

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE**

FULL MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

The fifth regular meeting of the 2012/2013 Faculty Senate was held on **Tuesday, January 29, 2013**, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Student Center, Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of [December 4, 2012](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Karriker (Business), Levine (Medicine), and Walker (Allied Health Sciences/Past Chair of the Faculty).

Alternates present were: Professors Tucker-McLaughlin for Howard (Communication), Bauer for Henze (English), Ketterman for Cable (Health Sciences Library), Meggs for Chen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Nalavany for Yoon (Social Work), Li for Smith and Frank for Sanders (Technology and Computer Science), and Garza for Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has acted on the following resolutions from the November 2012 and December 2012, Faculty Senate meetings:

- 12-91 Fall 2012 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.
- 12-92 Curriculum matters included in the [September 10, 2012](#) Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-93 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [September 19, 2012](#) & [October 3, 2012](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-94 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [September 27, 2012](#), and [October 11, 2012](#) University Curriculum meeting minutes.
- 12-95 Curriculum matters contained in the [October 16, 2012](#) Service Learning Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-96 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [October 12, 2012](#), Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-97 Revised Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee [Charge](#).
- 12-98 Removal of foundations credit from several Department of [Philosophy courses](#) and Department of [Political Science courses](#).
- 12-99 Revised [Student Perception of Teaching Survey \(SPOTS\) Face-to-Face Form](#).
- 12-100 Formal faculty advice on [University Behavioral Concerns Team](#) Interim Regulation.
- 12-103 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [October 17, 2012](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-104 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [October 25, 2012](#) University

- Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- 12-105 Curriculum matters included in the [November 12, 2012](#) Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
 - 12-107 Request Calendar Committee to split the University academic calendars into two (beginning with 2014/15 calendars) with a University academic calendar containing faculty-approved academic dates and a University student application/processing deadline calendar containing student deadlines determined after academic calendars are established and approved by the Chancellor.
 - 12-109 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [November 9, 2012](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including the [Department of Computer Science](#) unit academic program review.

Correspondence concerning unit elections for 2013-2014 Faculty Senate representation was distributed 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 University Academic Libraries Committee has provided a [written report](#) from Jan Lewis, Interim Dean of Academic Library Services. Please direct any questions to members of the Committee present at today's meeting.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard reviewed key points on the Report on Faculty Employment, which includes a longitudinal profile of faculty tenure status and tenure status of permanent and temporary faculty by unit. Chancellor Ballard noted that Professor Rachel Roper would be making a suggestion for revision. ECU did not retain 50 faculty for the 2011-2012 academic year. He was not pleased with this information but says that it is better than many other universities. ECU is retaining about two-thirds of its faculty on tenured or tenure track status which is a good figure compared to the national average.

Chancellor Ballard next addressed the *Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina Strategic Directions for 2013-2018* (Strategic Plan) and acknowledged that the planning process was very different than from previous years. His first goal is to support President Ross as he navigates some "shark infested waters." President Ross is being pressured to make fundamental changes in the UNC System. President Ross is trying to maintain quality and control in the UNC System. Chancellor Ballard believes each campus will have autonomy in implementing the goals of the Strategic Plan. One-third of the 104-page document is devoted to the goal of degree attainment. Specifically, in five years, the goal is to have 32% of the North Carolina population with a college degree; 37% in 10 years; and in 12 years, for North Carolina to be one of the top ten states in the U.S. with the highest number of residents with a college degree. Chancellor Ballard is unsure of whether these targets are achievable since the UNC System has never attempted this before. He is concerned with the focus being on degree attainment without paying attention to the quality of the degree. The Chancellor did not think academic quality received the amount of attention it deserved in the Strategic Plan. There are 14 identified variables related to strengthening academic quality such as E-advisor initiative, E-portfolio assessments, competency-based assessments, alumni and employer surveys, enhancing two-plus-two delivery, baccalaureate competency certificate programs and many others. The Chancellor thinks that most of the variables will be beneficial to students and the UNC System. He does not think the Strategic Plan focuses on important components of academic quality such as recruitment and retention of great faculty, the students' experience in the classroom, providing important services to students and many more. The Chancellor thinks the Strategic Plan

focuses on the 5% of the academic quality issues rather than on other key components of academic quality.

Chancellor Ballard addressed the costs of the Strategic Plan. The authors of the Strategic Plan estimated a three billion dollar return on investment within a 10-year period and if all the research in the Plan is completed, an additional \$1.45 billion for the State of North Carolina. The cost of implementing the plan is \$730 million. UNC-General Administration wants to convince legislators that if they invest in the Strategic Plan (UNC System), North Carolina will receive this return on investment. The author of the Strategic Plan anticipates that 56% of the \$730 million investment would be achieved by cost savings, reallocations, and other efficiency improvements. Consequently, the 17 institutions would have to invest over 50% of the costs associated with the Strategic Plan. The other 44% would in come from the state at a little more than 2% per year during the 10-year period. The state would give the UNC System over \$50 million beginning on July 1, 2014 if the Strategic Plan is approved.

Chancellor Ballard encouraged the faculty to review the research section and the section on “Serving the People of North Carolina” of the Strategic Plan. ECU is well positioned to respond to many areas of the Strategic Plan such as teacher quality research, comprehensive distance education, marine and coastal studies, and community health care needs. He has spoken with Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson about how to prioritize some of our research strategies in these four areas.

Chancellor Ballard spoke about the recent ECU Board of Trustees retreat. President Ross attended the first two hours of the retreat and addressed the Strategic Plan. The Board of Trustees focused the remaining part of the retreat on three areas: graduation rates, competency based education, and efficiency improvements.

ECU will have a goal of graduating 100 more students compounded per year. Focus will be on programs that lend to recruiting more students such as nursing, engineering, and the honors college. Competency based education is an important topic in higher education. Efficiency improvements are an important consideration for the Board of Trustees. The McKenzie report (financed by the Board of Governors and not reviewed by any of the chancellors to his knowledge) describes academic efficiencies that could be implemented in the UNC System. Chancellor Ballard does not believe that ECU could make further academic reductions. ECU’s contribution to the 56% of the \$730 million expected from institutions would be \$700,000 from program reviews that would result in program eliminations. ECU does not have direction from UNC General Administration regarding these academic efficiencies. Instructional efficiencies (such as consistent class scheduling) are another example of an academic efficiency.

The reports on faculty employment, including a longitudinal profile of faculty tenure status and tenure status of permanent and temporary faculty (by unit) are linked below.

[Faculty FTE by Unit and Gender](#)

[Full and Part-Time Faculty by Unit and Tenure Status](#)

[Longitudinal Profile of Faculty Tenure Status](#) (includes Medicine)

[Longitudinal Profile of Faculty Tenure Status](#)

Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked Chancellor Ballard about Governor McCrory's proposed standardized testing in higher education. Chancellor Ballard had not heard about this idea. He cannot predict whether this idea will materialize.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if the chancellors discussed external assessment and did they have a position on the issue? Chancellor Ballard was not aware of a discussion on this topic but is sure it will be a focus in the near future.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked what did the Chancellor thought of Governor McCrory's definition of liberal arts. Chancellor Ballard stated it was not his definition of higher education. It confuses and minimizes higher education. ECU does a great job preparing students for the workforce. Governor McCrory's definition of higher education does not resemble ECU and the focus on solely job preparation limits higher education.

Professor Roper (Medicine) thanked Chancellor Ballard for the faculty employment information and asked if the statistics by rank and tenure status could be provided to the Faculty Senate in a spreadsheet file. She then stated that she would like to see ECU a leader in mentoring women leaders. Chancellor Ballard agreed to her request for additional information and asked the Provost to provide this information.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) commented that, in addition to the excel reports referenced by Professor Roper, faculty would like to see the number of graduate students who serve in teaching roles. He is particularly interested in seeing the data to follow trends. Chancellor Ballard stated that he thought Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson was already working on this data and would be happy to have that provided to the Faculty Senate.

D. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson provided the following report (quoted below).

Report on Assistantship Reallocation

Our university continues to illustrate its good stewardship of scarce resources. For example we continue to implement recommendations that were provided by the PPC in April 2012. More recently, the Graduate School just concluded a careful analysis of assistantship allocations at the institutional level and also provided recommendations for reallocations to divisions and deans at the very end of the fall semester.

This represents a first for ECU and I am thankful for Dean Gemperline's efforts to assist our institution in assuring efficiency and effectiveness. Needless to say, it's been a difficult process because it sets precedent and because resources are at stake. My impression is that the vast majority believe the task was necessary, that the process was well designed and executed, and that the results while discomfoting for some are reasonable and rational. The process and recommendations involved a full year of effort with the original request and planning coming from Academic Council in January 2012. A draft RFP form was revised during meetings with Academic Council, Academic Deans, Graduate Council, and Graduate Program Directors. The process and form were finalized in late spring 2012. The Graduate School assembled data on: student demand, applicant pool quality, and degree completion rates, as well as student satisfaction with: advising, instruction, research opportunities, and financial support. RFP forms were pre-populated with these data and then programs submitted their proposals in October 2012. Proposal writers provided a detailed assistantship

budget request along with justifications. Proposals were evaluated by the Graduate School in preparing recommendations for new GA allocations to the Academic Council in November 2012 and to the Academic Deans in December 2012. Feedback was used to revise the recommended allocations. A series of meetings with colleges and departments concluded during the week of January 22. Please note that deans were provided some latitude in adjusting recommendations made from the Graduate School.

It should be of no surprise that every college (except one) requested more assistantship money than they are currently budgeted from the Graduate School. In order to meet all requests, the current GA budget in the Graduate School would need to grow from roughly \$6.5 million to \$8.6 million (\$2.1 million increase or 33%). What we actually face is a relatively flat assistantship budget with reallocation between programs as the more realistic outcome. At the departmental level, most units are unaffected or modestly affected by the reallocation. We knew this would be the case from the outset. At the collegiate level, the single largest reallocation took place within Health Sciences with the College of Allied Health witnessing a reduction of about 15.5% to be executed over the next two years. Most of that reduction will migrate to PHD programs in the basic sciences within BSOM. In addition, HCAS, COB, COE, and CFAC will see modest declines in assistantship funding ranging from 2.2 to 4.6% while HHP, CHE, CON, and CTCS will see modest increases ranging from 0.1 to 7.2%. The two programs residing outside colleges, CRM PhD and MS Sustainable Tourism, will see a 2.1% increase.

While I'm thankful for this effort and I am confident that the process was good and that the results are reasonable, I know that Dean Gemperline and Academic Council remains open to suggestions for an improved process and to any concerns for the results arrived at. We are all committed to using our scarce resources in the best possible way to achieve our mission.

Efficiency Audit RGS

Please recall that Recommendation #5 in Phase II of the PPC report suggests the design and implementation of an efficiency audit whenever a higher-level administrative office is vacated (i.e., above the level of department chair). In general, PPC provided little guidance as to what such audits should look like other than to consider: work volume and flow, centrality to mission, duplication between units, and the potential for merger. I've found myself in the rather ironic position of leading the group that made such a recommendation and then being the first to implement it. Since I did not really know just what we (PPC) had recommended, my first step was to spend an early summer afternoon with Auditor Stacie Tronto. She agreed that her office would serve in a consulting role but would not perform a formal audit.

My initial focus was on the operation of the RGS central office. It's rather small. As a result of the 2012 cuts, we already had removed one director position with savings in salary and benefits. I then proceeded to eliminate the position of Senior Research Fellow, a position that I had occupied for two years. That provided additional savings. The net cost reductions in the central office amount to \$250,000 in salary and benefits. Currently we also are examining several small offices within the Division. I anticipate the merger of two with a net reduction in the number of Directors by one. That merger will be announced at the beginning of the new fiscal year. An examination of ORCA by Tim Wiseman (Enterprise Risk) along with consultation with Stacie Tronto resulted in a recommended personnel increase in that office. That recommendation has been acted upon and we will have a new position in that office to better assist faculty, staff, and students to deal with managing conflicts of interest.

Another aspect of the efficiency audit involves the analysis of workflows in the OSP and the OGC. The process mapping for these two units was started in fall semester by IPAR and we should have results within the next month. I expect adjustments to be made based on those workflow analyses. My plan for next fiscal year is to conduct a similar examination of the Office of Innovation and Economic Development. Once completed, I will produce an efficiency audit document that summarizes the process and the results.

Coastal Studies Report

[Coastal and Sustainable Environment Research and Education Plan](#), [Appendices](#), and [Position Paper](#)
Another PPC recommendation would move all centers and institutes from their current home in RGS to new homes in HS or AA. We already have agreements for the relocation of the Center for Health Disparities and the NC Agromedicine Institute into the HS Division. I am thankful to Directors Hope Landrine and Robin Tutor and VC Horns for their cooperative spirit in negotiating good outcomes for all concerned. Consideration of our coastal research, instructional, and outreach enterprise at ECU, which is of obvious regional importance and has a relatively long history at ECU, is more complicated and we've invested much more effort in trying to get it right. It's more complicated because the investments in coastal programs are large and PPC requested that we at least consider the aggregation of several units, such as ICSP and CST and RENCI, into a single School.

Thus far, only one thing is certain, we will move ICSP and CST and RENCI into Academic Affairs. How they are configured and where they will precisely end up within AA has not yet been determined. We continue to get useful information. During the past summer months, Assoc. VC Lisa Clough and I met with deans, associate deans, directors, chairs, and faculty to discuss the PPC recommendation and views on various options. We invested well over 40 hours in meetings of this sort. Two additional activities were executed during the fall. First, a coastal self-study was prepared by centers, institutes, and departments in preparation for the current external review of coastal activities at the system level. In fact we have a site visit in Manteo at UNC CSI with the external review team this Thursday (1/31/2013). A small group will describe our contributions and emphasize key strengths for the external team and VP Chris Brown (UNC-GA). Second, Academic Council appointed (early in fall semester) a group of 9 faculty along with Lisa Clough, headed up by Dr. Jamie Kruse (Economics) to examine our coastal enterprise and to consider appropriate locations and configurations. They are to be commended for their hard work and their institutional commitment. Their report was issued in mid-December and we've been taking comments on their report electronically and in meetings since then. Provost Sheerer and I met with a room full of deans, associate deans, and chairs last Wednesday to hear their concerns and their views on appropriate locations and configurations.

The key consideration, given the strength of feelings expressed in positive and negative directions, focuses on whether the creation of a new coastal school as a code unit is in the best interest of our institution and the region it serves. Code unit status is the lightning rod. I can assure you that the Faculty Manual will be followed closely if such a process is needed. As you know, if a group of faculty desire to establish a new code unit, there is a process. There is absolutely no intent to violate the Faculty Manual. Personally, I have not formed a firm opinion about whether formation of a new code unit would provide a net benefit to our mission. I have more reading and listening to do. Our system's external review will provide new intelligence that none of us currently possesses. I think we all agree that it would be

premature to make such an important set of decisions before we hear from the external reviewers. I suspect that we'll hear from them in writing by the end of March. You will have access to that document.

While some uncertainty remains, I do know that the coastal work taking place on our campus is important. It's of special importance to our region. I know that the Chancellor and Academic Council are absolutely committed to excellence in coastal research, instruction, and outreach. I also now realize that no solution to this coastal question will make everyone happy. I request your continued patience with this difficult process but I also ask that you remain respectful—this will be important as we move forward with a solution that some will find inferior.

No questions were posed to Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson at this time.

E. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor with Campus Operations

Mr. Koch first introduced Debra Jo Garfi, Director of Parking and Transportation. Then briefly discussed his annual [Report](#) on Parking and Transportation Services as requested in a 2002 Faculty Senate [resolution](#) that was distributed to the Senators prior to the meeting.

Professor Karen Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) raised a concern about the crosswalk that crosses Charles Blvd at the baseball/softball/track/soccer complex. Professor Vail Smith noted that it is not a pedestrian crosswalk at which cars are not legally required to stop. However, during events at these facilities, ECU places orange cones to highlight this crosswalk. Because of these cones, many fans crossing (especially ones from visiting teams) assume that it is such a crosswalk and step out into the road assuming that the cars will stop. It is very dangerous. Professor Vail-Smith suggested to either making it a crosswalk where cars are legally required to stop or not adding the cones, which confuse people into thinking that it is such a crosswalk. Mr. Koch agreed that this was a problem and would work with others within public safety to address this concern.

Professor Reisch (Business) commented that "A" parking lots with restricted time limits (i.e., reserved for "A" stickers until 7pm) are not adequately monitored. It appears that students are cognizant of the times the lots are ticketed; thus, if a lot is ticketed at 5:30 pm, the lot quickly fills up shortly thereafter preventing "A" sticker holders from parking. In addition, no one is available after 5:00 pm in the parking and transportation office if someone wants to report a violation. Mr. Koch indicted that parking and transportation could rotate times for ticketing in the "A" lots noted above to help mitigate the influx of improper parking prior to 7:00 pm.

Professor Fitzgerald (Medicine) stated that using funds from the family practice plan is not appropriate to cover the cost of parking lot maintenance. He stated that patient revenue should not be used to maintain parking lots. Employees should only pay for parking lots that they use and the University should shoulder the costs of maintenance. Mr. Koch replied that the state law requires that users pay the cost of maintaining the parking lots. This includes ECU employees, guests, and patients of the various medical practice offices. Users should contribute to parking lot maintenance.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) asked about the parking deck being planned behind Mendenhall and where would people park once the parking lot is closed. Mr. Koch replied that Parking and Transportation Services will limit the number of new parking permits once the lot is closed and will maintain a 10% oversell of permits. In addition, they will have a plan in place to minimize hardships of parking permit owners. Mr. Koch also stated there was an agreement on student access to the deck due to the use of activity fee funds to build it.

F. Dale Knickerbocker, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures) provided a [report](#) on the January 18, 2013, UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting. Several items of interest were provided to the Senators prior to the meeting, including:

- NEW and REVISED Draft Strategic Plan (January 16, 2013)
http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/UNC_Strategic_Plan_Jan_16_DRAFT.pdf
- Faculty's Response to the Draft UNC Strategic Plan (January 19, 2013)
http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/19Jan2013_Faculty_Assembly_Response_to_the_Jan16_Draft_of_th.pdf
- ASG Response to Strategic Plan Draft
http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/130121_-_ASG_Response_to_Strategic_Plan_Draft.pdf
- Faculty Comments on the Draft of the 2013-2018 UNC Strategic Plan
http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/Faculty_COMMENTS_on_the_Draft_of_the_UNC_Strategic_Plan.pdf
- View streaming video of UNC's Advisory Committee on Strategic Directions
<http://elvis.mediasite.mcnc.org/mcnc/SilverlightPlayer/Default.aspx?peid=435d5cc07b48447bbba1281a75682cba1d>

Professor Knickerbocker made the following points regarding the Strategic Plan:

1. Methodology. Although the plan suggests that the proposed strategies are data-driven (page 2), many of the proposals are based on assumptions that are not supported by research data or are in opposition to it. The facts do not drive the outcomes. For example, what current or historical data support the assertions that E-Learning is less expensive than face-to-face, on campus delivery of curriculum; or that massive open online courses (MOOCs) are effective ways to ensure student learning, etc.? Who will evaluate instructor qualifications, and the identification of appropriate E-learning student populations based on past success rates? How would MOOCs be paid for and what would their effect be on other funding?
2. Special fees for online courses are to be eliminated. How will the added expenses of these labor-intensive courses as well as the hardware, software, and training needs be addressed?
3. Costs. How will the administrative costs to implement these ambitious reforms be paid?
4. Instruction. The Faculty Assembly is very concerned about the insufficient acknowledgment that faculty have primary responsibility for design, delivery, and assessment of the curriculum, and the risk our campuses have of losing accreditation if this faculty oversight is lacking.
5. Who will control the outcomes for the adoption of common general education requirement?
6. Since the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) has been demonstrated to correspond to SAT scores, what new data will be obtained to justify this expense of using this standardized examination? Programs are already assessed by SACS and undergo regular external reviews and, in professional schools, accreditation by their national disciplinary bodies. Therefore, what justifies this added expense? Will standardized exams be tailored to assess the outcomes specified by faculty?
7. Research. What is the effect of targeting certain research areas on other research? There is no research to support the conclusion that the economic benefits of hiring "rainmakers" outweigh the cost in start-up and support funds.

Professor Taggart (Music/Faculty Assembly Delegate) referenced Professor Rigsby's earlier comments about students and online courses and the Chancellor's candor on the change of guard with the new Board of Governors. Professor Taggart stressed the amount of time to deliver online courses and increasing class size was not, in his opinion, the way to go.

Following Professor Knickerbocker's remarks, Professor Morehead (Chemistry) offered the following resolution in support of the UNC Faculty Assembly and Faculty Advisory Committee Reports on "Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina"

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly of the 17 constituent campuses of the University of North Carolina has met and considered the January 16, 2013 draft report of the five-year strategic plan "Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina;" and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly and President Ross constituted a Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) which submitted a set of recommendations in the document "Our University, Our Future: A Faculty Vision for UNC Strategic Directions;" and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly resolved that the Faculty Advisory Council recommendations and Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03 be incorporated into the final strategic plan, and

Whereas, the mission of East Carolina University is

To serve as a national model for public service and regional transformation by:

- Preparing our students to compete and succeed in the global economy and multicultural society,
- Distinguishing ourselves by the ability to train and prepare leaders,
- Creating a strong, sustainable future for eastern North Carolina through education, research, innovation, investment, and outreach,
- Saving lives, curing diseases, and positively transforming health and health care, and
- Providing cultural enrichment and powerful inspiration as we work to sustain and improve quality of life, and

Whereas, the faculty and administration of East Carolina University, through shared governance, are best positioned to choose, implement, and evaluate the appropriate curricular and co-curricular activities, service, engagement, and economic development activities in pursuit of that mission, and

Whereas, our regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and other professional accrediting bodies, require that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty; and

Whereas, SACS and other accrediting bodies periodically and comprehensively examine and affirm the quality of educational programs, and require that the faculty lead the assessment of the academic programs of the University;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the strategic plan must reflect that the faculty, in their role as educational experts and as those charged with ensuring the highest academic quality programs, are the primary body to select course content and design, method of delivery, and to assess all academic programs, and

Be it Further Resolved That the recommendations articulated in the FAC response report and in Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03 be incorporated into the final strategic plan and into the plan's implementation.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences/UNC Faculty Assembly Chair) thanked faculty and reiterated that Chancellor Ballard stated earlier that the Strategic Plan was a “done deal.” President Ross does want to work with the faculty on curriculum matters especially. The resolution before the Faculty Senate was important because interpretations of the plan are already being offered.

Following brief discussion, the [resolution](#) supporting the UNC Faculty Assembly and Faculty Advisory Committee Reports on “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina” was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-01**

G. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Sprague provided the following comments to the Senators.

Happy New Year! I know that sounds a bit odd at the end of January, but this is my first opportunity to address you in 2013. The spring semester is well underway, and we are looking ahead to the end of the 2012-2013 academic year as well as making plans for the 2013-2014 year. This is the time when we consider changes to curricula and unit codes that we would like to implement before the fall. We have unit codes on the agenda today from the School of Dental Medicine, the School of Medicine, and the College of Education. I would like to acknowledge the work that all of the faculty and administrators put into producing these documents. Unit codes are extremely important because they contain guidelines for annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion of faculty and administration of the unit. Our process for developing and modifying unit codes has many important opportunities for review by the faculty and administrators. Thank you to everyone who worked on these documents.

As Vice Chancellor Ron Mitchelson discussed in his remarks, he appointed an *Ad Hoc* Committee on a Coastal and Sustainable Environment Research and Education Plan chaired by Prof. Jamie Cruz. This committee released a draft of their report at the end of the fall 2012 semester. This report outlines several options for the reconfiguration of centers, institutes, and programs related to coastal topics. We have a long history of research on coastal topics at ECU. Professors Stan Riggs and Bill Queen were among the early coastal researchers on campus. In addition to their individual research efforts, they put together an environment in which people from many disciplines were able to come together to discuss and collaborate on topics related to the coast. As a result, ECU faculty have produced groundbreaking interdisciplinary research on coastal topics. These truly interdisciplinary collaborations included faculty from the biological sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, and other disciplines. This collaboration on coastal topics still exists today at ECU. We have sociologists who study fisheries, geologists and oceanographers who collaborate with economists, biologists who use social networking models to study food webs, geographers and meteorologists who study storm impacts, and, yes, even a physicist who studies fish sound production and detection. One thing clear to me is that whatever choice we make about

restructuring our coastal studies, we cannot lose the interdisciplinary approach that has brought us this far. We cannot allow administrative barriers to erode the type of collaboration that has made coastal research a focus for faculty across campus. At the same time, our restructuring should not be detrimental to our existing departments and programs.

The coastal report has drawn attention to two faculty manual issues related to interdisciplinary programs and research. While the faculty manual does not prohibit academic programs that are not housed in a code unit, all of our procedures for proposing, reviewing, and modifying academic programs assume that the program is in a code unit. I am charging the Faculty Governance Committee and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee to consider how we should modify the faculty manual to allow our many interdisciplinary programs to continue to function. The second issue is joint appointments. The Faculty Governance Committee will be looking at our policy on joint appointments and suggesting possible changes very soon. Whatever path we decide to take for our coastal enterprises, the faculty manual should not impede our ability to collaborate with others on research and academic programs.

ECU released our Quality Enhancement Plan document in the last few days. I recommend that all faculty read this document and consider what changes you can make to your courses and programs to help our students master writing in the foundations, in the disciplines, and beyond. In order to achieve our goals for improving our students writing, we must consider changes to how we administer and staff our writing courses. It has been well established that writing intensive courses should have class sizes no larger than about 25 students to allow the instructors to effectively evaluate students' work and interact with them constructively. There are many programs at ECU that offer writing intensive courses with class sizes more than double this limit. If we want to improve student writing as well as maintain reasonable faculty workload expectations, we must invest in lowering these class sizes. As an aside, I could make the same argument related to class size, quality, and instructor workload as applied to MANY different subjects.

This fall, most of our tenured faculty will be up for post tenure review. To quote the faculty manual (ECU Faculty Manual Part IX, Section I.I) this review is "defined as the comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance" and "has the purposes of ensuring faculty development and promoting faculty vitality." It is not a process of reevaluating faculty for tenure. This spring units will be asked to submit performance standards for post tenure review. These standards must be based on criteria in the unit code and the faculty manual. The reviews must take into account faculty workload assignments during the review period. For example, we should not punish faculty who had assignments such as coordinating evaluation for the unit, higher teaching loads, or grant buyouts for research just because their assigned duties are different than others in the unit.

We have a lot to do before the end of the spring semester. As I said, we are considering changes to our courses, programs, and units. We are discussing reorganization of coastal studies research and programs, and we have to prepare for post tenure review. I did not even mention the SACS visit or strategic planning. Above all else, we are responsible for teaching and mentoring our students. I continue to advocate for us to accomplish these tasks using the principles of shared governance. Faculty, you have a voice in the way things are done at ECU. Use that voice to make a difference in these matters and others. Administrators, you have an obligation to seek faculty input and consider their advice. Together we can work toward solutions that do not compromise our principles or the quality of our work.

No questions were posed to Professor Sprague at this time.

H. Question Period

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) asked Provost Sheerer about reassigned time and the received [1/24/13 Transmittal Letter #81](#) (400.3.4 Monitoring Faculty Teaching Workloads) approved by the Board of Governors on January 11, 2013. Provost Sheerer replied that she just received the transmittal and could not at this time answer the specific questions but would report to the Faculty Senate in February.

Professor McFadden (Education) asked Provost Sheerer if she could provide an update on the review of their tenure options for academic library services and health sciences faculty. The Provost referred to the provided [library report](#) from the University Libraries Committee, drafted by Interim Dean Jan Lewis, for the latest on this issue.

Professor Christensen (Biology) asked Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson, in light of Chair Mark Sprague's comments on the interdisciplinary nature of coastal studies, and being a molecular geneticist that works on fruit flies who has directly benefited from collaborations with coastal colleagues, if consideration has been given to revising the *ECU Faculty Manual regarding* joint appointment and other issues. Interim VC Mitchelson responded that Research and Graduate Studies would make a careful examination about the issue before making a decision.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented first curriculum and academic matters contained in the [November 7, 2012](#) and [December 5, 2012](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including items within the College Nursing, Allied Health Sciences, School of Music, Departments of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Psychology, and Geography.

Professor West then provided a report on Thesis and Dissertation activities reporting that two theses were not approved by Dean Paul Gemperline in Fall 2012 and both incidents involve issues of quality. Dean Gemperline consulted an external reviewer about the theses and the reviewer was in agreement that quality of work was not adequate. During Dean Gemperline's tenure there have only been a total of five theses that were not approved. Dean Gemperline met with the chair of the committees, the graduate program director and the unit administrator and determined that the students could complete the degree by December 2012 in a non-thesis track. Dean Gemperline also met with Chair of the Faculty Mark Sprague (Physics), and Professors Ken Wilson (Sociology/Parliamentarian) and George Bailey (Philosophy/Vice Chair of Faculty Governance Committee) to discuss the issue and agreed that there would have to be changes to the *ECU Faculty Manual* to give the Dean of the Graduate School authority to approve/disapprove theses and dissertations. The Graduate Council Executive Committee will develop a policy and procedure for appeals and submit it to the Graduate Council for approval and then it will be forwarded to the Faculty Governance Committee and to the Faculty Senate if approval is obtained with each committee.

Professor West reported that a new Graduate Mentor Award will be announced soon by the Graduate School. The award will be presented at the Research and Creative Achievement Week.

Professor Cope (Psychology) stated that there was an editorial change needed in Professor West's report to state that only the M.A. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology program was being deleted. Professor West accepted this change and thanked Professor Cope for his comments.

Following brief discussion, the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [November 7, 2012](#) and [December 5, 2012](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #13-02**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [December 13, 2012](#), including curricular actions within the School of Art and Design. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [December 13, 2012](#), University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-03**

B. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Hector Garza (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of December 10, 2012 including requests for writing intensive (WI) designation for [HNRS 4500](#): Seniors Honors Project I and [HNRS 4550](#): Seniors Honors Project II.

Professor Wilson (Sociology/Parliamentarian) asked if the Committee would approve a course for writing intensive credit if the academic unit was planning to place more than 50 students in the WI course. Professor Garza replied no. The Committee was currently looking at the process and working to formalize recommendations and informal guidelines into a formal report to be acted on by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor later this Spring.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) stated that the recommended limit on the number of students in a WI course publicized to his academic administrator was 25 and asked if the Committee was abiding by the limit? Professor Garza stated that the 25-student limit was only an informal recommendation made prior to the current University Academic Writing Across the Curriculum Committee becoming a Faculty Senate committee again and that the course limit is an important item of business currently before the committee.

Following discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [December 10, 2012](#) Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #13-04

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Ed Stellwag (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic program matters included in the [December 7, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including a [Certificate in Teaching English](#) in the Two-Year College. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters included in the [December 7, 2012](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-05**

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee presented first the curriculum matters included in the [January 22, 2013](#) meeting minutes, including removal of Foundations Credit for [RELI](#)

[4699](#) Special Topics in Religious Studies, approval of Foundations Credit in Social Sciences for [POLS 1050](#) Politics and Global Understanding. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters included in the [January 22, 2013](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including removal of Foundations Credit for [RELI 4699](#) Special Topics in Religious Studies, approval of Foundations Credit in Social Sciences for [POLS 1050](#) Politics and Global Understanding were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-06**

Professor Brown then provided the Senators with a follow-up report on [September 2012 Faculty Senate](#) discussion on Co-Curricular Policies and Procedures and made the following points:

1. Co-Curricular Endorsement Policy: In the September Faculty Senate meeting a resolution was passed asking for a review of policies regarding academic support for co-curricular activities. The Chair of the Faculty asked the FCIE Committee to work with the university attorney and the Division of Student Affairs to address the concerns. The committee chairperson worked with appropriate individuals in the Division of Student Affairs and had a representative of the division come to a meeting with the FCIE Committee. As a result, the Division of Student Affairs revised the Co-Curricular Collaborations Funding Form to add the following statement under criteria number 3 for funding:
If an academic department or program is sponsoring, approving, or endorsing this activity, there must be a signed letter from the unit administrator or program director verifying that the department or program and its faculty have agreed to sponsorship/approval/endorsement of the activity.
The FCIE Committee believes that this addresses the request for establishing a policy that makes it clear as to whether an academic unit is endorsing the project.
2. Diversity Requirement: The FCIE Committee has been working to address the resolution from Faculty Senate that will require all undergraduate students graduating from ECU to complete a 3 credit course designated as covering domestic diversity and a three hour course designated as covering global diversity. Departments can apply to the FCIE Committee for designation of courses that meet the requirement. This is not a Foundations Requirement but a graduation requirement, so students are not restricted to taking only courses with these designations that also receive Foundations Curriculum credit. More information will be shared as the process continues.
4. General Education, Transfer Students, and the UNC-GA Strategic Plan: There are a number of issues under discussion at the UNC-General Administration that address general education and transfer students. The first is to ensure that campuses understand that the current Comprehensive Articulation Agreement requires that a student transferring to a four year university who completes an AA or AS degree is considered to have met the university's general education (in our case, Foundations Curriculum) requirements.
There is increasing emphasis on improving the process of transfer from a community college to the four year universities in the UNC system. This has resulted in initiatives that run the range from trying to more carefully align the current Comprehensive Articulation Agreement and its courses for transfer to developing more specific transfer course guidelines at the community college level. In addition, the proposed UNC Strategic Plan moves closer to establishing some sort of consistency across the four year universities as to the competencies to be addressed by general education at the four year universities. The FCIE Committee has discussed the implications of the proposed UNC Strategic Plan for ECU, and has also had representatives in meetings with GA and university representatives from the other universities. We will keep the Faculty Senate informed as we hear more information in the next few months.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked about co-curricular collaborations and if these activities support the course objectives. Professor Brown responded that activities sometimes are in support of a specific curriculum item but are not required to be. The activity could be something that does not relate to a particular class but is housed within the Division of Student Affairs. Professor Brown reminded faculty that he is only addressing those co-curricular activities funded by the Division of Student Affairs.

Professor Sprague asked for a show of support for Professor Brown's follow-up on the [September 2012 Faculty Senate](#) discussion on Co-Curricular Policies and Procedures. The Senate voiced verbal support of the initial information provided.

Professor Brown then provided an informational report on New Diversity Course requirements and the process for getting courses approved for credit, stating that he would bring a more formal report to the Faculty Senate in February.

Professor Brown concluded his reports to the Faculty Senate with information on general education, transfer students, and UNC-GA planning and stated that the committee was working to keep the Faculty Senators abreast of the issues. He stated the Committee is very current on the issues that have arisen due to the new UNC Strategic Plan and will keep the Senate informed of their involvement in specific activities.

E. Unit Code Screening Committee

Professor Patricia Anderson (Education), Chair of the Committee presented first a proposed new [School of Dental Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the proposed new [School of Dental Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-07**

Professor Anderson then presented proposed revisions to the [School of Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the revised [School of Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-08**

Professor Anderson then presented proposed revisions to the [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the revised [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-09**

F. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor David Durant (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee presented a proposed revision to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Subsection: Graduation Requirements. There was no discussion and the proposed revision to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Subsection: [Graduation Requirements](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-10**

Professor Durant then presented a proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I, Subsection VIII.C. Recording of Grades. There was no discussion and the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I, Subsection VIII.C. [Recording of Grades](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-11**

G. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Rachel Roper (Medicine), Chair of the Committee presented formal faculty advice on a Proposed Supplemental Pay for EPA Employees Policy and stated this policy was designed to provide guidance for faculty and EPA nonfaculty employees. The Committee was not recommending any revisions to the proposed policy. There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice on a Proposed [Supplemental Pay for EPA Employees Policy](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-12**

H. Committee on Committees

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee presented first nominees for the election of UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates and Alternates for the one delegate and two alternate seats.

Nominees included:

- Tim Fitzgerald, Medicine
- Derek Maher, Philosophy
- Ralph Scott, Academic Library Services
- Marieke VanWilligen, Sociology
- Marianna Walker, Allied Health Sciences
- Cheryl McFadden, Education (for Alternate seat only)

Prior to casting votes, Professor Sprague thanked Faculty Senate Alternates Professor Tatjana Goodman (Foreign Languages and Literatures) and Professor Jim Tisnado (Art and Design) for serving as tellers during the meeting.

Following elections, Professor Marianna Walker (Allied Health Sciences) was elected to fill the 3-year Delegate term and Professors Cheryl McFadden (Education) and Ralph Scott (Academic Library Services) were elected to fill the two 3-year Alternate terms.

Professor Theurer then presented the first reading of proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee charge. He reminded Senators that the vote on the revisions would take place at the February 26 Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Gibson (Business) asked why the Committee needed to review reports from the University Online Quality Council? Professor Sprague replied that the activities of the administrative committee related to the activities of the academic committee and the collaboration was necessary in order for all entities to be involved in the important issue of distance education. The administrative University Online Quality Council was charged to develop university/college online course standards or recommend adoption of a university rubric to assure on-line course quality standards (e.g. [Quality Matters Rubric](#)), establish a process of approval of online courses and a process of ongoing peer review of online courses, and assist with preparation of the SACS-COC Compliance certificate related to the 19 extracts from the [Principles of Accreditation](#) that cite specific Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements relevant to distance education.

Professor Theurer then presented the second reading of proposed revisions to the following University academic committee charges:

- a. Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee
- b. Committee on Committees
- c. Admission and Retention Policies Committee
- d. Calendar Committee
- e. Student Academic Appellate Committee
- f. Libraries Committee

- g. University Athletics Committee
- h. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
- i. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee
- j. University Curriculum Committee

There was no discussion and the [proposed revisions](#) to the following standing University academic committee charges were approved as presented Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee, Committee on Committees, Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Calendar Committee, Student Academic Appellate Committee, Libraries Committee, University Athletics Committee, Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, University Curriculum Committee. **RESOLUTION #13-13**

Agenda Item VII. New Business

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McFadden
 Secretary of the Faculty
 College of Education

Lori Lee
 Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 29, 2013, MEETING

- #13-01 [Support for the UNC Faculty Assembly](#) and Faculty Advisory Committee Reports on “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina”.
Disposition: Faculty Senate
- #13-02 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [November 7, 2012](#) and [December 5, 2012](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-03 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [December 13, 2012](#), University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-04 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [December 10, 2012](#), Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-05 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [December 7, 2012](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-06 Curriculum matters included in the [January 22, 2013](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including removal of

Foundations Credit for [RELI 4699](#) Special Topics in Religious Studies, approval of Foundations Credit in Social Sciences for [POLS 1050](#) Politics and Global Understanding.

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-07 New [School of Dental Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-08 Revised [School of Medicine](#) Unit Code of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-09 Revised [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-10 Revision to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Subsection: [Graduation Requirements](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-11 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I, Subsection VIII.C. [Recording of Grades](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-12 Formal faculty advice on a Proposed [Supplemental Pay for EPA Employees Policy](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-13 [Revised Committee Charges](#) for Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee, Committee on Committees, Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Calendar Committee, Student Academic Appellate Committee, Libraries Committee, University Athletics Committee, Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, University Curriculum Committee.

Disposition: Chancellor