

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2010

The fourth regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, December 7, 2010, in the East Carolina Heart Institute.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 2, 2010, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Parker (Economics), Miller (Geology), Fitzgerald (Medicine), Willson (Medicine), Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance), Provost Sheerer, and VC Mageean.

Alternates present were: Professors Willis for Reynolds (Academic Library Services), Kanaboshi for Morris (Criminal Justice), Felts for Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance), and Moore for Larson (Nursing).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolution from the October 5, 2010, Faculty Senate meeting:

10-72 Curriculum matters contained in the September 9, 2010, and September 23, 2010, University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolution from the November 2, 2010, Faculty Senate meeting:

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

10-76 Curriculum matters contained in the October 14, 2010, University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

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

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

10-80 Request for Approval of a Residential Construction Track in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.

10-81 Request for Approval of a Commercial Construction Management Concentration in the Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program, within the Department of Construction Management, College of Technology and Computer Science.

10-82 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline (effective July 1, 2011).

10-86 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy.

The Chancellor also acknowledged receipt of the following resolutions:

10-75 Resolution in Support of the UNC Faculty Assembly *Resolution on Academic Freedom*.

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

Special thanks were extended to Chancellor Steve Ballard for providing the additional food and wine for today's meeting.

Welcome was extended to Dean David White (Technology and Computer Science), the new Academic Deans and Directors representative on the Faculty Senate.

Letters concerning unit elections for 2011-2012 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

William Bagnell, Associate VC for Campus Operations, provided the Master Plan drawings for faculty review. An open faculty presentation will take place on Tuesday, January 25, 2011 at 1 pm (prior to the Faculty Senate meeting) to obtain faculty input on the University's Master Plan. Mr. Bagnell will also be in attendance at the January Senate meeting to address any questions.

The Chancellor will host a reception for Faculty Senators, Alternates, and Academic Committee members on Tuesday, March 1, 2011, from 5:00 to 6:30 pm in Spilman Gallery. Formal invitations will be forthcoming.

The Committee on Committees has been charged to seek volunteers to serve on the various 2011-12 academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. A faculty member may complete the volunteer preference form available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/callforvolunteers.htm> and forward it to the Faculty Senate office at faculty senate@ecu.edu or go to OneStop sign in using user name and password and click on "Faculty Committee Volunteer Form" under the Employee Section and complete the committee volunteer preference form.

Please note that the annual Founders Day and University Awards Day celebration will take place on Tuesday, April 26, 2011, at 9 am in the Hendrix Theater. Additional information will be forthcoming.

Vice Chancellor Horns began the meeting by welcoming the Faculty Senate to the West Campus for the meeting today.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard began his remarks to the Faculty Senate by discussing the importance of the strategic planning process. The master planning display boards were present at this meeting. The Chancellor indicated there were lots of options and costs associated with each. In addition, the Chancellor stated, that there are no easy answers and that this is an attempt to prioritize a 25 year growth plan. Although both sides of the campus are described, the decisions on the East Campus are more difficult and more costly and will affect a greater number of people. There were many options and costs associated with each plan and that Dr. Niswander and Bill Bagnell will lead the discussion in January.

The next topic that the Chancellor indicated that he wanted to discuss was politics and economics. He said he looked forward to the day when this would not be quite so necessary. The Chancellor indicated that since the November elections he has been trying to figure out the "new normal" and

that he does not yet know what it means. He stated that he is not optimistic; the indications are that ECU is in an entirely new environment for higher education. There is much uncertainty and many behind the scene rumors about how higher education might be treated at the system level as well as at the legislature. There is a rumor that the new legislative leaders intend to replace half of the UNC Board of Governors, which could be as many as 16 or the 32 members. The new legislative majority can do this if they vote together. The Chancellor indicated that the Board of Governors has been extremely supportive of the UNC system during his seven years at ECU. There could be a radical change in this support that indicates a change in political will power that is not as supportive of higher education. Political changes resulting from the November election could lead to radical changes in the makeup of Board of Governors with new members that are not as supportive of higher education and the UNC system.

There is a great effort to figure out how to best position the university. He stated that certainly there are new opportunities as the "new normal" is clarified. ECU has a great story to tell about the quality of the programs at the university and what it means for our students and for our region. The efficiency and the lean manner in which ECU does business are well recognized throughout the state. Philip Rogers and Chancellor Ballard have been meeting with new legislators to make sure that this story is being told and that it has an impact. These legislators are paying attention to ECU's importance in the region. Next Wednesday the new legislators are being invited to campus for tours, which will continue to be an effective strategy in getting the legislators to understand the university needs. He also appealed to the Faculty Assembly for help in orienting the legislature to the needs of higher education in the state. The Chancellor stated that he is an optimist by nature and proactive by necessity.

This context brings to mind that another administrative effort is to design a campus engagement strategy. This effort will begin on January 10, 2011, the first Monday of the new semester. This effort will continue all spring semester to assist in decisions related to budget planning. The hope is that by early January there should be some structure and then the discussion should be opened to the entire campus for several months to find out what is on the minds of members of the campus communities. There will be three open engagement structures that will be vital. The Faculty Senate University Budget Committee will be a vital engagement component. There will also be a constituent by constituent strategy where every constituent of the university will be included. A member of the executive council will be made available to each constituent group so that these groups can make comments and receive feedback. The Parents Council is an important group at ECU, for example, since it represents twenty-eight thousand families. The same need to address the concerns will be needed for the Staff Senate the Student Government Association. The third strategy includes college by college forums, websites, and various ways to make sure that people with different perspectives are able to share their concerns and receive feedback.

The University now faces the worst budget situation it has seen in a generation. In the last two years alone ECU has lost \$106 million, and as a result, only the worst budget cutting options are left. The easy and middle options are gone. Only the budget cutting options that are painful exist at this time; every part of the campus will now have to "pay the price" of the next group of contribution to budget reductions. A cut of 1% is a little over \$3 million, which means that a cut of 10% which is the best scenario, translates into a \$30 million loss to the University. The UNC Chancellors meet in Chapel Hill on Monday so there may be new budget information disclosed at that meeting.

The state budget gap is at 18%, and the Chancellor stated that he believed that the higher education system was likely to take the average percentage of the difference between revenue projections and spending needs. Some people are forecasting that higher education will drop to the bottom of the spending priorities in this legislature. If K-12 and community colleges are seen by state leaders to be as more important than higher education then the 18% cut is possible. He stated that he is worried that there will be a 20% or \$60 million cut, and for this reason scenarios are currently being developed at this level. We can manage 10% and above that will be tough.

Administrators are currently examining four options for meeting the budget cuts. The first option is for student tuition to go up. The second option is to tap the emergency fund that Vice Chancellor Seitz and the executive council has been building for several years. The third option would be unit cuts across every college. Fourth would be service and program consolidation and vertical cuts and other ways of doing business more efficiently. The amount of money that can be contributed in the first two options is limited. The other two have more dire consequences. All these options will need to be used if the cuts are 15% or above. Generating preliminary scenarios will be the function of the campus engagement strategy, beginning on January 10th. However, it maybe June, July or August before we really know what the total required budget cuts will be. So that, the Chancellor indicated, is the “not so happy news” for Christmas time.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) expressed her appreciation for the Chancellor’s comments and all that he said about the most recent budget situation and plans to handle the expected budget cuts. She then asked why the faculty leaves were cut after they had already been approved by the various academic units earlier in the Fall. She did not think that cutting the leaves now would save a substantial amount of money for the University and that many faculty had already made plans relative to their approved activities. The Chancellor replied that the Academic Council (VC Horns, VC Mageean, and Provost Sheerer) made that decision and asked VC Horns to speak to the question. VC Horns replied that there was an actual cost to the leaves that were granted and that the University community needed to be careful in how State funds were being utilized and that all entities needed to be prudent at this time.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked if we were going to be able to offset the budget cuts with tuition increases. Chancellor replied that he had been told that the tuition increase money should stay with the campuses and he thought that it would be a horrible thing to have the tuition seen as a tax on students. It is hoped that a \$500 tuition increase will remain on campus and that supplemental increases of \$263 plus \$100 in fees will be approved by the ECU Board of Trustees and the UNC Board of Governors to help reduce the budget shortfall

Professor Rigsby (Geology) applauded the Chancellor for wanting to work with the University Budget Committee in January to involve faculty. She then stated that Provost Sheerer had noted in her report that the ECU low productivity program report was due to General Administration by mid-December: The response was that the Academic Council will complete its review of the low performing programs report this week. The final report is due to UNC-GA as of December 14th. The Academic Council has received responses from all program areas, which were cited on the report; and the Vice Chancellors have met with every Dean who has oversight for these programs. The expectation was that department chairs and faculty completed the response to the questions asked of low performing programs. In all of the ECU cases, this was done; and the Academic Council asked further questions of the Deans at our individual meetings with them. Once the report is completed, we will share it openly with Faculty Senate leadership and EPPC.

Professor Rigsby noted that the process is not the way things are supposed to work. The correct process is outlined in the *ECU Faculty Manual* and should involve EPPC working with the Academic Council and other administrative components. She then asked the Chancellor why were they doing it this way now without complete faculty input from the start. Chancellor Ballard agreed with Professor Rigsby and wondered if the time restraint was limiting the time for discussion. VC Horns replied that the Academic Council did send out reports to all units with low productivity programs asking for an analysis on the programs and had the assumption that all faculty would be involved in preparing the reports. The Academic Council has met with the appropriate Deans on any things they had questions about. VC Horns stated that the process mentioned would be followed if programs were to be discontinued. The report on December 14 does not include program discontinuation and units were being asked to increase enrollment and graduation rates. VC Horns stated that she felt that the Academic Council was following the process and thought that it would all be a collaborative process.

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

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Provost Sheerer was out of town and unable to attend the meeting. She provided the following written report to the Senators:

1. The next meeting of the Program Curtailment committee is scheduled for early January at UNC-GA. Because we have lost two members of the group, we await the appointment of their replacements by President Tom Ross. The committee members will also discuss faculty membership on the committee and the involvement of faculty in all next steps. It is expected that faculty representatives will become part of the second phase of this process as of February.
2. The agenda for the most recent CAO meeting included extensive conversation around budget issues, program curtailment and processes, and legislative issues, particularly in light of the newly constituted legislature. There is an expectation that there will be increased focus on faculty workload and enrollment growth funding, which will include continued emphasis on retention, degree production efficiency, and graduation rates.
3. The Academic Council will complete its review of the low performing programs report this week. The final report is due to UNC-GA as of December 14th. We have received responses from all program areas which were cited on the report; and we have met with every dean who has oversight for these programs. The expectation was that department chairs and faculty completed the response to the questions asked of low performing programs. In all of the ECU cases, this was done; and the Academic Council asked further questions of the deans at our individual meetings with them. Once the report is completed, we will share it openly with Faculty Senate leadership and EPPC.
4. If the Academic Council decides to recommend that a program be discontinued, and the Dean and faculty have not made such a recommendation, a meeting will be scheduled with the appropriate parties (dean, department chair, program faculty) for further discussion prior to the report being submitted to UNC-GA.

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

“In the past month, I had heard many comments and concerns about issues involving the university budget, low productivity of academic programs, and considerations for program curtailment. As the Chancellor just outlined, our university will be facing budget cuts, as anticipated, although the extent of our cuts are not known at the present time. As Chancellor Ballard stated, we are anticipating a possible 20% cut, although we hope for less. Of course, faculty remained worried about how such an extensive cut could affect academic programs, faculty positions, and academic programs. A few years ago, when the budget crisis was initially experienced in our state, I heard widespread concern for the possible loss of fixed-term faculty, and empathy for our colleagues who might have potentially lost a position. During the last few years, we have been fortunate that our academic core has been protected. The reduction in force has been minimal and we have not lost faculty positions or programs. However, with the pending major budget cuts, these fears are mounting and concern over the state of our academic programs and academic core have resurfaced. So what will we do? Will faculty be involved? Will the budget situation and possible cuts be transparent to the faculty? Will we have any input?

Amid this climate, faculty remain cautious and look to the leadership of our university to provide guidance and transparency about the state of our budget and affects on our academic core. We have been fortunate that our financial and senior leadership, including Chancellor Ballard and Vice Chancellor Seitz, have been transparent in budget decisions and how enrollment growth funding has contributed to our financial health. We look to our new leadership, under Interim Vice Chancellor Niswander, and his interaction with the University Budget Committee, in continuing to inform the faculty senate and general faculty about the state of financial affairs.

A few years ago, a University Budget task force was developed to assist in obtaining input from and informing the various campus constituencies about the state of the budget. This year, the Provost and I decided to use the University Budget Committee as the source for faculty input to the senior administration and to provide ongoing communication about the budget situation to the faculty senate and ultimately the entire faculty. The Provost and I will be meeting with the committee in December and have asked the committee to provide regular updates to the faculty senate. We feel that through this standing university committee, consisting of faculty and key administrators, including Interim VC Niswander, the faculty will have a consistent voice in providing input to and keeping up with the budget situation at ECU. We may have faculty budget forums as needed, to keep entire budget situation transparent, and to give faculty a chance to express their views/suggestions regarding looming budget cuts.

Related to our financial woes, concerns are mounting about possible program curtailment, with the establishment of a UNC system-wide committee on program curtailment, as chaired by our own Provost Sheerer. Speculations about the elimination of tenured faculty, in the event of program elimination, are growing. As I stated to the Board of Trustees in the November 19th meeting, ‘I ask the BOT and senior administration to continue to have open dialogues and discussions with faculty and faculty senate committees (EPPC) in the event of such decisions, to involve the faculty in such decisions, and to uphold the process as outlined the Faculty Manual, in the event of program elimination, which could potentially affect tenured and non-tenured faculty’.

We are fortunate that our Faculty Manual, in Appendix D, outlines the process in the event that a program is being considered for curtailment. As stated in Appendix D, when the university “is considering a major curtailment in or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program”, the chancellor or delegate prepares a report that outlines the options of such a decision, which may

potentially involve termination of faculty. The Chancellor then provides a report to the EPPC for “written advice and recommendations”, and provides the committee with supplemental information used in development of the report. Following review of this information and interviewing “appropriate persons”, EPPC then prepares a response to the Chancellor. Following this action, if the Chancellor decides to reduce a unit’s faculty, the Chancellor will establish an “ad hoc Faculty Advisory Committee” to advise the Chancellor on the possible reduction. The committee would consist of four elected permanently tenured members of the unit, unit administrator (ex-officio), 8 faculty members from disciplines “complementary to the unit”, as nominated by the Committee on Committees and elected by the Faculty Senate. This Faculty Advisory Committee will then submit a report to the Chancellor regarding the consideration of faculty termination/cuts based on a major program curtailment, program elimination, or financial exigency. As you can see, our university, in line with the UNC Code, has a process in place, for such decisions, involving the faculty senate and faculty in university standing committees, advisory committees, and faculty within units.

I have been in discussion with Provost Sheerer, about transparency in the recent UNC system-wide committee on program curtailment. Hopefully, faculty will be represented on the committee, as suggested by Faculty Assembly. We await the charge and further details on this system wide committee and we are fortunate that Provost Sheerer will share details of the committee as they surface.

For the third area of concern, the GA low productivity reports have surfaced again (every two years) and many of our academic programs are again on the list. Of course, in the face of looming budget cuts and the talk of program elimination, some of our units remained concerned and cautious about this designation. The Provost has recently met with some of these units to obtain faculty feedback and answer questions about these concerns. I recently met with one of the departments, where the Provost and faculty discussed possible solutions to this classification, including different ways of categorizing/naming the degree. I have been impressed with the Provost’s dedication to these faculty and units. She has discussed being available for other units who may be in such a position. We plan to attend the next EPPC meeting, to discuss responses to GA regarding low performing programs and to obtain feedback from the committee on future guidelines.

So, ECU is poised and open to faculty feedback, in many different forms, regarding budget cuts/constraints, low productive academic programs, and possible program curtailment, should the budget cuts be severe enough to warrant such decisions. I will work to ensure that the faculty senate, its committees, and faculty representing units across campus will be involved and informed throughout the remainder of the year, in all of these areas. I ask you, as faculty senators, to keep your faculty informed as well, and to come to forums, be involved in your committees, and to come to the senate with questions and concerns from your faculty. Encourage your faculty to be involved whenever possible and make sure to communicate your ideas openly. Thanks for all that you do!”

There were no questions posed to Professor Walker at this time.

F. Catherine Rigsby, Faculty Assembly Delegate
Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) provided a report on the November 12, 2010, Faculty Assembly Meeting and information on several links to additional information referenced in her report.
Performance Model for Enrollment Funding
Performance Model for Enrollment Expansion
Delaware Study on Teaching Workload

Delaware Faculty Teaching Workload
2011-13 Budget Priorities

She stated that she would like to thank Professor Walker for mentioning how important faculty involvement is at times when budget cuts are being considered. Further Professor Rigsby stated that just because no formal meetings of the UNC system-wide program curtailment committee were being held, did not mean that staff work of the committee was not being done. Questions like what is a program, what does it mean to re-deploy faculty, what is the appeals process, and will special review boards be established are being considered at this time. Professor Rigsby also mentioned that there were no faculty members on this UNC committee at this time. She continued by stating that the Faculty Assembly will be working on a white paper in January because the performance measures being discussed at this time do not encourage or maintain the quality of education in the university system.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked how the search committees will be formed for the many GA Vice Presidents leaving (Academic Affairs, Human Resources, Financial Affairs). Professor Rigsby replied that at this time only one faculty member has been placed on the Academic Affairs Vice President Search Committee.

G. Question Period

Professor Popke (Geography) asked about productivity targets in reference to the proposed Administrative Faculty Workload Policy 3.7.1? If so, there was a misrepresentation of the data?

VC Horns replied that Professor Popke's point came up in discussion in the Faculty Governance Committee and that the Academic Council knows that there is more discussion needed on this issue. She felt that the matrix in the document was important to help understand how ECU received enrollment growth dollars and how it was linked to a faculty member's workload. She stated that his analysis of how we got to the data is accurate – 1990 Delaware study – and that this was not the intent of the administration to have it relate directly to a faculty members' workload. We want to stay in tune with the level of student credit hours being generated, which is how we get enrollment dollars. We need this to know how to allocate State dollars. A designated "Matrix Committee" has recommended that half of new resources should be allocated in accordance with the enrollment growth formula. We thought that this should be a part at this time of the Administrative Faculty Workload policy. She noted that the Chancellor anticipated the enrollment growth funding to be changed in the Spring 2011. Although it has been a great benefit to ECU, the fiscal office sees enrollment formulas differently and more as a performance indicator.

The Chancellor stated that the student growth enrollment formula had created a huge incentive for campuses to increase the production of student credit hours. There is every indication that some performance indicators will be required by the legislature. The Chancellor stated that he agreed with Professor Rigsby that the quality of education needs to be considered when these indicators are devised. Chancellor Ballard stated that the enrollment growth formula was set to account for enrollment funding increases and did not reflect the faculty workload/release issues and it should.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that faculty on the Faculty Governance Committee agreed with what Professor Popke had stated and asked that the Academic Council reconsider their decision. It was currently under the workload assignment section. The information on where the money comes from is important but the location within the document makes it difficult to understand.

Professor Novick (Medicine) stated that he understands that ECU may have a reduction in the number of faculty and that enrollment growth provides for an increase in faculty positions and expressed several ways to approach the current budget situation. He noted the increases in faculty positions from enrollment growth could be used to cover the reduction of faculty, or enrollment growth positions could be treated independently while reducing faculty from unproductive areas. He then asked what approach was being considered. Chancellor Ballard stated all of the above approaches would be used, and that enrollment growth money provides some flexibility since the funds cover not only faculty but also infrastructure support. The Board of Trustees has guidelines to follow and across the board cuts have been discouraged. Reducing resources across all academic units are being contemplated. The information that Dr. Niswander (Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance) was putting together would be beneficial to discuss once made public.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that he understood that a new SOIS instrument was being developed and wondered what the status of the new instrument. He noted that some students had told him that some professors were giving extra credit to those who fill out the SOIS and wondered if there was a policy in place to discourage this behavior. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that, as a member of the SOIS2 Committee, a new questionnaire was being developed and expected a recommendation to the Academic Standards Committee in early Spring 2011, and then reported, after consideration, to the Faculty Senate for approval.

IV. Unfinished Business

The Libraries Committee report and discussion on library resources and faculty needs in relation to SACS reaffirmation was again postponed pending the Committee gathering more information on the budget and drafting more of the SACS report.

V. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee, Carolyn Willis

Professor Willis (Academic Library Services), an ex-officio member Committee, presented curriculum matters contained in the November 11, 2010, University Curriculum Committee minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-87**

B. Agenda Committee, Rodney Roberts

Professor Roberts (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed 2011-2012 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates as follows. There was no discussion and the proposed meeting dates were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-88**

Agenda Committee will meet:	2011/2012 Faculty Senate will meet:
August 30, 2011	September 6, 2011
September 20, 2011	October 4, 2011
October 18, 2011	November 1, 2011
November 15, 2011	December 6, 2011
January 10, 2012	January 24, 2012
February 7, 2012	February 21, 2012
March 13, 2012	March 27, 2012
April 3, 2012	April 17, 2012
	April 24, 2012 (2012/13 organizational mtg.)

C. Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee, Carmine Scavo

Professor Scavo (Political Science), Chair of the Committee, presented the 2011/2012 Research/Creative Activity Granting Guidelines. Applications available online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm> He summarized the proposed major revisions to the grant competition noting the move incrementally to only fund research grants for Humanities and the Arts: There were three major points:

1. To compensate for a lower availability of internal and external funding resources in the areas of the humanities and the arts, preference in the evaluation of grant proposals will be given to proposals in those two areas. It is the topic of the proposal rather than the home department of the PI that will determine the proposal's classification;
2. Faculty from the Brody School of Medicine are now eligible to apply for RCAG funding
3. The deadline for the applications moved back until February, 2011

Professor Rigsby (Geology) asked why the Faculty Senate Committee would not consider grant applications from faculty within natural sciences. Professor Scavo noted that the Committee had decided that competition would be limited for the upcoming 2011-12 funding year. Professor Rigsby asked why couldn't the money be used in the same way as in the past. Why the change now in support of art and humanities and not sciences. She expressed her concern that the Faculty Senate Committee was not hurting those faculty within the sciences involved in research.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that he understood that the School of Medicine was leading the University in external grants so why was the Research Grants Committee opening the limited research funds to the large academic unit. Professor Scavo replied that faculty within the School of Medicine inquired late last spring as to why they could not participate. It was noted that since 1978, there has been a standing tradition that made Medical faculty ineligible for these research funds. He noted that for the past 15 years, research funding for the School of Medicine had changed and that faculty now within that unit were at a disadvantage. He stated that, for example, with the revised granting guidelines, faculty within medical humanities would be given preference along with other faculty within the arts and humanities disciplines.

Professor van Willigen (Sociology) asked who would determine Humanities from Sciences. Professor Scavo replied that the Committee had discussed this and one of the reasons for the change that lists Arts and Humanities specifically was to get around addressing all of the specific academic units that were possibly underfunded. He stated that future funding would relate to actual proposals and not specific academic units.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that in 1978 we all knew that the School of Medicine had money, which is why they were exempted from applying for these grants.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that he felt when he served on the committee that the faculty members were able to take into account what research activities could be funding elsewhere without stating a prohibition on particular units. There were appropriate proposals for seed money, which also helped young faculty. Professor Scavo noted that at in the past this was the "only game in town", but that that is currently not the case. In fact there are now actually three pots of money for research: Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee, start up funds (through funds from VC Mageean), research and development awards. The current research funds are not evenly distributed, with faculty in Arts and Humanities suffering the most. For example last year 27% of the SGAC funds went to Arts and Humanities and of the \$3.5 million in start up funds only 9% went to the Humanities, and of the Research and Creativity Awards only 11% went to the Arts and Humanities. Professor Scavo

reminded the Senators that all that seed money would not be affected by this change in the committee's funding choices.

Professor Jones (Allied Health Sciences) stated that some areas of research require more money. She would like to see the actual distribution numbers for those funded by the Committee in the past few years., She noted that 69 of the funded research grant listed online since 2005 were from the College of Arts and Sciences and noted that maybe the number of grants funded within College of Arts and Sciences should be limited. Since 2005, only 30 grants were funded outside of Arts and Sciences. All ECU faculty need research funds.

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance/Chair of Educational Policies and Planning Committee) asked what formula did the Committee have for preferences and how would it be decided what grants/units would be funded. Prior to faculty taking on the enormous task of writing a research proposal, would preferences be publicized once the committee decided on how they would provide preferential treatment to what academic units? Professor Scavo stated that, by default, VC Mageean funded 25% across social sciences, arts, and humanities.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that he was not asking for favoritism for his particular unit and that since the Faculty Senate represented all faculty and this Committee served at the will of the Faculty Senate, it should foster research growth across campus. He asked that the Committee explore different ways to allocate funds. He noted that the limited research funds given to this committee to oversee should be applicable across the board for everyone. Professor Scavo stated that the Committee charge states generically that the Committee should review grants for funding. New faculty given start up funds are not eligible for these additional research grants funds.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked if the amendment passed with a preference for arts and humanities, the Committee should post the new preferences because to be fair to those in the sciences who would prepare and submit proposals with no chance of funding. Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that before recommending this as a long-term change in funding, the Committee should provide more information on how all academic units are funded, especially before we exclude future research grants for certain academic units.

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) stated that when he served on the Committee in the past, the funding was divided fairly equally among the various academic units. He asked how did the discussion come to the Committee and how was it determined. He wondered what was the tenor in the Committee discussion and asked if there was there a consensus.

Professor Scavo replied that the original proposal was originated from VC Mageean, with the committee last year discussing it after the review of 10-11 proposals. In September 2010, the committee met twice and discussed the proposal further. Of the two major points noted in his remarks to the Senate, there were 16 committee members in favor out of 20.

Professor Jones (Allied Health Sciences) asked for clarification on if a yes vote simply approves what the Committee wishes to do for this year only. She asked if the Committee wished to do this or other things differently next year, and will the Committee have to report back to this body? Chair Walker replied yes. Professor Jones then against the proposed revisions to the granting guidelines and expressed her opposition to the possible future direction of this committee.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated her appreciation for the Committee in its efforts to look out for the underfunded academic units. However, she was against preferential treatment to a smaller group within the full faculty body. She stated her belief in the merits of this Committee and felt that each faculty member on the Committee was capable of looking at the submitted proposals and weighting all of the factors. The members might ultimately come to the end of the process with more humanities applicants funded. She then moved to delete the text, after the first sentence of the second paragraph to the end of the third paragraph (see below).

~~“The Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee (RCAG) solicits proposals for meritorious research or creative activities from eligible East Carolina University faculty members. Faculty members in all Colleges, Institutes and Centers are now eligible including faculty in the Brody School of Medicine. Awards will be made for 2011-12 academic year. Proposals should clearly show that the activity (a) is in the general area of the applicant's field, (b) is of scholarly importance, (c) promises permanent worth, and (d) will not be directed toward graduate thesis research. The proposed research may be a pilot project to be used as a precursor for a proposal to be submitted to an external agency or it may be a stand-alone project. Funds are limited, so only projects that are exemplary in all aspects are likely to be funded.~~

~~Applications for projects in all areas of research and creative activity will be accepted. In this year's competition, the Committee seeks primarily to reward meritorious projects in areas for which there is currently a low availability of internal and external funding sources. Grant proposals in such areas will be given preference in the Committee's evaluation process. The Committee expects that most such proposals will be for projects in the arts, humanities, and underfunded social sciences. The subject matter of the proposal itself will be used to determine whether it is an underfunded discipline rather than the departmental affiliation of the faculty member. Proposals that are arts, humanities, or social science-oriented are solicited from faculty in any unit within the university. Faculty proposing projects in areas for which other sources of funding are available—natural science, medical/health, or some social sciences—are strongly encouraged to specify why RCAG funding is appropriate for their project.”~~

Professor Scavo replied that the motion would make the research grant guidelines the same as past years. Professor Novick (Medicine) asked why did Professor Scavo think his Committee's preference was a good idea? Why have exclusions among the academic units when it came to research funding? All proposals should have equal review and allow the Committee members to evaluate each proposal according to merit. Professor Scavo responded that the idea of restricting (or preference) for particular academic areas was suggested during the Committee's meeting with VC Mageean. Professor Spurr (Mathematics) spoke in favor of the motion. Following discussion, the motion to revise the research granting guidelines was approved.

Following discussion, the 2011/2012 Research/Creative Activity Granting Guidelines were approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #10-89**

D. Faculty Governance Committee, Ken Wilson

Professor Wilson (Sociology) first noted that the Committee was removing their proposed revisions on Academic Freedom (Part II) for further committee discussion. There was no discussion.

Professor Wilson then presented formal Faculty Advice on the proposed Faculty Workload Regulation.

Chair Walker noted that this administrative policy, originally proposed by the Academic Council two years ago, was sent by Chair of the Faculty to the Faculty Governance Committee in August 2009. Suggestions and revisions were sent back and forth between the Committee, Academic Council, Academic Deans, and University Attorney until October 2010. The Academic Council is asking for formal advice from the faculty, by way of the Faculty Governance Committee and now the Faculty Senate. She stated that the Senate will now vote on this feedback from the Committee, relative to this administrative policy, as formal faculty advice. This advice will be submitted to the Chancellor and to the Academic Council, as the delegated authority, in development of this administrative policy.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked why not delete all subsections of 3.7? Professor Wilson replied that there was a different format than what had occurred traditionally and that yes, the Senate could offer advice to amend that section, but asked if the Senate could actually change the policy. Professor Sprague then moved that the administration consider deleting the subsections of 3.7 because the funding formula was likely to change and the workload policy would still exist even when/if the funding formula changed.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) expressed her support of the motion and stated that faculty need to be aware of the funding formula but did not think that the matrix should be a part of the faculty workload policy. She then offered a friendly amendment to Professor Sprague's motion that 3.7 subsections be removed and added that the funding formula matrix be made very clear and available to the campus community. The motion was approved as amended.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that he trusted his Dean and asked if the Faculty Governance Committee had thought yet about how to put in language that protects faculty and keeps deans and other administrators from changing the workload formula depending on various factors. Professor Wilson (Sociology) replied yes, the Committee had thought about this and felt that the current document was better than what had been presented in various documents several times before.

REG # (*To be done by Legal*)

PRR General Subject Matter (*To be done by Legal*)

Authority: Academic Council

History: [*Insert dates the PRR was first enacted and last revised.*]

Related Policies: ECU *Faculty Manual*; UNC Policy Manual, § 300.2.6[G] (Guidelines on Reassigned Time for Faculty), §400.3.1.1 [G] (Guidelines on Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina) and §400.3.4 (Monitoring Faculty Teaching Workloads)

Additional References: A Report of Faculty Teaching Workload Covering the Years 2000 to 2006 (UNC General Administration, 2008); UNC Enrollment Growth Funding Productivity Matrix

Contact for Info: Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (328-0607)

1. Purpose

As per UNC Policy 400.3.1.1 [G], teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions; therefore, while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions.

The purpose of this regulation is to define faculty workloads at East Carolina University as per policies established by the UNC Policy Manual and the ECU *Faculty Manual*. The Brody School of Medicine and the School of Dental Medicine are excluded from this regulation and will be governed by separate workload regulations, which must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences.

2. Definitions

- 2.1. Faculty Workload – the entirety of a faculty member's duties for the relevant period
- 2.2. Relevant Period – academic year, contract period, or time-frame for special duties formally or informally assigned
- 2.3. Instructional Load – the portion of the faculty workload spent on direct instruction and instructional activities
- 2.4. Overload – a workload assignment that exceeds 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE)
- 2.5. Course Reduction – a reduction in the instructional load to allow time for work on non-instructional activities
- 2.6. Faculty Scholarly Reassignment - an approved reassignment for a defined period of time in order for a faculty member to pursue a project involving research or creative activity as addressed in UNC Policy 300.2.6 [G]

3. Workload Assignments

- 3.1. The duties that commonly constitute a faculty member's workload fall under the areas of instruction, research/scholarship or creative activity, service, clinical duties, community engagement and administration.
- 3.2. The Academic Council, in consultation with the academic deans, will establish workload and productivity criteria (see section 3.7 below) for each college for the relevant period.
- 3.3. The dean of each college, in consultation with the chairs and directors within the college, will establish workload and productivity criteria for each department or school in the college for the relevant period. These criteria will be guided by the requirements that the college meet workload and productivity criteria set by the Academic Council.
- 3.4. The chairperson or director of each department or school will establish individual workload and productivity requirements for each member of the faculty for the relevant period. These requirements will cumulatively meet the requirements for the department or school as established by the dean for the relevant period.
- 3.5. For faculty holding a joint appointment, the unit administrator of the faculty member's primary academic unit, in consultation with the administrator(s) of the unit(s) to which the faculty member is jointly appointed, will set the workload and productivity requirements.
- 3.6. As a Doctoral/Research university, the University will maintain an overall equivalent of five 3 semester hour courses per year per 1.0 FTE.
- 3.7. Colleges will produce at least the average student credit hours (SCH) per FTE assigned by the Academic Council (see section 3.2 above) to the respective units as defined by UNC General Administration. **Matrix to be made very clear and available to the campus community but not included in final Administrative Faculty Workload Regulation.**

3.7.1. ~~UNC Enrollment Change Formula Productivity Matrix~~

Program Category	SGH per Instructional Position		
	Undergraduate	Master's	Doctoral
Category I	708.64	169.52	115.56
Category II	535.74	303.93	110.16
Category III	406.24	186.23	109.86
Category IV	232.25	90.17	80.91

3.7.2. ~~Category I Disciplines: Communications & Journalism; English; Mathematics; Philosophy & Religion; Psychology; Corrections & Criminal Justice; Social Sciences; History; Other~~

3.7.3. ~~Category II Disciplines: Area, Ethnic, Cultural & Gender Studies; Education; Foreign Languages, Literatures & Linguistics; Family & Consumer Sciences; Liberal Arts & Sciences, Humanities; Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies; Parks, Recreation, Leisure & Fitness; Business, Management & Marketing~~

3.7.4. ~~Category III Disciplines: Agriculture; Natural Resources & Conservation; Architecture; Computer & Information Sciences; Engineering-related Technologies; Library Science; Biological Sciences; Physical Sciences; Public Administration & Services; Visual & Performing Arts; Health Professions~~

3.7.5. ~~Category IV Disciplines: Engineering; Nursing~~

3.7.6. ~~As per Board of Governors action, student credit hours for student teaching in Education are placed in Category III for all campuses. Medicine and Dentistry are excluded from this model due to distinct funding by the General Assembly.~~

- 3.8. College, department and faculty workload and productivity requirements and assignments may vary in relation to overall assignment of duties, disciplinary standards, class sizes, contact hours, accreditation requirements, and productivity goals.
- 3.9. Department chairs and school directors will ensure that the aggregated faculty workloads for the department or school meet the productivity criteria established for the department or school by the dean. Failure to satisfy the workload and productivity criteria established by the dean for the relevant period may result in an unsatisfactory performance evaluation and/or removal of administrative duties.
- 3.10. As per Appendix C, Part III of the ECU *Faculty Manual*, the unit administrator's annual performance evaluation of faculty members shall employ the criteria contained in the unit code approved by the Chancellor. The evaluation shall be based upon that year's assigned duties and shall consider: teaching, research and creative activities, patient care, service, and other appropriate responsibilities. The relative weight given to teaching, research/creative activity, and service in personnel decisions shall be determined by each unit code. In no case, however, shall service be weighed more heavily than either teaching or research/creative activity.
- 3.11. Workload and productivity data alone are not sufficient justifications for the return of vacant faculty lines or for the allocation of new faculty lines. The Chancellor, Executive Council and/or Academic Council allocate or reallocate resources based upon a variety of factors, including but not limited to, workload and productivity data, institutional priorities, UNC General Administration initiatives, and legislative mandates.

4. Instructional Assignments and Other Responsibilities

4.1. Course Reductions

- 4.1.1. With the exception of assignment of academic administration responsibilities and 100% Faculty Scholarly Reassignment, both of which require approval from the appropriate vice chancellor, a department chair or director may authorize one or more course reductions if the demands of activities, as defined in section 4.1.4 below, warrant a reduction in the instructional load.
- 4.1.2. Reductions in the instructional load are measured in terms of credit hours and are determined on a case by case basis.
- 4.1.3. A faculty member who is granted a course reduction may not receive an instructional overload assignment for additional compensation without approval from the dean and the appropriate vice chancellor.
- 4.1.4. The criteria for course reductions will be grouped into the following reporting categories: course/curriculum development, heavy load of academic advising, accreditation/program review, technology training for instruction, co-curricular activities, academic administration, externally funded research, institutionally supported research, institutional service, service to the public, and service to the profession.
- 4.1.5. At the end of the academic year, the dean is responsible for generating a report which will identify all faculty course reductions for the academic year and the associated outcomes using the unit guidelines established for monitoring productivity. This report will be compiled for the unit and shall be due to the appropriate vice chancellor by the end of the fiscal year.

4.2. Faculty Scholarly Reassignment

- 4.2.1. Administrators shall adhere to guidelines established for 100% Faculty Scholarly Reassignments per UNC Policy 300.2.6[G] and ECU's Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Regulation.

5. Effective Date

- 5.1. This regulation is effective [insert date]

Following discussion, the formal Faculty Advice on the proposed Faculty Workload Regulation was approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #10-90**

E. Academic Standards Committee, Mike Brown
Professor Brown (Psychology), a member of the Committee, first presented the proposed Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses. He first provided background on the issue stating that after the 2005 Foundation Curriculum program was approved, units had to present a proposal to the Academic Standards Committee for approval all new courses for which Foundation Curriculum credit was desired. Pre-2005 courses that received general education credit under the older prefix system were grandfathered into the Foundation Curriculum program. There were now many courses that receive Foundation Curriculum credit, especially upper division courses, which are not being taught as Foundation Curriculum courses. This policy sets out a manner in which units can request that Foundation Curriculum credit be removed from courses that currently receive Foundation Curriculum credit but are not being taught according to the goals of the Foundation Curriculum.

Proposed Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses

Units wishing to remove Foundation Curriculum credit from a course must send a memo to the Academic Standards Committee by email attachment stating the requested action and a list of the courses for which Foundation Curriculum credit should be removed. The list should include the name of the person requesting the action, and the prefix, number, and name of the course. If the course is cross-listed with another unit or is otherwise a cognate in another unit, a letter of approval from the cognate department must be submitted with the request to remove

Foundation Curriculum credit. The Academic Standards Committee will consider the request and, if approved, will take the request to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) asked when would the Committee not approve a faculty member's request to take foundation credit off a course. Professor Sprague (Physics), as a member of the Committee, replied that he could not imagine the Committee not approving the faculty members request. If it did occur, the academic unit's Faculty Senator could then bring it to the floor of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Sprague then asked how about students who are currently taking this course how would the foundation credit be handled for those. Would it be in the catalog? Professor Brown replied that the student would not be penalized and it would be handled in the best manner for the student. Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked if approved, does this complete the loop with the Senate initially approving the course's foundation credit designation? If so, she could not imagine it not happening and if so, it would be a good reason.

Following discussion, the proposed Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-91**

Professor Brown then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection X. Student Conduct.. He noted that the proposed text was first presented to the Faculty Senate in April 2010 (Resolution #10-63) and later returned to the Committee by the Chancellor for additional review. Those additional changes are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

Professor Thomas (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Admission and Retention Policies Committee, who worked with the Academic Standards Committee in drafting the text, offered an editorial change to update the link to the current Student Conduct Process. There was no objection.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"X. Student Conduct

The Student Code of Conduct and the procedures for its administration and enforcement exist to promote standards of behavior that create a positive environment in which students can learn and live. Instructors should be familiar with the Student Code of Conduct and refer students whose behavior violates community standards and/or disrupts any normal curricular or extracurricular functions of the university to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or the Dean of Students. ~~In addition, instructors should follow the steps for addressing Disruptive Academic Behavior in the classroom as outlined in Section Y.~~ The Student Code of Conduct applies to **on- and off-campus behavior of** both individual students and student groups/organizations, **and to both undergraduate and graduate students. The Student Conduct Process, which applies to all ECU students is available at: <http://www.ecu.edu/PRR/11/30/01>. When appropriate, instructors should follow the steps for addressing Disruptive Academic Behavior in the classroom or other academic settings as outlined in Subsection Y of Part V of the ECU Faculty Manual. If student behavior appears threatening or likely to result in immediate physical harm, the faculty member should contact the ECU Police Department.**

The Academic Integrity Policy governs student conduct directly related to academic activities involving ECU students. All alleged violations of the policy must be resolved in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy as found in Part IV Academic Integrity of the

ECU Faculty Manual. The Academic Integrity Policy is available to students at: http://www.ecu.edu/cs-studentlife/policyhub/academic_integrity.cfm.”

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection X. Student Conduct were approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #10-92**

Professor Brown then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsections C. Certification, P. Re-examinations, Q. Release of Directory Information, T. Resale of Complimentary Textbooks, U. Senior Summary Sheet, and BB. Used Books.

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~C.——Certification~~

~~Current certification requirements for teachers and administrative personnel applicable in the State of North Carolina may be found in the School of Education. In order to assist students in pursuing their various programs, faculty members are requested to become acquainted with these requirements. If there are any questions regarding their interpretation, faculty members are urged to consult with the dean of the School of Education and the director of teacher education. For other regulations governing student programs, see the undergraduate and graduate catalogs.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~P.——Re-examinations~~

~~Only those graduating seniors in the last semester, who are passing a course at the time an examination is given, and who fail the examination will be given one re-examination on the course. No other re-examinations are to be given. A grade change resulting from a re-examination must be on file in the registrar's office one week after the original scheduled examination.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~Q.——Release of Directory Information~~

~~It is the policy of the university to make routinely available certain directory information on its students. This policy is for the convenience of students, parents, other members of the university community, and the general public. In compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (P.L. 93-380), the university will continue this policy of releasing directory information, such information being defined by the act as some or all of the following categories: the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, major field of study, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, weight and height of members of athletic teams, dates of attendance, degrees and awards received, and the most recent previous educational agency or institute attended by the student. If any student does not wish any or all of this directory information released without his or her prior consent, then the student must notify the Office of the Registrar in writing within seven days after registration day of the current term of enrollment.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~T.——Resale of Complimentary Textbooks~~

~~East Carolina University has an established policy against the resale of complimentary copies of textbooks and encourages faculty to ask book buyers who come on campus to show their permit to solicit required by university regulations. Faculty are encouraged to dispose of complimentary copies of textbooks by giving them to students or returning them to the publisher. (Faculty Senate Resolution #88-53, December 1988.)~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~U.—Senior Summary Sheet~~

~~Advisers shall confer with first-semester seniors concerning their remaining requirements for graduation. At this time the senior summary sheet is filled out in triplicate, one copy to be sent to the registrar for immediate verification, one to be kept by the student, and the third to be retained by the student's major department or school. The senior summary sheet will note the appropriate undergraduate catalog edition carrying the requirements to be met, the degree sought, the intended date of completion of all requirements, and the requirements unfulfilled to date. Remaining requirements will be listed specifically as provided in the appropriate catalog.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~BB.—Used Books~~

~~At the beginning of each semester, Dowdy Student Stores try to have on hand as many used books as possible since this is the best means available to help students keep the cost of their textbooks down. The store will pay 50 percent of the new price provided the store is not already overstocked on readopted texts. The used book will be sold at 75 percent of the new price. If that book is resold to the store, 50 percent of the new price will be paid again.~~

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsections C. Certification, P. Re-examinations, Q. Release of Directory Information, T. Resale of Complimentary Textbooks, U. Senior Summary Sheet, and BB. Used Books were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-93**

F. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Joseph Thomas
Professor Thomas (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, asked to remove their report on proposed revisions on the Academic Integrity Policy for further revisions/edits to incorporate graduate school feedback. There was no discussion.

G. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Scott Gordon
Professor Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed additional revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section III. Curriculum Development. He noted that the proposed text was first presented to the Faculty Senate in January 2010 (Resolution #10-03) and later returned to the Committee by the Chancellor for additional review. Following that review, additional changes are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~striketrough~~.

There was no discussion and the proposed additional revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section III. Curriculum Development were approved as presented.
RESOLUTION #10-94

H. Faculty Welfare Committee, Katrina DuBose
Professor DuBose (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, first presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section III. Institutional Services Available to Faculty, Subsection R. Tuition Privileges for Faculty.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

“Tuition Privileges for Faculty

In accordance with the North Carolina General Statute, East Carolina University faculty are eligible to take classes at a reduced cost. See http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/cashier/Tuition-Waiver.cfm for more information.”

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked about “reduced cost” instead of “free tuition”. Professor DuBose replied that there are still fees associated with tuition so it is actually not free.

Professor Willis (Academic Library Services) asked if the current policy has been changed from allowing faculty to take one free class to now only taking a class at a reduced cost? She asked if the breakdown of fees would remain the same? Would the faculty be allowed to take classes during the summer? Professor DuBose replied that she did not know if/when the current fee breakdown would change so the Committee agreed to include a link that provides details to the most current information.

Professor Sprague (Physics) read the policy as linked, which stated, “two courses are allowed each academic year with only certain fees provided.” Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that his impression was that the policy did include summer school since it was financed differently. Professor Brown (Psychology) noted that the choice of wording was confusing and that he wondered if the Senate could recommend changing the text to reflect two courses. There was no formal motion to edit the proposed document.

Following discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section III. Institutional Services Available to Faculty, Subsection R. Tuition Privileges for Faculty were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-95**

Professor DuBose then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. Salary Policies.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

“Salary Policies

Faculty annual salaries are paid semimonthly. New employees receive the first check on the last work day of September. When the 15th or last day of a month falls on a non-work day for the business office, distribution of checks will be made on the last work day prior to that day. Arrangements must be made with the payroll office to have checks deposited in a local bank to the faculty’s account. Salaries for summer term I teaching are paid in three installments. Salaries for summer term II are paid in two installments, and salaries for 11-week summer term are paid in five installments.

Federal and state income tax withholdings are based off information furnished to the payroll office on the US Treasury Department Form W-4 and North Carolina Department of Revenue Form NC-4, respectively

For a more detailed description on Salary Policies (e.g. overloads, summer overloads, research/creative activity, less than full time employees, etc.) see the following resources: ECU Policy Manual: <http://www.ecu.edu/prr/>, Human Resources: <http://www.ecu.edu/hr/>, Financial Services (payroll): http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/payroll/index.cfm.”

Professor Rigsby (Geology) asked if the policy on maximum salary relating to 100% or 133% had been changed yet by administration? If not, and if/when it does how will the faculty find out about the change? Professor DuBose noted that she was not privy to the activities of the Administrative EPA Personnel Policies Committee and did not know if there would be changes. Chair Walked noted that she served on this administrative committee and would keep the faculty "in the loop" once this issue was discussed again among the group.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) stated his longstanding concern that new employees did not receive their first checks until the last day of September and that this was seen as terrible for new employees. He asked why this continued because new employees should receive their salary either the last day of August or September 15 to allow them an opportunity to start insurance, etc. when they are hired. VC Horns stated paychecks for new employees were no longer held until the end of September. Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) noted that some faculty start in the spring, so the text should be reworded to address those situations too.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked that since the funds were deposited directly, should the text in the manual still refer "checks"? Professor Christian (Business) made a motion to change the text to "direct deposit". There was no objection.

Professor VanWilligen (Sociology) stated that the links provided did not provide specific information. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that the links needed to provide current information. He then moved to return this report to the Committee for further revisions. Professor Boklage (Medicine) noted that maybe the information had not yet been defined.

Donna Payne, University Attorney, noted that removing items from the *ECU Faculty Manual* were complicated. The process, agreed upon by the administration and Chair of the Faculty, involved items being kept available until a permanent administrative home was created. That was why some of the information may not yet be available through the link provided. Nothing is going to disappear until there is a home. All areas of the University, including human resources, financial aid, cashier, student life, academic affairs, and health sciences were reviewing their policies and procedures and working to update all information before it is made available on the University's PRR website.

Professor Sprague (Physics) offered to withdraw his motion since the informational links could be revised at any time. Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that she did not think that the full report needed to be returned to the Committee but did support the notion that all links being placed in the *ECU Faculty Manual* should be functioning, informational links. Professor Boklage (Medicine) agreed that, with respect to those links, it would serve no purpose to send it back to the Committee now. VC Horns stated that she felt that additional work on the text was necessary.

The motion to return the report to the Committee for further revisions was not withdrawn and, once acted on, the report on proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. Salary Policies was returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further review. **RESOLUTION #10-96**

Professor DuBose then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection A. Substance Abuse Policy.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that the last sentence in first paragraph referenced "Illegal drugs" whereas later in the text it was referenced "illegal and abusive use of drugs" and offered an editorial revision to make the wording the same in both areas. There was no objection to this editorial revision.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"A. Substance Abuse Policy

The highest standards of personal and professional conduct must be maintained by faculty, staff, and students. Illegal or abusive use of drugs or alcohol, referred to in this policy as substance abuse, by members of the university community adversely affects the mission of the university and is prohibited. A substance abuse policy adopted by the East Carolina University Board of Trustees, consistent with the UNC Board of Governors' Policy on Illegal Drugs, is intended to: prevent substance abuse through a strong educational effort; encourage and facilitate the use of counseling services and rehabilitation programs by those members of the university community who require their assistance in stopping illegal or abusive use of drugs or alcohol; and discipline appropriately those members of the university community who engage in illegal drug or alcohol related behaviors.

The substance abuse policy of East Carolina University is located at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/uqcat/policies.cfm>. The UNC Board of Governor's Policy on Illegal Drugs is located at http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?pg=dl&id=300&inline=1&return_url=%2Fpolicy%2Findex.php%3Fpg%3Dvb%26tag%3DChapter%2B1300." **Check links**

Following brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection A. Substance Abuse Policy were approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #10-97**

Professor DuBose then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts.

Proposed reorganization and additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

- "II. ~~Welfare and Benefits~~ **and Leave**
- A. ~~Hospitalization Insurance~~ **Benefits**
 - B. ~~Disability Income Plans~~ **Workers' Compensation**
 - C. ~~Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program~~ **Vacation and Sick Leave**
 - D. ~~Group Insurance Plans~~ **Faculty Serious Illness and Parental Leave Policy**
 - E. Social Security
 - F. ~~Deferred Compensation Plan~~
 - G. ~~Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K)~~
 - H. Tax Deferred Annuity
 - I. ~~US Savings Bonds~~

- ~~J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits~~
- ~~K. Vacation and Sick Leave~~
- ~~L. Workers' Compensation~~
- ~~M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts~~

II. ~~Welfare and Benefits and Leave~~

A. Benefits

A variety of benefits are available to permanent employees of ECU, based on specific eligibility criteria. All benefits are subject to state regulations, university policies and procedures, and individual plan documents. Employee benefits are subject to change and reasonable notice is provided to employees by Human Resources when changes occur. Information about these plans may be obtained from the University Benefits Office in Human Resources. See the University Policy Manual for more information.

B. Workers' Compensation

All university employees, including paid student help, are covered by workers' compensation that provides for certain benefits in the event there is an on-the-job accident, causing injury. If and when an on-the-job accident causing injury should occur, it should be reported immediately to the supervisor who will notify the appropriate university offices. For additional information about workers' compensation and for related forms, see the University Policy Manual.

C. Vacation and Sick Leave

Faculty with professorial rank who have twelve-month employment contracts may earn leave as authorized by the vice chancellors and chancellor. Teaching faculty who have a nine-month employment contract do not earn any vacation or sick leave.

D. Faculty Serious Illness and Parental Leave Policy

This policy provides leave with pay for eligible faculty for cases of serious health conditions, maternity leave, or parental leave as defined by the Family and Medical Leave Act. See the University Policy Manual for more information.

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) stated for a point of clarification, workers compensation was not the same as disability so he thought that the two should be listed in this section of the manual. He stated that combining the two was fine, as long as they are both listed.

Professor VanWilligen (Sociology) stated that disability should be included here and agreed that it was completely different from workers compensation. She stated that retirement should also be added to this section. Professor DuBose replied that retirement would be addressed by the Committee in early spring.

Professor Brown (Psychology) suggested that under B. all university employees "help" should be changed to "workers". Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that, in the 2nd sentence, the word "should" should be deleted. Professor Boklage (Medicine) suggested that "accident causing" be deleted.

Professor Sprague (Physics) moved to have the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits for further discussion, to make those noted editorial revisions and include retirement in this section. There was no objection.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts were returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further consideration. **RESOLUTION #10-98**

VI. New Business

There was no new business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time. The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 7, 2010, MEETING

10-87 Curriculum matters contained in the November 11, 2010, University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-88 2011-2012 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates, as follows:

Agenda Committee will meet:	2011/2012 Faculty Senate will meet:
August 30, 2011	September 6, 2011
September 20, 2011	October 4, 2011
October 18, 2011	November 1, 2011
November 15, 2011	December 6, 2011
January 10, 2012	January 24, 2012
February 7, 2012	February 21, 2012
March 13, 2012	March 27, 2012
April 3, 2012	April 17, 2012
	April 24, 2012 (2012/13 organizational mtg.)

Disposition: Faculty Senate

10-89 Revised 2011/2012 Research/Creative Activity Granting Guidelines.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

10-90 Formal Faculty Advice on proposed Faculty Workload Regulation.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-91 Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses, as follows:

“Units wishing to remove Foundation Curriculum credit from a course must send a memo to the Academic Standards Committee by email attachment stating the requested action and a

list of the courses for which Foundation Curriculum credit should be removed. The list should include the name of the person requesting the action, and the prefix, number, and name of the course. If the course is cross-listed with another unit or is otherwise a cognate in another unit, a letter of approval from the cognate department must be submitted with the request to remove Foundation Curriculum credit. The Academic Standards Committee will consider the request and, if approved, will take the request to the Faculty Senate for final approval.”

Disposition: Chancellor

10-92 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection X. Student Conduct, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

X. Student Conduct

The Student Code of Conduct and the procedures for its administration and enforcement exist to promote standards of behavior that create a positive environment in which students can learn and live. Instructors should be familiar with the Student Code of Conduct and refer students whose behavior violates community standards and/or disrupts any normal curricular or extracurricular functions of the university to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or the Dean of Students. ~~In addition, instructors should follow the steps for addressing Disruptive Academic Behavior in the classroom as outlined in Section Y.~~ The Student Code of Conduct applies to **on- and off-campus behavior of both individual students and student groups/organizations, and to both undergraduate and graduate students. The Student Conduct Process, which applies to all ECU students is available at: <http://www.ecu.edu/PRR/11/30/01>. When appropriate, instructors should follow the steps for addressing Disruptive Academic Behavior in the classroom or other academic settings as outlined in Subsection Y of Part V of the ECU Faculty Manual. If student behavior appears threatening or likely to result in immediate physical harm, the faculty member should contact the ECU Police Department.**

The Academic Integrity Policy governs student conduct directly related to academic activities involving ECU students. All alleged violations of the policy must be resolved in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy as found in Part IV Academic Integrity of the ECU Faculty Manual. The Academic Integrity Policy is available to students at: http://www.ecu.edu/cs-studentlife/policyhub/academic_integrity.cfm.”

Disposition: Chancellor

10-93 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsections C. Certification, P. Re-examinations, Q. Release of Directory Information, T. Resale of Complimentary Textbooks, U. Senior Summary Sheet, and BB. Used Books, as follows:

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

C.——Certification

~~Current certification requirements for teachers and administrative personnel applicable in the State of North Carolina may be found in the School of Education. In order to assist students in pursuing their various programs, faculty members are requested to become acquainted with these requirements. If there are any questions regarding their interpretation, faculty members are urged to consult with the dean of the School of Education and the director of teacher~~

~~education. For other regulations governing student programs, see the undergraduate and graduate catalogs.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~P. — Re-examinations~~

~~Only those graduating seniors in the last semester, who are passing a course at the time an examination is given, and who fail the examination will be given one re-examination on the course. No other re-examinations are to be given. A grade change resulting from a re-examination must be on file in the registrar's office one week after the original scheduled examination.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~Q. — Release of Directory Information~~

~~It is the policy of the university to make routinely available certain directory information on its students. This policy is for the convenience of students, parents, other members of the university community, and the general public. In compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (P.L. 93-380), the university will continue this policy of releasing directory information, such information being defined by the act as some or all of the following categories: the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, major field of study, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, weight and height of members of athletic teams, dates of attendance, degrees and awards received, and the most recent previous educational agency or institute attended by the student. If any student does not wish any or all of this directory information released without his or her prior consent, then the student must notify the Office of the Registrar in writing within seven days after registration day of the current term of enrollment.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~T. — Resale of Complimentary Textbooks~~

~~East Carolina University has an established policy against the resale of complimentary copies of textbooks and encourages faculty to ask book buyers who come on campus to show their permit to solicit required by university regulations. Faculty are encouraged to dispose of complimentary copies of textbooks by giving them to students or returning them to the publisher. (Faculty Senate Resolution #88-53, December 1988.)~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~U. — Senior Summary Sheet~~

~~Advisers shall confer with first-semester seniors concerning their remaining requirements for graduation. At this time the senior summary sheet is filled out in triplicate, one copy to be sent to the registrar for immediate verification, one to be kept by the student, and the third to be retained by the student's major department or school. The senior summary sheet will note the appropriate undergraduate catalog edition carrying the requirements to be met, the degree sought, the intended date of completion of all requirements, and the requirements unfulfilled to date. Remaining requirements will be listed specifically as provided in the appropriate catalog.~~

Remove from the Faculty Manual.

~~BB. — Used Books~~

~~At the beginning of each semester, Dowdy Student Stores try to have on hand as many used books as possible since this is the best means available to help students keep the cost of their textbooks down. The store will pay 50 percent of the new price provided the store is not already overstocked on readopted texts. The used book will be sold at 75 percent of the new price. If that book is resold to the store, 50 percent of the new price will be paid again.~~

Disposition: Chancellor

10-94 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section III. Curriculum Development.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-95 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section III. Institutional Services Available to Faculty, Subsection R. Tuition Privileges for Faculty, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

“Tuition Privileges for Faculty

In accordance with the North Carolina General Statute, East Carolina University faculty are eligible to take classes at a reduced cost. See http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/cashier/Tuition-Waiver.cfm for more information.”

Disposition: Chancellor

10-96 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. Salary Policies returned to Faculty Welfare Committee for further review.

Disposition: Faculty Welfare Committee

10-97 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection A. Substance Abuse Policy, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

“A. Substance Abuse Policy

The highest standards of personal and professional conduct must be maintained by faculty, staff, and students. Illegal or abusive use of drugs or alcohol, referred to in this policy as substance abuse, by members of the university community adversely affects the mission of the university and is prohibited. A substance abuse policy adopted by the East Carolina University Board of Trustees, consistent with the UNC Board of Governors' Policy on Illegal Drugs, is intended to: prevent substance abuse through a strong educational effort; encourage and facilitate the use of counseling services and rehabilitation programs by those members of the university community who require their assistance in stopping illegal or abusive use of drugs or alcohol; and discipline appropriately those members of the university community who engage in illegal drug or alcohol related behaviors.

The substance abuse policy of East Carolina University is located at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ugcat/policies.cfm>. The UNC Board of Governor's Policy on Illegal Drugs (Chapter 1300.1) is located at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>.

Disposition: Chancellor

10-98 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation

and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts returned to Faculty Welfare Committee for further review.

Disposition: Faculty Welfare Committee