

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2012**

The sixth regular meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 21, 2012, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

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 [January 24, 2012](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Zoller (Art and Design), Miller (Geology), Fitzgerald (Medicine), Terrian (Medicine), and Rigsby (Geological Sciences/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Rodriguez for Romack (Chemistry), Smith-Canter for Voytecki (Education), Simpson for Russell (Health Sciences Library), Hernandez for Russell (History), Robinson for Shlapentokh (Math), Ding for Smith (Technology and Computer Science), and Frank for Sanders (Technology and Computer Science).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved partial resolutions from the January 24, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting:

- #12-10 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [December 8, 2011](#).
- #12-16 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [January 13, 2012](#), meeting minutes, including (a) Request to move and rename the Media Production (MPRD) concentration in the School of Communication to the [Cinematic Arts and Media Production \(CAMP\) concentration](#) in the BFA in Art Program within the School of Art and Design in the College of Fine Arts and Communication and (b) Request to establish a new concentration in the PhD program in Biomedical Physics: Integrated PhD in Biomedical Physics and MS in Physics – [Medical Physics concentration](#) within the Department of Physics in the College of Arts and Sciences

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Council invites faculty, staff, and student input on the initiatives being developed to support ECU's QEP, "Write Where You Belong," a multi-faceted, multi-year project to integrate, align, and reinforce writing instruction for students throughout and across the curriculum. For more information about the QEP and how you can provide feedback and suggestions, see the handout at your seat or contact Dr. Wendy Sharer, QEP Director, at sharerw@ecu.edu.

The 2011/12 EPA Personnel Salary information is now available on One Stop, under employee, entitled *EPA Personnel and Salary Information*. For those interested, the past 5 years of EPA salary information is also available on One Stop.

State of the University Address, is scheduled for 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 2012, in the Hendrix Theatre, Mendenhall Student Center. Students, faculty, and staff – as well as members of the Greenville community – are welcome. If you are unable to attend, you can access the event or view it afterward at the link below: [State of the University Address](#)

Faculty members are reminded that April 1 Chancellor Ballard will call for candidates for the prestigious Oliver Max Gardner award. A copy of the University's nomination procedures is available at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxgardneraward.htm>.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that he had three topics to bring to the Senate's attention. The first was a brief synopsis of the issues at the February Board of Governors Meeting. The University's proposal for a 9.3% tuition increase was passed by the Board. ECU's increase was in the middle of the system wide tuition proposals, raising ECU students' tuition for next fall by just under \$500.00. The increase will recapture less than 25% of the University's overall budget cuts (ECU lost \$49 million last year). Another Board of Governors topic was Financial Aid. Every year, a certain percentage of tuition increase goes into financial aid. Directing tuition increase funds to financial aid is a progressive tax on students to support those students with the greatest financial need. Chancellor Ballard felt that the Board of Governors wished to prohibit the mandatory allocation of tuition dollars to financial aid. The Chancellor does not agree with this and feels that a progressive tax is appropriate given the nature of ECU's student body. The University has a huge need for financial aid that cannot be met by private giving. The Chancellor asked that the Faculty Senate give feedback on this issue and perhaps a resolution after formal discussions have been held. Chancellor Ballard stated that another important topic was the continuation of the request for performance based budgeting. ECU has been implementing performance budgeting for the past three years using the indicators that the author of the News & Observer article stated should be used. Erskine Bowles started this with his focus on retention graduation rates and efficiency of degree production. The Chancellor stated that Dr. Sheerer would say more on ECU's QEP Committee at a later time during the meeting. He stated that the old funding formula is under great criticism and will likely be replaced by other systems probably including performance based budgeting.

The next topic addressed additional base budget cuts that are coming to the UNC System. The UNC General Administration has been asked by the State Administrative Fiscal Office for priorities that could be cut. The Chancellor said this is a hard thing to do after losing 1.2 billion dollars from the base budget over the past 4 years. The Chancellor is concerned about the probability of a 2-3% base budget cut across the System next year. There is a structural deficit within the State despite the fact that revenues are slightly above projections for this time of year. Even if higher revenues continue into April, the Medicare deficit will remain in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars and will still require the 2-3% cut to the base budget. The Chancellor stressed that he is working to express to the legislature how much the University System means to the East and to the State.

The third topic addressed by the Chancellor concerned the new athletic conference being developed. One of the stipulations that ECU required was to remain in the Eastern Region to compete against local schools. The intent was to merge the remaining eight teams from Old Mountain West Conference and the remaining eight teams from Conference USA into a new conference with the commitment to grow the number of members from these original 16 to perhaps 36 over time with four divisions set by regional geographic scope. The Chancellor stated that the University would hope to be playing teams in the East. There are a lot of hopeful teams from the West, but more teams from the East need to be found. The Chancellor anticipates that once legal documents get resolved, in 90 to 120 days, there is likely to be a new conference. This still rests on the University stressing the best class schedule for student athletes. The Chancellor stated that the University feels that it is an obligation to student athletes to earn their degrees. The University is opposed to midweek games, and long travel

distances for any sports. The Chancellor stated that student success depends on their ability to be in class.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) expressed his support for the Chancellor's comment that included "Success depends on presence in the classroom." In reference to tuition and the Board of Governor's actions, Professor Robinson wondered why the NC Constitution was not recognized that referenced education being free through college. He stated that he thought that raising tuition for North Carolina was a violation of the Constitution. The NC Constitution requires universities to keep the State education system free or at minimal cost. Chancellor Ballard agreed with the comments expressed by Professor Robinson.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his remarks and leadership in these crucial times for our University.

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

Provost Sheerer stated that she was asked by the Agenda Committee to address three topics, several of which could require more time than allotted for today's meeting. The first topic the Provost referenced was enrollment-based funding versus performance-based funding. The Provost stated that a system-wide committee has been formed to look at this issue, composed of provosts and financial VCs. From their draft report, performance-based funding is the way the University is moving. The committee will revise current UNC System enrollment growth projections based on national calls for an increase in higher education. They wish to engage the North Carolina Community College System and their review for enrollment projection and work force needs. They wish to consider new degree programs and low degree programs as well as projected work force needs in the state. They also wish to consider providing incentives for increased enrollment in those programs that benefit the state. The committee also wished to investigate distance education and how it can contribute to enrollment growth and to remove barriers among the UNC System to make distance education more accessible. President Tom Ross recently addressed the need for everyone to contribute across the System in developing online programs, specifically referencing foreign languages. The particular performance indicators are nothing new, but the committee will work to re-establish targets for graduation and retention based on comparative data from revised peer institutions. They will also consider the number of Pell Grant recipients as a weighted factor in assessing each institution's success, as well as those institutions that have a large amount of students that transfer. The Provost stated that these issues would become front and center.

The Provost then addressed the second issue of a move to standardize academic policies across the UNC System. The Chief Academic Officers' meeting is this upcoming Monday, and the first item on the agenda is something called Academics First. The UNC System is trying to decide whether to establish some blanket academic policy guideline around retention and academic performance. For example, one proposal suggests having an umbrella policy setting minimum standards for academic progress. Another suggests that federal financial aid and good academic progress should be the same across the System, while another suggests making a 2.0 GPA the requirement for graduation and should be standard for all campuses. The whole draft packet is on the agenda and the Provost welcomes comments on it. Another example of becoming more consistent is with academic program and curriculum development. A small committee worked with Dr. Griffin to respond to proposal of streamlining this process. There has also been discussion of developing a new SPA and personnel system.

The third issue addressed by the Provost was that of the unit codes driving how the faculty are evaluated for promotion to full professor. Most units at ECU are on the block review plan, with all tenured faculty reviewed during the same year. The next review is 2013/2014. The major changes are that the tenure committees must begin to revise units' existing review standards. The faculty member under review will provide an updated vita and materials for review. The performance review committee must be elected each year. A faculty member found deficient must be given a detailed performance plan with a specified timeline and progress meetings for this plan must be held at least semi-annually. These changes must be reviewed by the committee and approved by the appropriate Vice Chancellor, so there is work to do.

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) asked about post-tenure review and the mentioned "block review" schedule and what determined the review schedule. Provost Sheerer replied that the units voted to chose block or serial review sometime ago. The majority of units use block review for Post-Tenure Review.

Chair Walker thanked Provost Sheerer for her remarks and support of faculty.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

"Today my remarks will center on the Faculty Senate and its responsibilities, as charged to do in the UNC Code and the ECU Faculty Manual. According to Appendix A, which is the Faculty Constitution and by-laws of East Carolina University, the 'purpose of the of the faculty organization shall be to provide the means by which the faculty is enabled to fulfill its function with respect to academic and educational policies and other affairs of East Carolina University. The Faculty Senate and the various committees on which the faculty serve shall be the primary media for the essential joint effort of faculty and administration in the government of East Carolina University.'

In Section XI. Functions of the Faculty Senate, Appendix A states: 'The Faculty Senate may, at its own discretion, seek the advice and counsel of any member of the general faculty. In exercising its function the Faculty Senate shall establish whatever procedures are necessary. The Faculty Senate shall ratify, amend, or remand all matters of academic policy or faculty welfare which have been recommended by any standing or special committee of East Carolina University, or initiate any policies in such matters which it deems desirable.'

As the preceding text implies, the Faculty Senate, represents each of the academic units and as such, the elected senators represent the faculty of their respective units in any matter that comes to the senate, including matters affecting all faculty. This body is important in its representation of the faculty, as the legislative and advisory body, and in its reporting and recommendations to the Chancellor. Senators and alternates have a responsibility to represent the faculty of the unit. With this responsibility comes accountability. We should always be mindful of this in our continued work this year.

As you are aware, there is an additional Faculty Senate meeting on March 20, with the primary focus on the Reorganization White Paper of the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) relating to program. This white paper was made available to the campus community on February 15 and the PPC is seeking advice and feedback relative to the possibilities of changes in structure and reorganization in an effort to increase administrative efficiencies and establish strategic hierarchical

structures. Following this feedback and input from surveys, forums, and other feedback, the first draft of possible reorganization scenarios will be provided to the campus community on March 30.

The special called Faculty Senate meeting is to allow members of the Faculty Senate to discuss this Reorganization White Paper. At this meeting, Dr. Ron Mitchelson will present the background and nature of this reorganization white paper. In addition, Dr. Todd Fraley, with the University Budget Committee will address questions and receive comments from senators relative to the financial implications for reorganization. Following reports there will be discussion among the Senators.

I encourage you to seek faculty input during the next four weeks, relative to strengths, concerns, or suggestions from faculty in your unit and in your college.

The Faculty Senate welcomes written feedback from Senators and others that can supplement the Faculty Senate's response to the PPC report. Feel free to email written comments to the Faculty Senate and we will make sure that they are distributed to the full Senate body. Through this feedback to the PPC, many voices, disciplines, and units will be represented in a common purpose – to give faculty a chance to offer their perspectives prior to any changes to the current ECU academic structure.

During the next month, there will be forums in your colleges, and a survey for individual comments, relating to this initial reorganization report and I suggest senators to attend the forums. Senators should step back and think about their unit's place and role as part of the university and aid their colleagues in addressing their concerns in constructive ways. However you, as the faculty representative from your academic unit, obtain input on the possible reorganization options, please make sure you represent your unit, in oral and/or written form. We need reflective discourse written in the words of faculty across this diverse campus.

I, as the Chair of the Faculty ask each of you, as a part of the Faculty Senate to meet our responsibility to serve as a media for the joint efforts of faculty and administration in the governing of ECU and talk with your colleagues to encourage involvement in the process and open discussion on what is best for the University as we move forward. We as faculty need to be a voice in strategically planning for the future, preserving strengths, encouraging growth and addressing higher education for our students. This is a crucial time for us at ECU and each of you is asked to continuously step up and demonstrate your leadership. The faculty of this great institution are counting on us to carry their concerns forward and be vocal on their behalf.”

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) stated that the current PPC review process was being misunderstood by not only faculty and staff but students too. He asked that Chair Walker ensure that those speaking about the PPC report assist in helping students understand the complex process being undertaken. He stressed the need to be mindful of how we communication to the student and public.

F. Election of Faculty Officers Nominating Committee

According to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, [Section VIII](#), the following Faculty Senators were elected by acclamation to serve on the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee: Professors Ken Wilson (Sociology), Cheryl McFadden (Education), John Howard (Communication), Mark Richardson (Music), and Jeff Popke (Geography). The committee will meet soon to begin their work and provide a slate of Faculty Officer nominees to the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2012.

G. Question Period

Professor Popke (Geography) asked Provost Sheerer, in reference to the new plus/minus grading system that goes into effect Fall 2012, if this was an optional for faculty. Provost Sheerer replied that she did not know whether the plus/minus grading system was optional for faculty. The Provost added that it had been years since the new grading policy was passed by the Faculty Senate and she needed to review the material again. She thought that this item was going back to a committee for further review. Chair Walker noted that Professor Joseph Thomas, Chair of the Admission and Retention Policies Committee, had graciously drafted an information sheet that was distributed to Mary Schulken to address requests from the local newspaper and news stations and that Professor Thomas would be present later in the meeting to address any questions on the new grading system.

IV. Unfinished Business

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

V. Report of Graduate Council and Committees

A. Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 18, 2012](#) and [February 1, 2012](#), which included curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Human Ecology, Department of Physics, College of Education, and College of Allied Health Sciences.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 18, 2012](#) and [February 1, 2012](#), which included curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Human Ecology, Department of Physics, College of Education, and College of Allied Health Sciences were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #12-18**

B. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [January 12, 2012](#) and [January 26, 2012](#) which included curricular actions within College of Fine Arts and Communication, Honors College, Department of Anthropology, Department of English, College of Health and Human Performance, College of Technology and Computer Science, and Office of Undergraduate Studies. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [January 12, 2012](#) and [January 26, 2012](#) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-19**

C. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Joseph Thomas (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-20

D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee, first requested approval of [SOCI 1010](#) Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Social Sciences. There was no discussion and [SOCI 1010](#) was approved as a Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Social Sciences. **RESOLUTION #12-21**

Professor Wolfe then invited Professor George Bailey to address the proposed recommendation revising ECU's current Cultural Diversity course credit undergraduate graduation requirement. Professor Bailey began his remarks by stating that these courses will not add extra hours to the graduation requirements. The Chancellor's Leadership Council used ECU's definition of diversity. On Jan 23, 1996 this body passed a three-hour cultural diversity requirement. This was a "content-less" requirement. There has been no uniformity in standards for this requirement. The Chancellor's Leadership Council created a subcommittee to address this concern about content. UNC Tomorrow required campuses to respond to the goals in the report. One of these goals was preparing students to be successful in a global environment. ECU's committee suggested that we address these goals in a manner similar to the way we are addressing the diversity requirement.

Professor Bailey said that on the diversity side, there have been a lot of changes between 1996 and the present time (2012). By 2010, Professor Bailey stated, many universities across the country had diversity and globalization requirements similar to those that are proposed today. Other campuses found that they were offering courses about getting along in other countries when they wanted their students to learn about racial issues in America. The problem is no goals are perfect. It would be good if we would have a set of goals that deal with growing up in America as well as globalization. The diversity goals in the current proposal were written by the Chancellor's Diversity Council. The Senate can amend these goals, and that would be preferable to just rejecting. The global goals are the result of the work of about 40 faculty members over the last 18 months.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked what the justification was for increasing the number of courses from one to two. Professor Bailey replied that the committee felt that three hours or one course that dealt with diversity throughout the college career was not enough, and that these courses would not be restricted to Foundations Courses.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) asked if Professor Bailey or the Committee had done any substantive review of ECU's programs to confirm that this additional course would add to the program requirements. Professor Ross stated that he was doubtful that the recommendation would not increase the number of hours of required courses. Professor Bailey replied that we deal with people who need special permissions all the time. We may have to make special arrangements for students at first, but we will get it worked out. Professor Ross then asked how this would affect transfer students. Bailey stated that he did not know how this policy would be applied to transfer students.

Professor Christian (Business) asked if wouldn't this depend on what university catalog the student began with. Professor Bailey stated that the senate can recommend whatever it wants.

Professor Popke (Geography) was in favor of the six-hour requirement and understood the information relating to both diversity and global. He asked how the committee came up with the definition of "diversity." Was the material drafted in a pedagogical manner? Professor Bailey replied that the definition of diversity was what is currently used in all University documents, and the same criticism was raised in committee.

Professor Frank (Technology and Computer Science) expressed her concern about transfer students and how cultural diversity would be noted, i.e. in the past writing intensive courses worked as long as “writing” was included in the course title. Professor Bailey replied that this was a very important point and unfortunately he did not take into account how this new course requirement would relate to transfer students. He thanked Professor Frank for the question, but noted that this issue goes into the area of the Registrar and will perhaps need advice from the Provost. Professor Bailey stressed that he did not want the Senate’s actions to prevent students from graduating.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that he was happy to see the proposal at this level provide teeth to what qualified for diversity. He asked if the six-hour course criteria would be passed on to the University Curriculum Committee. Professor Bailey said that it would be passed along.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) appreciated the six credit hour requirement and wondered if the language in the goals were accurate. The categories listed were not universal and only related to the United States.

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) asked about existing courses that may meet the diversity criteria. She expressed problems with the process but supported the notion. She asked how would departments update their courses or create new courses.

Professor Bailey replied that the timeline was extended due to concerns about process. There were some courses that were not flagged or titled in a way to reflect diversity. Some existing courses could be altered without going through the University Curriculum Committee. He expressed doubt that the University would not have enough courses to meet the proposed six-hour requirement by Fall 2013, and felt that this is not a roadblock like the transfer issue.

Vice Chancellor Horns spoke in favor of the motion to return the report to the Committee for further discussion, and offered to help Professor Bailey and others address how this new requirement for additional courses would affect highly structured and sequenced professional programs without any leeway.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) moved that, before the Senate voted on the recommendation, the Committee address the concerns expressed during the meeting, including transfer students and high impact professional programs. The recommendation revising ECU’s current cultural diversity course credit undergraduate graduation requirement was returned to the Committee for further discussion. **RESOLUTION #12-22**

Professor Given (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked what level of assessment was expected for courses that have this credit attached to them, i.e. Foundations, Writing Intensive, Service Learning and what impact would this new criteria have on the units.

Professor Brown (Psychology) asked faculty who were concerned about their particular curriculum, to please forward their specific concerns to Professor Bailey to aid him in the compilation of courses.

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) asked about the process of reviewing courses to meet the new requirement, i.e. subcommittee and what should be submitted. Professor Bailey replied that he could answer these questions at this moment. If there were a flood of proposals coming through, a subcommittee would have to be created. Otherwise the current committee

structure can maintain the process. He stated that things happen when someone submits a proposal to the Foundations Curriculum Committee. Sometimes one of the goals is misunderstood or there are no instructions throughout proposal for reading assignments, etc. Sometimes proposals come back twice before being approved by the committee and submitted to the Faculty Senate. This system works.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated some of these things definitely needed to be discussed in an intellectual environment, and he wondered if three of the six diversity requirements could be in a service-learning environment.

Professor Bailey stated that he did not have a lot to add except that the six-hour Global Credit graduation requirement differed in its content from the Cultural Diversity requirement. The general idea is to create better functioning students in a globalized world.

Following a brief discussion, the recommendations establishing a six-hour Global Credit graduation requirement were rejected by the Faculty Senate. **RESOLUTION #12-23**

Professor Wolfe then invited Professor Mike Brown to address the recommendations for revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey. Mike Brown stated he is member of the FCIEC and the SOIS II Committee. In Spring 2009 the Chancellor asked the Committee look at constructing a new student opinion survey instrument. The SOIS I Committee studied other instruments and found that they all had the same flaws. The SOIS I Committee recommended that we develop our own instrument. The SOIS II Committee developed an instrument for students to give feedback about the quality of instruction and give feedback about the course. The proposed instrument gives students the opportunity to answer questions about which they are qualified to answer. Student opinion is NOT a measure of teaching quality. This instrument would prevent the use of student surveys as a proxy for measurements of teaching quality. He recommended approval of this instrument.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) stated that he also served on this SOIS subcommittee and spoke against the proposed revisions. He noted that there were questions relating to how these things can be done much better than they have been presented in this report. In his opinion, the problem was that the proposed SOIS is worse than the current survey. Professor Ross said that he did not think that the survey adequately determines what those being surveyed feel or know. He expressed an interest in having the report returned to the Committee for further discussion.

Professor Heidal (Nutrition Science) stated that the current SOIS survey had clear measurements. How will the proposed SOIS grading be calculated? Professor Brown replied that the mean gives no real information. He sees that faculty as having their tenure voted down due to low SOIS scores. How will the new SIOS be scored? The grading will be given to the faculty member as feedback to the teacher and should not and would not be used in a way to evaluate faculty.

Professor Given (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked about members having training. What did the committee envision on the training and the unit administrator using the results? He stated that unfortunately now we use SOIS as the only criteria for teaching effectiveness.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that he was also a member of the subcommittee and wanted to develop an instrument that was not for someone to take, crank out a number at the end of the day and compare to other faculty. In the subcommittee's opinion, the current SOIS was weak and

opinion based. We need faculty to use this instrument to discourage weak uses such as comparisons with just numbers. The proposed new instrument has many great advantages, i.e. what does it meant to say I skipped class?

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) expressed her appreciation for the work and that it was long overdue. Using this instrument as the goal to improve one's teaching is totally different than using it to evaluate someone's teaching. The yes/no questions seem to make student thinks black and white. Just adding a "sometimes" may be needed. Professor Brown reminded faculty that the new instrument had a different use for the collected data stating that you can see patterns and that this will help faculty by providing data and not just a score.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) expressed support in moving away from the current SIOS, noting that it was typically biased against females, minorities, and foreign faculty members. Nothing is perfect, but it is now time to move away from old SOIS. He suggested that if the proposed new instrument needed fine tuning later it could be addressed again. Time has come for change.

Professor Stiller (Biology) supported the idea to improve the instrument and suggested that it might be better to phrase the questions so that the student answers no sometimes in order to keep others from using the total number of yeses or noes as cumulative. He asked if the committee intentionally left out the relevancy of the course content in the instrument. He expressed a desire to see if students think the course he teaches is relevant to their interest and need. Professor Brown replied that the written comments would provide that detail.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that it would be entirely appropriate for the Faculty Senate to prohibit the use of this SOIS instrument for evaluative purposes. Professor Brown replied that the committee report and proposed recommendation is stating that.

Professor Christian (Business) expressed support for the instrument and thanked Professor Stiller and others for their comments, which are true. Just providing the number of yeses or noes in a report as the overall data collected was unacceptable. He made a motion to return the report to the Committee to rephrase the yeses/noes. The motion failed.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) stated that the Chancellor has stated that this would be used for evaluation purposes and the reporting will be noted as the number of yeses and noes.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that the results of the instrument could still be used for evaluation purposes. Professor Brown reiterated that this proposed new SOIS instrument cannot be used in ways that the proposed policy does not provide for. They will not be individual norms, university norms or departmental norms and the numbers collected will not be used in negative ways.

Professor Heidal (Nutrition Science) expressed concerns that question 20 could be used negatively. Professor Brown replied that the Chancellor wants an instrument to gather students' opinions.

Professor Popke (Geography) expressed concern that question 8 contained biases, and was concerned that the question about speech may be unfair to foreign faculty members. Professor Brown stated that the University does want to know if faculty can speak clearly, and noted that ECU has resources for faculty to improve their speech.

Professor McFadden (Education) stated that she would change the phrasing to “communication skills.” Professor Brown said that communication skills differed from speaking clearly, and this instrument is not to be used for evaluation. He stressed that it does not measure anything except student perception.

Professor Ding (Technology and Computer Science) stated that she would include the question of whether students feel as though they have learned a lot in a course. She also felt that student participation in completing these evaluations needed to be stressed. Professor Brown stated that it is not an evaluative tool and that the Committee had another recommendation in preparation to address response rates.

Professor Given (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked why we are training unit administrators how to use SPOTS in evaluation of teaching effectiveness if this is not an evaluative tool. Professor Brown stated that the administrators do need to be trained on the appropriate use of this instrument. It is just one source of information. Professor Given then asked what question 8 was trying to ask. Professor Brown cited mumbling, looking at the blackboard when talking, and not speaking clearly with or without a foreign accent as examples for question 8.

Professor Williams (Allied Health Sciences) asked if the sentences could be revised to read so that they were not confusing. He then offered a friendly amendment to delete the SPOTs reference in item 3 and after “unit administrators would have training” strike the rest of the sentence. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) called the question.

Following discussion, the recommendations for revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey were approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #12-24**

E. Committee on Committees

Professor Nelson Cooper (Health and Human Performance), Secretary of the Committee, first presented Professor Natalie Stewart’s name for the open seat on the Appellate Hearing Committee. He noted that the Hearing Committee was the appellate committee that handled all appeals that result from non-reappointment or non-conferral of permanent tenure. There were no other nominees from the floor of the Senate and Professor Natalie Stewart (Theatre and Dance) was elected by acclamation.

Professor Cooper then presented the third reading of proposed revisions to Faculty Governance Committee charge. He noted that this charge was approved by the Faculty Senate last Spring, but was returned to the committee by the Chancellor who wanted clarification of the sections that referred to “unit re-evaluations.” The committee conferred with the Chair of the Faculty and members of the Faculty Governance Committee before recommending the changes as indicated in the committee report. This change clarifies the wording in sections 4E and 5, making it more clearly reflect the actual work of the Committee. He reminded the Senators that this committee was involved in unit codes, for example, reviewing and making recommendations on the parts of the Faculty manual that describe how unit codes are formed (currently Appendix L) and reviewing vestigial codes for newly formed code units. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the standing University academic Faculty Governance Committee charge was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-**

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 10, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including the Request for Authorization to [Discontinue the Pre-school Add-on licensure](#) in the Birth through Kindergarten (BK) Teacher Education Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the College of Human Ecology. There was no discussion.

The request to add an [Infrastructure Concentration](#) in Construction Management Program in the Department of Construction Management within the College of Technology and Computer Science. There was no discussion. The request to [discontinue the Occupational Safety and Health Minor](#) in Department of Technology Systems within the College of Technology and Computer Science. There was no discussion.

The Request for Notification of Intent to Plan a [Bachelor of Science in University Studies](#) within the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Professor Gordon invited representatives (Schwager, Geissler, Bunch) from the working group to assist in addressing any questions.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked if this was not just another general education degree? It should be an Associate's Degree for adult students, not 18/19 year olds. Professor Schwager replied yes, that it is very much like a general education degree. With multiple programs with higher required GPA's there are several students discovering their way through college and what they wanted to do.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked if he was taking poor performing students and providing a degree program for them. Is this being proposed in order to provide a way for those type students to graduate?

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that the University already has a process in place to assist poor performing students and we all understand the obligation to graduate students here at ECU. We should focus our initiatives on helping student through the pirate tutoring program, etc. allowing graduation rates to be handled in a more honest way. Professor Schwager stated that there would be required courses to help them figure out what they wanted and the University would set up a business advisory council.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked which college would house the degree and who will oversee the students? Professor Schwager replied that right now it would be housed in the office of Undergraduate Studies within the Academic Affairs Division office.

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) asked what the projected numbers were of graduates over a five year period and what was the cost stating that going off on this academic tangent is risky. Advising Director Geissler replied that this was an intensive advising responsibility. She then detailed some of the advising situations relating to students with 100 credit hours noting that majors at ECU are different and tough to get into. Transfer students and military students are put through too many hoops with 50% surcharges on courses over 140.

Professor Edwards (Sociology) asked what proportion of the programs are at the 2.0 level? Was it not true that departments within the College of Arts and Sciences were not allowed to increase their admission entrance requirements for majors? The entire College has no opportunity to raise their standards and that is a part of the situation that really needs to be discussed. Advising Director Geissler stated that a lot of those majors within the College of Arts and Sciences have math and

science requirements that make it hard for some students to be successful. Students are leaving ECU with 100 semester hours and no degree.

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) asked again what the projected numbers of graduates was over a five-year period and what the cost was. Associate Provost Bunch stated that their projection was 100 full-time students and 25 part-time students for the first year based on how this major is tracking at other institutions. This program will initially be used as an opportunity to get students out who need help graduating, but a secondary use would be for a student to provide a self-designed major just as other institutions offer.

Professor Given (Foreign Language and Literatures) stated that we currently have a lot of this through our multidisciplinary programs and he does not see these students as discovering, but already knowing what they want.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) stated that a student coming into ECU with 100 credit hours would have trouble establishing himself or herself in a program with the limited number of credits before reaching the tuition surcharge limit. Advising Director Geissler replied when students come in with a large number of course credits, the faculty oversight committee will take a look at the situation and see what needs to be done to help the student in a holistic fashion.

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) asked again for the third time, what was the projected numbers of graduates over a five-year period and what was the cost. Associate Provost Bunch replied that two academic advisors and a program coordinator within the first three years. As the program grows more advisors and support staff will be added. The cost of personnel was the only expense for this new program. The office of undergraduate studies within the Academic Affairs division main office will oversee the program.

Following a vote of 18 to 17, the Request for Notification of Intent to Plan a [Bachelor of Science in University Studies](#) within the Office of Undergraduate Studies was approved.

Following that, the Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of [Anatomy and Cell Biology](#) within the School of Medicine was presented and there was no discussion.

Chair Gordon also discussed briefly the proposed [New UNC-GA Program Approval Timeline](#) and that the Committee would be bringing revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* relating to curriculum development in the near future. There was no discussion.

Following the reports, the curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 10, 2012](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-26**

G. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on a proposal to move the administrator survey from paper-based to online administration in Spring 2012. There was no discussion and the Senate approved formal faculty advice to move the administrator survey from paper-based to online administration in Spring 2012. **RESOLUTION #12-27**

H. Faculty Welfare Committee, Ken Ferguson

Chair Walker noted that this report was based on the brief Faculty Senate discussion and recommendation from the January meeting that the Faculty Welfare Committee be asked to consider

further discussion relating to faculty and classroom safety. She noted that Professor Ferguson was here to lead the discussion in light of the recent safety concerns and faculty response, especially in relation to classroom management.

Professor Ken Ferguson (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, presented first the Role of Faculty in Classroom Safety that was distributed electronically to all faculty in late January at the request of Tom Pohlman, Environmental Health and Safety administrator. He noted that the information did not change any policy, program or institute any new ones. It was just an informative email from one faculty group to another. We want to continue to send these emails out monthly to faculty. The Committee has talked with the University Attorney and can assure the faculty that you are not encumbered legally by anything included in these safety emails. The Committee comes before the group wanting to know how best to share this information.

Professor Sprague (Physics) moved that the Senate advise the Committee that it is authorized when appropriate to send out safety emails to faculty.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) expressed concern about responsibilities being pushed down to faculty and that it should not be a faculty member's responsibility to purchase a doorstop, etc. He did not think that the email information was helpful.

Professor Roper (Medicine) reminded the Senators that there was a link within the email detailing all emergency procedures.

Following discussion, the Faculty Senate advised the Faculty Welfare Committee that it was authorized when appropriate to send out safety emails to faculty. **RESOLUTION #12-28**

Professor Ferguson then presented formal faculty advice on the proposed Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) moved to remove "of truly exceptional merit" from Section 2.1.Definition. Following the brief discussion, the Faculty Senate approved the revised formal faculty advice on the proposed Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy. **RESOLUTION #12-29**

Professor Anderson (Education) moved adjournment due to the lack of a quorum.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 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 FEBRUARY 21, 2012, MEETING

12-18 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 18, 2012](#) and [February 1, 2012](#), which include curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Human Ecology, Department of Physics, College of Education, and College of Allied Health Sciences.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-19 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 12, 2012](#) and [January 26, 2012](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-20 Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students as follows:

(Revisions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.)

Nontraditional Students

Individuals who are at least twenty-four years of age and do not qualify for admission as a freshman or transfer student may apply for admission as a nontraditional student.

Applicants should complete an application, submit all academic transcripts, and explain the nature of their academic preparation. Students are reviewed holistically by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, and must demonstrate the potential for academic success at the university level. Applicants with limited or no college experience are encouraged to complete some classes at a community college to increase the competitiveness of their applications. Please note admission is not guaranteed.

Admission to the university does not guarantee admission to individual programs. Please see individual program requirements for enrollment information.

Students enrolling under this policy must

- 1. comply with all university policies regarding payment of tuition and fees.**
- 2. comply with NC state law concerning health and immunization.**
- 3. meet university retention requirements.**
- 4. follow all university academic regulations as shown in the undergraduate catalog published in the year during which the student enrolls.**

~~Individuals who are at least twenty-four years of age (nontraditional students) or individuals whose high school class graduated three or more years prior to the expected date of entry and who meet UNC minimum course requirements may be permitted to enroll in the university under a performance-based admission policy that specifies retention stipulations provided they meet one of the following conditions. (See General Transfer, Note, above.) The student must~~

- ~~• have had no previous college experience or~~
- ~~• have had previous college experience but have not been matriculated within the past one year and are eligible to return to the previous institution but do not meet all stated university admission requirements or~~
- ~~• have had previous college experience, are not eligible to return to the previous institution, and have not been matriculated at the collegiate level for at least three years prior to the expected date of entry.~~

~~Meeting one of the above conditions does not guarantee admission. Admission is not guaranteed and is granted on a capacity available basis as the University must adhere to its enrollment projections. Students are reviewed individually and must demonstrate the potential for academic success at the university level.~~

~~Individuals enrolled as degree-seeking students under the performance-based admission policy must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.2 and meet all retention stipulations by the end of the semester in which the twenty-eighth semester hour of degree creditable work is attempted. Failure either to meet the GPA requirement or to satisfy the retention stipulations will result in the student's being ineligible to continue enrollment at ECU. (See Section 5, Academic Regulations, Readmission.)~~

~~Students enrolling under this policy must comply with all university policies regarding the payment of tuition and fees and must comply with NC state law concerning health and immunization.~~

~~An individual enrolled under the performance-based admission policy may not declare a major, compete in intercollegiate athletics, or participate in student exchange programs until all retention stipulations specified in his or her admission letter have been satisfied.~~

Disposition: Chancellor

12-21 Approval of [SOCI 1010](#) as a Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Social Sciences.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-22 Recommendation revising ECU's current Cultural Diversity course credit undergraduate graduation requirement was returned to the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee for further discussion.

Disposition: Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

12-23 Recommendations establishing a six-hour Global Credit graduation requirement were rejected.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

12-24 Revisions to the [Student Opinion of Instruction Survey](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-25 Revisions to the standing University academic [Faculty Governance Committee charge](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-26 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 10, 2012](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including the following:

1. Request for Authorization to [Discontinue the Pre-school Add-on licensure](#) in the Birth through Kindergarten (BK) Teacher Education Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the College of Human Ecology.
2. Request to add an [Infrastructure Concentration](#) in Construction Management Program in the Department of Construction Management within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
3. Request to [discontinue the Occupational Safety and Health Minor](#) in Department of Technology Systems within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
4. Request for Notification of Intent to Plan a [Bachelor of Science in University Studies](#) within the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
5. Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of [Anatomy and Cell Biology](#) within the School of Medicine.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-27 Formal faculty advice to move the administrator survey from paper-based to online administration in Spring 2012.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 12-28 Faculty Welfare Committee is authorized when appropriate to send out safety emails to faculty.
Disposition: Chancellor
- 12-29 Formal faculty advice on the proposed [Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy](#).
Disposition: Chancellor