the proposal to say that the cap of 25 would be in effect for lower division writing intensive courses across campus. The motion was seconded.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) spoke against the amended motion insisting that such a solution would be ineffective across campus. The disparity of upper division and lower division courses would not be fair and equitable.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) explained that the practical reality is that this is an unfunded mandate that will work against helping students graduate on time. Professor Morin (Communication) explained that her teaching has included multiple sections of writing intensive courses because of the importance of clarifying expectations for faculty members who teach large sections of courses along with meeting research requirements. Professor Yoon (Social Work) reported grading 2500 pages of student work within a single semester, while he was also expected to be research productive. Providing quality feedback to students takes significant time that must be taken from other tasks such as research. The reality is that it is unfair that faculty teaching large sections of writing intensive courses at the same time.

Professor Leorri (Geological Sciences) explained that a writing intensive course cap of 25 would mandate an additional section and take twice the contact time as well as meet the number of pages to be graded within the course. The department has to make these resource decisions; budget restrictions are paramount and may cause great harm to a faculty member expected to provide more contact hours.

The question was called on the amendment being discussed and seconded. The motion to call the question passed. The motion to amend to change to cap to apply only to lower division courses failed.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language) spoke in favor of the motion regarding writing intensive caps. She emphasized that quality teaching in foreign languages requires smaller caps and that in order to be effective in a writing intensive courses a course must be no more than 25. Research demonstrates that clearly.

Professor Ding (Technology and Computer Science) explained that they have a course that is writing intensive and they cannot afford an additional writing intensive course. They use a collaborative approach to the teaching of the course; they do not see a problem with the absence of a cap.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked the Provost if she would be able to support the cap of 25 in writing intensive courses, emphasizing that graduation rates could be affected. Sheerer reported that she supports the theory of limiting enrollment in writing intensive courses. There are not adequate resources to support this cap, and she cannot promise that the resources will be available to support the cap of 25 students. She suggested that departments could review the curriculum delivery within the department. Professor Garza added that a unit should go back and review the offerings of writing intensive courses. He realized that some students may have been taking multiple courses beyond the stated writing intensive course mandate; are all the courses being offered required or imperative?

Professor Yoon (Social Work) explained that within writing intensive courses the focus is on the content of the courses, not on the writing. It is very difficult to include the focus on the course content along with the writing requirements within the course. Both content expectations and writing intensive requirements are realities. He recommended that the Writing Center can provide additional support to faculty teaching writing intensive courses.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) recommended that because of the massive difference of opinions it may be wise to have faculty senators return to their units to gather information about if the cap of 25 is practical or possible. Professor Garza explained that forums have already occurred; feedback from the faculty has been very positive about establishing the cap of 25.

Professor Cope (English) asked that the Senate consider proposing the cap as a strong recommendation to the units rather than posing an unfunded mandate. Garza replied that the recommendation of the cap of 25 already exists.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) explained that it is in the minority of units across campus that the recommendation of units are harming faculty productivity. We need to honor the cap of 25 across campus by using new and creative ways of scheduling classes. Routine violations of recommendations will harm faculty and students.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked if Student Credit Hours (SCH) are calculated differently for writing intensive courses. Will the SCH be the same? Other factors may enhance an equitable distribution of workload and counting of SCH and faculty workload.

The motion to approve the mandated cap of 25 students in a Writing Intensive Course was carried by voice vote. A show of hands was called for; 22 voted in favor; 18 voted against. The motion carried.

The proposed course cap of 25 students per section for Writing Intensive (WI) courses was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-90**

Professor Garza then presented proposed changes to procedures making all sections of a course, if requested and approved, designated as a Writing Intensive (WI) course.

Professor Mahrer (Philosophy and Religious Studies) explained that in his unit there will be an elimination of many writing intensive courses; the net effect of this would be less writing for students in his program while the goal is for students to write more within their classes, so he spoke against the motion. Professor Garza replied that the policy would not eliminate the use of writing within an individual course.

Professor Moore (Nursing) asked about a specific situation in his course. Would all course sections have to be writing intensive? He spoke against the motion.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) explained that the current policy is a necessary flexibility; problems have resulted from a lack of attention. Professor Zoller (Art and Design) explained that students have arrived in classes previously advertised as writing intensive only to find that a faculty member announced at the beginning of class that courses were not actually writing intensive.

Professor Eble (English), a member of the committee, clarified that humanities and social sciences credits do not have labeling by section, so we should follow the same practices for writing intensive designation. By section, there is no current allowance for variation in those courses.

Professor Dotson-Blake (Education) explained that service learning uses the asterisk system of designation and that has worked well for that area. She insisted that faculty must be good stewards of the use of the asterisk system.

Professor Eason (Nursing) explained that it would be a problem with her accreditation system if the expectation would be that a course would require a different number to be a writing intensive course.

Professor Morin (Communication) asked if there were some courses that are required to be writing intensive courses. Units and programs must make intentional decisions about courses identified as writing intensive.

Professor Rigsby (Faculty Assembly) explained that the use of the cap is a possibility in her department with a new approach mandated by the cap. That solution would not be possible with the passing of the elimination of the asterisk approach.

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) spoke against the motion due to eliminating flexibility for students.

Following discussion, the proposed changes to procedures making all sections of a course, if requested and approved, designated as a Writing Intensive (WI) course failed.

Professor Garza then presented a revised Writing-Intensive course proposal form; the writing intensive by section would be stricken on page 34.

Professor Gibson (Business) asked how the proposal would affect current Writing Intensive courses and course proposals. Garza replied that every unit would be asked to do an audit of their Writing Intensive courses; the unit will make decisions about the course proposals.

Following discussion, the revised Writing-Intensive course proposal form was approved.

RESOLUTION #13-91

Professor Garza then presented a request for removal of WI designation for [SOCI 4385](#): Theoretical Perspectives and Applications and a request for WI status for [POLS 2090](#): Writing for Political Science.

There was no discussion and the request for removal of WI designation for [SOCI 4385](#): Theoretical Perspectives and Applications and a request for WI status for [POLS 2090](#): Writing for Political Science were approved a presented. **RESOLUTION #13-92**

Agenda Item VII. New Business

Professor Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee on Committees stated that there was a 2016 UNC Faculty Assembly delegate position open and stated that Professor Edu Leorri (Geological Sciences) was willing to fill the open seat. Following discussion about a lack of Senators' ability to inquire of

interest within their units, Professor Gibson (Business) moved to return this item to the Committee on Committees.

Professor Given (Parliamentarian/Foreign Language) presented a request for new business to consider a resolution to support North Carolina teachers. The motion was presented in writing; the word “affect” was changed to “effect” and the word “farther” was changed to “further.”

Whereas, the elimination of tenure in NC public schools and its pending implementation plan pose a threat to the quality of public education in the state; and

Whereas, this can have a direct effect on the quality of education at East Carolina University and on its graduates; and

Therefore, Be It Resolved That, the ECU Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern over the forthcoming changes in the tenure policy in state public schools; and

Be It Further Resolved That, the ECU Faculty Senate urges lawmakers and education policymakers to rethink the legislation and policies that have resulted in these changes.

Following discussion and several minor editorial changes, the resolution in support of North Carolina Teachers was approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #13-93**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Anderson
Acting Secretary of the Faculty
College of Education

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 5, 2013, MEETING

13-78 Support of System-wide Core Competencies, as follows:

Whereas, the five-year strategic plan, “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina” has defined as a major priority the implementation of system-wide assessments of academic core competencies; and

Whereas, the UNC Strategic Directions General Education Council has, after considered deliberation, recommended Critical Thinking and Written Communication as system-wide core competencies most appropriate for assessment; and

Whereas, [UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-11](#) endorses the core constituencies recommended by UNC Strategic Directions General Education Council and requests campus votes to approve the competencies; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has resolved that the University of North Carolina, under the imprimatur of its constitutive faculty, must offer a general comprehensive education (as articulated in Resolution 2012-06); and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has also resolved that an effective curriculum is essential to the development of critical skills necessary for students to become productive citizens and leaders of North Carolina, and that faculty recognize these core competencies as vital to student success (as articulated in Resolution 2012-07); and

Whereas, the core competencies of Critical Thinking and Written Communication are widely recognized by faculty as expressions of a general comprehensive education and as fundamental requirements for successful mastery in all academic disciplines; and

Whereas, economic leaders in North Carolina and nationwide agree that Critical Thinking and Written Communication are fundamental to career success as cited in the Listening Sessions Summary (Strategic Directions Initiatives 2013-2018, Appendices) and

Whereas, our regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), periodically and comprehensively examines and affirms the quality of educational programs and requires that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the ECU Faculty Senate endorses the General Education Council's choice of Critical Thinking and Written Communication as two system-wide core competencies for the UNC system; and

Be It Further Resolved that the faculty of ECU and other the constituent UNC institutions must have primary responsibility for the development and administration of assessment instruments consistent with the missions of their respective campuses.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

13-79 Support of UNC Faculty Communication with Boards of Trustees, as follows:

Whereas, faculty communication is essential with every decision maker regarding the operations of each institution; and

Whereas, the faculty have established communication with provosts, chancellors, and UNC-GA administrators; and

Whereas, although the ECU Board of Trustees meetings include a report from the ECU Chair of the Faculty, some faculty governance bodies at UNC institutions do not have established avenues of communication with the Board of Trustees of their institution; and

Whereas, the Board of Trustees are key decision-makers regarding the operations of each institution; and

Whereas, [UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-09](#) calls for regular oral and/or written reports from campus faculty senate chairs to their boards of trustees.

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the ECU Faculty Senate endorses UNC Faculty Assembly resolution 2013-09 that each UNC institution Faculty Senate Chair should present an oral and/or written report to the Board of Trustees on a regular basis.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

13-80 Approval of the Fall 2013 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-81 Formal faculty advice on curriculum matters acted on and recorded in the [September 4, 2013](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-82 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [September 16, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-83 Inclusion of MATH 1066 within the common final exam schedule in approved University calendars, excluding Fall 2013. This addition will include adding the following text to the Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015 approved calendars:

<u>Spring 2014</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, May 7"
<u>Fall 2014</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Thursday, December 11"
<u>Spring 2015</u>	"MATH 1066	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, May 6"

Disposition: Chancellor

13-84 Curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the [October 11, 2013](#) Committee meeting minutes, including a request to establish [new undergraduate concentrations](#) within the Department of Biology, request to discontinue a [Certificate in Virtual Reality in Education and Training](#) within the College of Education, request to discontinue the [minor in Media Studies](#) within the School of Communication, and a request to establish a new [graduate certificate program in Health Communication](#) within the School of Communication.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-85 [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Geological Sciences and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-86 [Academic Program Review](#) of the Department of Technology Systems (within College of Technology and Computer Science) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-87 [Academic Program Review](#) of the Counselor Education (within College of Education) and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-88 [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Joyner Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-89 [Administrative Program Review](#) of the Health Sciences Library and [response](#) to the external review recommendations.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-90 Course cap of 25 students per section for Writing Intensive (WI) courses.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-91 [Writing-Intensive course proposal form](#)

Disposition: Faculty Senate

13-92 Request for removal of WI designation for [SOC1 4385](#): Theoretical Perspectives and Applications and a request for WI status for [POLS 2090](#): Writing for Political Science.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-93 Support of North Carolina Teachers, as follows:

Whereas, the elimination of tenure in NC public schools and its pending implementation plan pose a threat to the quality of public education in the state; and

Whereas, this can have a direct effect on the quality of education at East Carolina University and on its graduates.

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the ECU Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern over the forthcoming changes in the tenure policy in state public schools; and

Be It Further Resolved that the ECU Faculty Senate urges lawmakers and education policymakers to rethink the legislation and policies that have resulted in these changes.

Disposition: Faculty Senate