

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 2013

The sixth regular meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 26, 2013, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of [January 29, 2013](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Perry (Anthropology), Zoller (Art and Design), Terrain (Medicine), Edwards (Sociology), Chancellor Ballard, and Provost Sheerer.

Alternates present were: Professors Willis for Reynolds (Academic Library Services), Tucker-McLaughlin for Howard (Communication), Dudley for Hernandez (History), Gilliland for MacGilvray (Medicine), Bard for Fitzgerald (Medicine), and McCarty for Maher (Philosophy).

B. Announcements

The Academic Library Services Library Assembly wishes to thank the members of the Libraries Committee and Faculty Senate for their support of librarians at East Carolina University having the option of continued employment in positions that have faculty tenure, rank and status.

The Chancellor will host a reception for Faculty Senators, Alternates and elected University Academic and Appellate Committee members following the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday, March 19, 2013, from 5:30 to 7:00 pm in the Chancellor's residence. Formal invitations will be forthcoming.

Current and past EPA Personnel Salary information is available on OneStop, under Employee, entitled *EPA Personnel and Salary Information*. Please contact John Toller, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources with any questions.

Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by May 1, 2013.

All faculty members are reminded that April 1 Chancellor Ballard will call for candidates for the prestigious Oliver Max Gardner award. The University's nomination procedures are available online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxgardneraward.htm>. Please contact Dorothy Muller, Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence with any questions.

C. Rick Niswander, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

Vice Chancellor Niswander reported that in February, the Board of Governors approved a \$201 tuition increase for in-state undergraduate and a \$214 increase for in-state graduate which is a 5.3% increase for all in-state students. A \$500 increase was approved for out-of-state undergraduate students and a \$700 increase for out-of-state graduate students. The Board of Governors also approved a \$40 increase in educational technology fees and a \$30 increase in athletic fees. The total cost for undergraduate tuition and fees is \$6,084 which is \$75 more than UNC-Charlotte, \$238 less

than UNC-Greensboro, \$272 less than Appalachian State University and \$182 less than UNC-Wilmington.

Vice Chancellor Niswander explained the budgetary process within the UNC System and the General Assembly. Each campus approves their budget and then it is forwarded to the Board of Governors, the Governor, and to the General Assembly for approval. The General Assembly meets in “long session” in January of each odd-numbered year and in “short session” in May in even-numbered year. During the “long session,” legislators pass a two-year budget for the State and during the “short session” modifications are made to the budget.

In February, the Board of Governors approved their priorities for the UNC System. The priorities were divided into operating cost and capital improvement costs. The priorities are to (1) Fund the Strategic Directions 2013-2018 plan; (2) Fund need based financial aid; (3) Increase the optional retirement rate (TIAA Cref) from 6.84% to 8.1% to match the State compensation rate; (4) Campus security; and (5) Allocate funds for the North Carolina School of the Arts. The Board of Governors approved a capital budget of \$160 million for repairs and renovations. This is a 1.5% increase. There are seven strategic capital priorities and ECU has one on the list (Life Sciences and Bio-technology building and the Howell Science Complex renovation).

The Governor is expected to issue his budget plan on March 18. Vice Chancellor Niswander reported that the budget for higher education is “ok,” not “super,” but not “ugly.” He stressed the importance of recognizing that there are no absolutes at this point in time and the eventual outcomes will not be known until five or six months from now. Vice Chancellor Niswander referred to the Overview of General Fund Revenue provided by the Fiscal Research Division (attached to the Faculty Senate agenda). Revenues are on track for the current year although, as always, it is the last quarter of the year that is most uncertain since a majority of the state revenue is collected between April and June. Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that there is a low likelihood of any one-time or permanent reversion. For the next fiscal year, there is a maybe 70% chance that higher education will incur a 2% permanent reduction in appropriations. He emphasized that the 2% reduction was not a fiscal issue but a prioritization issue with the General Assembly. Also, this reduction is a “possible” reduction and not a “for sure” reduction or a “low likelihood” reduction. ECU needs to be ready for the possibility of a reduction and the number may be different than the 2% anticipated. He feels that at this point, the reduction is unlikely to be larger. For ECU, the 2% reduction in appropriations is a little more than \$5 million.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) thanked Vice Chancellor Niswander for the report and asked if there was a possibility that the state budget would be even worse for the university. Vice Chancellor Niswander replied that the chance of a larger reduction was low. Overall in the State budget, higher education has taken a significant reduction. ECU had had a 16% reduction during the earlier cuts.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked Vice Chancellor Niswander to repeat the information on changes to the TIAA Cref retirement information. Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that there would potentially be increased funding from the legislature for the matching funds paid by the employer from 6.84% to 8% for the 401K optional retirement account going forward.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked if financial aid this spring would be impacted by the March 1 sequester. Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that the students would not be impacted this spring but was unsure for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) asked if ECU receives enrollment growth funding, would it interfere with the expansion budget for new items needed. Vice Chancellor Niswander replied that the General Administration could add performance funding to the formula but does not think this will occur.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Vice Chancellor Horns provided an update on the libraries. The review was undertaken as a result of the PPC recommendation. The consultants Maureen Sullivan and Gene Spencer continue to explore what the library of the future will look like and how to appropriately staff the libraries to best meet those future needs. A small group of (four) librarians were asked in January to draft an alternative staffing model for librarians that might consider in addition to the faculty tenure model currently in place. They have been asked to submit a report of this work by March 1. A formal program review is being conducted in each library, using the same review process that other academic or administrative units on campus undergo. Peer reviewers will be on campus May 13-14 to do the reviews. ECU continues to receive ideas about collaborations between the libraries and potential efficiencies to be explored. The formal reviews are expected to provide even more items for consideration. ECU anticipates completing the library review work and decisions made by beginning of fall 2013. Provost Sheerer has met with the Joyner Library faculty and staff to discuss the review process, hear their questions and concerns and share information about staffing possibilities and a potential timeline for searching for a new Dean of Academic Library Services. Vice Chancellor Horns has a meeting scheduled to talk with the Laupus Library faculty and staff next week.

Vice Chancellor Horns addressed the impact of funding the Doctorate of Nurse Practitioner (DNP) on other programs across the campus. The DNP was approved by the Board of Governors earlier this month to begin in fall 2013. Funding for the program is being generated through a tuition surcharge also approved by the Board of Governors. These tuition dollars will fund five to six faculty lines, which will be adequate for this program. There should be no negative impact on the rest of the campus from the DNP.

Vice Chancellor Horns next addressed the School of Public Health Planning (SPH) process. The planning process for the SPH has been in the early stages for the past two-three years and will remain so for the next two to three years. A project of this magnitude certainly requires a protracted and deliberate process to align all the various elements that will comprise a SPH in the future. The established UNC and ECU processes for planning new degree programs are being followed for development of the PhD in Epidemiology and DrPh in Public Health Administration (and one other focus area). The Master of Public Health (MPH) program continues to grow and resources are being allocated to accommodate this growth. A major factor in planning a new SPH is securing and protecting the accreditation of this existing Public Health program during the planning process. When appropriate the process outlined in the *ECU Faculty Manual* for adding a new code unit, merging or moving existing codes units will be followed. Engaging these processes is premature at this point.

Professor Rigby (Geological Sciences) asked about the composition of the small group of librarians asked to draft an alternative staffing model for librarians. How was the committee formed via volunteers or selected by administrators? Vice Chancellor Horns replied that these individuals volunteered to serve in this capacity.

E. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Sprague provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

The end is near! The end is near! That is the message I have been sending to our committees lately. It is not as traumatic as you might think, but it is an important detail nonetheless. The end of the 2012-2013 academic year is approaching, and we must make plans to consider all of the urgent matters before us. After today, we have two regular Faculty Senate meetings left in the year (and the organizational meeting). Committees must make plans to finalize their work and submit it to be considered by the Faculty Senate. Some of the matters our committees are considering include UNIV 1000 learning outcomes, procedure changes for planning, implementing, and evaluating interdisciplinary programs, joint appointments, new recommendations for Writing Intensive courses, clarifying the professional development requirement for instructors of online courses, changes to the conflict of interest policy, a multitude of curriculum changes, and much more.

Later in this meeting we will consider recommendations on post-tenure review standards and procedures from the Faculty Governance Committee. I cannot emphasize enough how important it is that we do post-tenure review correctly. As you consider this matter in the Faculty Senate and in your unit tenure committees, remember that post-tenure review is not about reevaluating faculty for tenure or inventing new criteria. We must base our post-tenure review on criteria in our codes and on the duties assigned to the faculty member during the review period.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform you about some matters under consideration by administrative committees. The deans and the Academic Council formed a task force to study faculty workloads and release time assignments. This group is preparing recommendations for standardizing certain workload equivalencies across campus. They are doing a virtual pilot of their recommendations by examining workload assignments in some departments to look at the impact of their recommendations. I believe that we should have policies for equitable distribution of faculty workload, but I am concerned that a one-size-fits-all policy may not be able to account for differences between faculty workload activities in all the disciplines across campus. Any workload policy must account for faculty efforts in teaching, research, and service. Such a policy must not be merely an attempt to increase individual teaching loads. Considering Vice Chancellor Niswander's remarks today, it is particularly important that we generate the appropriate number of student credit hours as a university, as colleges, and even as programs, but any workload policy must allow for all types of faculty effort to be counted appropriately. When the task force releases the final draft of the policy, I will ask the Faculty Governance Committee to develop formal advice on for consideration by the Faculty Senate prior to implementation.

The Academic Council is developing a procedure for reallocation of positions based on PPC recommendations, new data, and other factors. This procedure calls for an evaluation of the criticality of vacant positions before they are returned to a unit. A review team will evaluate each request for a position and make a recommendation to the Academic Council about whether it should be returned to the unit or reallocated elsewhere. The current plan includes the Chair of the Faculty providing input at a quarterly Academic Council discussion about position reallocations. I will refer this matter to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee for discussion and faculty advice on this proposed policy.

Thank you for all of the work you do in our committees and in the Faculty Senate. Everything that we consider in this body, even matters that we approve with little or no debate on the Senate floor, is the result of much faculty effort. Our system of shared governance would not work without all of you!

No questions posed to Professor Sprague.

F. Wendy Sharer, Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Director
Professor Sharer provided the following [Quality Enhancement Plan](#) Update

1. Last month, the Chancellor circulated an announcement about and a link to a full draft of the QEP. Based on responses to that draft, members of the QEP Steering Committee made revisions and submitted the final document to our onsite SACS review team. The full, final draft can be downloaded from the QEP website: www.ecu.edu/qep
2. Our onsite SACS visit will take place April 2-4. A good portion of time that the team is here will be spent talking with people who have been involved in the identification of our QEP topic, the development of our QEP document, and the preparations being made for the implementation of the QEP. They will also want to talk with students about writing and writing instruction at ECU.
3. Official QEP implementation will begin, assuming that all goes well with the onsite review, in fall 2013.
4. Many things are happening this academic year to ensure that we have a smooth implementation in our three action areas: Curriculum Enhancement, Faculty Support, and Student Support:

Highlights from Curriculum Enhancement Action Area

- 1) The course proposal for English 2201: Writing About the Disciplines is making its way through the curriculum approval process. It has received approval at the departmental and college level, and, recently was approved by the WAC Committee and the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee. The University Curriculum Committee is scheduled to review the proposal on March 21.

What is English 2201: Writing about the Disciplines?

- The vast majority of students take it in their sophomore year
- The course serves as place to reinforce and remind students of what was covered in English 1100
- The course is central to QEP efforts to bridge the gap between general analytical, expository, and research-based academic writing (English 1100) and discipline-specific reading, researching, and writing skills in upper-level, major specific courses.
- Course would go into effect with the incoming class of fall 2014, thus the class will be widely offered for the first time in the fall of 2015.
- During AY 2013-2014 and AY 2014-2015, prior to the full implementation of the course, the QEP team and the English department will work with departments and

advisors to ensure that degree plans accommodate the new course and that offerings of English 2201 are consistent with what students need to proceed through their degree programs in a timely manner.

Highlights from Student Support Action Area

- 1) Construction of new University Writing Center/University Writing Program/QEP Space
 - Target completion date March 15
 - Open House/Launch Week fall 2013
 - More consultants will be hired –expanded hours and more appointments
- 2) Training of Students to serve as Writing Mentors
 - Writing Mentors—embedded writing tutors in WI courses
 - These mentors will have completed a 3-hr. course in the English Department—they are enrolled in it now. It's taught by Dr. Nikki Caswell, the Director of University Writing Center.

Highlights from Faculty Support Action Area

- 1) QEP Writing Liaisons Meetings—
 - Writing Liaisons are faculty from programs across campus who serve as nodes of communication about writing and support for writing instruction between their programs and the QEP leadership team
 - Liaisons met twice last semester and have, so far, met twice this semester, discussing, among other things
 - Characteristics of writing assignments in different disciplines/programs
 - Characteristics of effective writing in different disciplines/programs
 - The QEP draft, focusing on the “Actions to be Implemented” and the “Assessment” plan
5. In addition to the groundwork being completed this semester/academic year, I want to mention important preparatory work being done for the assessment of the QEP.
 - The five QEP Student Learning Outcomes are things we want our undergraduates to be able to do in terms of writing by the time they have completed their undergraduate degrees. In order to see how much of an impact QEP initiatives might have on student writing, we are gathering writing samples from WI courses across the curriculum this academic year and next academic year to serve as “baseline” data, or pre-QEP actions data.
 - If you are teaching a WI course at the 3000 or 4000 level, you should have received an email from me asking for your help in gathering writing samples from students in your class. I will send a reminder/second request shortly after Spring Break, and a final reminder just before the end of classes.
 - I encourage those of you teaching these upper-level WI courses to provide samples for this purpose and, if you are not teaching one of these courses, please encourage

faculty in your program/department who do teach those upper-level WI courses to collect the samples as requested.

Professor Smith (Technology and Computer Science) asked about the protocol for collecting samples. Professor Sharer replied that only the Banner ID number should be included on samples of student writing. FERPA grants an exception to the rule since the data is only being used for institutional purposes and will not be published. The Banner ID number is needed to track other variables.

G. Ralph Scott, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Scott provided the following report on February 22, 2013 UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting.

Professor Scott noted that President Tom Ross reported on the Strategic Directions 2013-2018 plan and legislative and budget issues. Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Suzanne Ortega reported on the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement between University of North Carolina and the North Carolina Community College System and the general education requirements. There was a report by Senior Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Karrie Dixon on her division and on GEAR UP. There was a panel discussion on the role of the Faculty Ombuds Offices. Panelists included Wayne Blair, UNC-Chapel Hill, Bruce Auerback, UNC-Charlotte, Dennis Daley, NCSU, and Debra Parker, NCCU. The Governance Committee of the Faculty Assembly presented a resolution on academic freedom that is attached to the Faculty Senate agenda. Catherine Rigby, Chair of Faculty Assembly, spoke about the revised charge of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Strategic Directions 2013-2018 plan.

The full report is linked and includes references to the following additional attachments:

[Strategic Directions, 2013-2018](#)

[Information on Ombuds Programs](#)

[DRAFT Resolution on Academic Freedom and Due Process](#)

[Information on Faculty Assembly Elections](#)

Professor Taggart (Music) suggested to Chair Sprague that Wayne Blair, ombuds officer at UNC-Chapel Hill, be invited to speak to the Faculty Senate about the faculty ombuds position. Chair Sprague agreed and stated that he would contact Mr. Blair.

H. Election of Faculty Officers Nominating Committee

According to *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Part II, Section II](#), the following Faculty Senators were elected by acclamation to serve on the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee: Professors Derek Maher (Philosophy, Committee Chair), Bob Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences), Patricia Anderson (Education), Nelson Cooper (Health and Human Performance), 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 23, 2013.

I. Question Period

Professor Theurer (Music) requested a list of all administrative and ad hoc committees on campus. Vice Chancellor Horns is working on the list but explained that it was a very difficult process because there are so many of these committees on campus.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) asked for an update on the proposed BS in University Studies. Interim Vice Chancellor Mitchelson replied that currently there are three programs requesting Authorization to Plan (Appendix A) from General Administration: BS in University Studies, a PhD in Economics, and a M.S. in Bio-Engineering. The BS in University Studies was submitted to General Administration on February 13, 2012 and General Administration has acknowledged receipt. General Administration has four weeks to review the document and respond with approval to move forward or to pose questions/request clarifications from ECU. ECU will have four weeks to respond to their inquiry. Upon receipt of approval, General Administration invites submission of Appendix C (Request for Authorization to Establish), which campus must submit within four months. Appendix C documents will go through ECU's on campus approval process and once approved, are submitted to General Administration. Within four weeks, General Administration responds that proposal is complete or they raise questions/request clarification. ECU has four weeks to respond to their concerns. The completed Appendix C is posted on General Administration website (four weeks) for review and comments by other campuses. GA reviews comments within two weeks and forwards to EPPP or requests further clarification from ECU. Review by EPPP and, if recommended, forwarded to the Board of Governors for a decision. Campus is notified of the decision.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked for information on earlier remarks from Chair Sprague referencing a task force preparing recommendations on the workload assignments, which would require new revisions to the workload policy. She asked if ECU was creating more work by initially asking a task force to look at the required revisions on a workload policy that relates to faculty. Instead the policy should be sent to an academic committee because without faculty involved in the revision process, we are not engaging in a shared governance structure. Chair Sprague stated that he did not initiate this workload task force. He would like the Faculty Governance Committee to address the issue. He believes the workload task force grew out of Deans and Director's group. Vice Chancellor Horns stated that ECU is under a General Administration directive to pay close attention to faculty workload. ECU did not have a faculty workload reporting system in place. IPAR is developing a new workload system. Vice Chancellor Horns believes that faculty members are on the committee but is not sure. Currently, the new workload policy is being piloted in four areas before the system is adopted for large-scale use. She stated that she would follow up on this issue and let the Provost know of the Senate's interest.

Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) inquired if the new reporting system would change the current PRR. Vice Chancellor Horns replied that it was possible but that was not the original intent. The intent is to demonstrate the great work faculty do in teaching, research and public service.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if there was any flexibility with the February 28 scholarship deadline. Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that the February 28 planned deadline is a month or so earlier than last year and even earlier than previous years. He acknowledged it was a reasonable concern. He stated that it was important not to duplicate the outcome in 2008-2009 when ECU could not meet the demands due to the economic recession. ECU will give you an actual number this year because the December 31 numbers are being used instead of the past June 30. Chair of the Faculty stated that the Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee had discussed this issue. Professor Deale (Hospitality Management), the Faculty Senate representative to the committee, clarified that the Committee had discussed the issue following their second annual scholarship workshop and are gathering input from across campus on the process.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented first curriculum and academic matters contained in the [February 11, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, noting the 5000-level standard operating procedure, a title revision of an existing degree (PhD in Technical and Professional Discourse to PhD in Rhetoric, Writing, and Professional Communication), a request for a PhD student (Physics) time extension, and a draft of the Thesis and Dissertation section for the Graduate Catalog.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked why there were going to be 5000 level classes still offered? Chair Sprague stated that some departments offered 5000 level courses and there needed to be a procedure for handling new and existing 5000 level courses.

Chair Walker (Allied Health Sciences) asked if the academic University Curriculum Committee bring forward their recommendation on how to proceed with 5000 level courses? Professor Reece Allen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Vice Chair of the University Curriculum Committee stated that they were looking at the Graduate Curriculum Committee for their process before proceeding. Any changes they will offer to the Faculty Senate in relation to the undergraduate catalog about this issue will first be considered and approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, Linner Griffin reviewed the standard operating procedure for review of 5000-level courses (see February 6, 2013 Graduate Curriculum Committee minutes, which will be considered by the Faculty Senate at its March 19 meeting).

Following discussion the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [February 11, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor.

RESOLUTION #13-14

Professor West then presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the [January 16, 2013](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including items within the Departments of History, Anthropology, and English and the Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [January 16, 2013](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #13-15**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Committee on Committees

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee presented the second reading of proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee charge. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee [charge](#) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-16**

B. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Reece Allen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Vice Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [January 24, 2013](#), including curricular actions within the Departments of Chemistry, History, Geography and Foreign Languages

and Literatures, College of Health and Human Performance, Honors College, and College of Technology and Computer Science. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the [January 24, 2013](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-17**

C. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Hector Garza (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee presented first curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [February 11, 2013](#) including request for removal of WI credit for SOCW 3401, revision to prerequisites for CMGT 4300, approval of writing intensive (WI) designation for ENGL 2201, 4110, and revisions to ENGL 1100, 2200, 2400, 3870, 3885. There was no discussion and curriculum and academic matters contained in the [February 11, 2013](#) Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #13-18

Professor Garza the presented a report on a New, More Comprehensive Definition of Writing Intensive (WI) courses in order to gather input from the Senators on issues relating to writing intensive courses.

Professor Dudley (History) asked if there was one Student Learning Outcome (SLO) per course or one SLO per professor. Professor Garza noted the confusion and stated that the course is approved for writing intensive credit (WI) and not the instructor who can teach the WI course. He stated that each course should meet all five Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Professor Reisch (Business) stated that a unit should be allowed to have 40 students in a WI course.

Professor Smith (Technology and Computer Science) stated that within his department they have one WI course and it is one section for seniors. However, if a 25 cap is implemented and they have 26 students in one year, two courses would need to be offered. The 25-student limit really impacts small departments.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) stated:

First, the use of a 25-student cap helps to promote an adequate amount of quality contact time between instructors and students. This is a well-documented fact that is also noted on page 5 of the WAC Committee's own Handbook (originally published in the 2009 academic year) for WI courses (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/writing/wac/upload/wac_handbook_2009.pdf). If we care about quality contact and writing instruction, then we must cap WI courses at 25 students per section, as per the WAC Committee's proposal that is also under discussion today.

Second, limiting enrollment of WI courses to 25 students per section puts an upper ceiling on the number of pages that must be (a) reviewed, (b) marked, (c) graded, and (d) entered into the Blackboard system. While a regular Model 4 WI course (for example) with 25 students generates about 45 to 50 pages per student (about 1,250 pages per section), each additional 10 students above the 25-student cap adds around 500 extra pages of grading, basically the equivalent of a ream of paper. Given that many WI instructors are saddled with duplicative sections, two over-enrolled courses with 10 extra students in each section results in the review, marking, and grading of an additional 1,000 pages of type-written work. In my unit, we had one of our faculty members instructing duplicative WI sections with 45 students per section in the fall of 2011. Such additional burdens can easily compromise the grading

process, resulting in lower-quality feedback regarding the organization of papers, the mechanics of writing, and grammatical feedback in general. I can personally attest the vagaries of duplicative over-enrolled sections as I was recently assigned duplicative sections with 35-student caps. If we want students to receive quality feedback on written work, we must require adherence to 25-student caps to create working conditions for faculty that support an adequate amount of time for reviewing, marking, grading papers, and entering grades.

Third, beyond the capacity of over-enrolled courses to impede student outcomes, over-enrollment also jeopardizes the research productivity of professors. While the requirements for promotion and tenure at ECU are more and more demanding each year, the time constraints created by over-enrolled WI courses can become debilitating to research productivity. For example, imagine that you had three classes to instruct with two over-enrolled WI courses that contained 45 students per section. Such assignments actually occurred in many units during the 2011-2012 academic year. Would you really have adequate time for research with such an assignment or would you look up and ask why ECU assigned the equivalent of two extra sections of students on top of your regular three course assignment? Such cap violations are simply unfair to faculty and they hurt research productivity. For these and other reasons, I applaud the WAC Committee's proposal to end over-enrolled WI courses and limit seating to 25 students per section. In sum, 25-student caps will help to advance both student-based learning objectives and research productivity at ECU. Thus, I would request that all senators support the WAC Committee's call for WI caps.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that student learning outcomes (SLOs) are a bit onerous if they address all five SLOs. The learning outcomes are for the entire QEP process that is multi-pronged to aid the students in improving their learning. It does not make sense to require all five SLOs for every WI course.

Professor Reisch (Business) stated that a 25-student cap on WI courses ties administrators' hands. They will be unable to meet the needs of the academic unit. If implemented, one section with five students and another with 35 would cause hardship to units and faculty.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy) a member of the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee stated the idea of telling academic units how many students they can place in a WI course is an issue that involves many people. He suggested that there be an open faculty forum on this issue before anything is presented formally to the Faculty Senate for action. Smaller academic units could not handle this restriction, citing that he currently has 40 students in one WI course and another with 45 students. This issue should be open for discussion.

Professor Kerbs (Criminal Justice) pointed out for clarification that, in reference to the example of the section with five students and section with 30 students – the overload would re-register with the smaller section.

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Ed Stellwag (Biology), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 8, 2013](#) meeting minutes, including a request for termination of the [Certificate in Employee Assistance Program](#) (EAP) in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitations Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 8, 2013](#) Educational

Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including a request for termination of the [Certificate in Employee Assistance Program](#) (EAP) in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitations Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #13-19

E. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented first formal faculty advice on a proposed Co-Curricular Endorsement Policy. There was no discussion and the proposed [Co-Curricular Endorsement Policy](#) was accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor.

RESOLUTION #13-20

Professor Brown then presented curriculum matters included in the [February 18, 2013](#) meeting minutes, including approval of Foundations Credit in Writing Competency for ENGL 2201 Writing about the Disciplines, in Fine Arts for ENGL 2815 Intro to Creative Writing, and in Humanities for ENGL 3460 Literature and Mythology, ENGL 3470 Popular Literature, ENGL 2570 The Supernatural, and ENGL 3280 African Literature and removal of Foundations Credit from all of the upper-division (3000 and 4000) Sociology courses. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters included in the [February 18, 2013](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including approval of Foundations Credit in Writing Competency for ENGL 2201 Writing about the Disciplines, in Fine Arts for ENGL 2815 Intro to Creative Writing, and in Humanities for ENGL 3460 Literature and Mythology, ENGL 3470 Popular Literature, ENGL 2570 The Supernatural, and ENGL 3280 African Literature and removal of Foundations Credit from all of the upper-division (3000 and 4000) Sociology courses were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-21**

Professor Brown then presented proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section: Academic Advisement, Progress and Support Services, Subsection: Additional Requirements for all Degrees.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked why “race” wasn’t included in the items. Professor Brown stated that the wording came straight from the Chancellor’s Diversity Council and included in what was approved by the Faculty Senate last spring.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked again why wasn’t “race” included. Professor Brown stated that he did not know where the original language came from but was there today only presenting what was already approved last spring.

Following discussion, the proposed [revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog](#), Section: Academic Advisement, Progress and Support Services, Subsection: Additional Requirements for all Degrees was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-22**

On another matter, Professor Brown noted his concern with General Administration addressing general education and the misunderstandings, noting that the reported “44 hour core” does not exist. A “30 hour core” requirement is what General Administration wants but faculty should resist that with strong language. What is being proposed at this time is a “30 hour track” for community colleges for transfer students when they come to the university system.

F. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor David Durant (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented a report on

the Policy on Awarding Undergraduate Degrees with Distinction. There was no discussion and the [Report](#) on the Policy on Awarding Undergraduate Degrees with Distinction was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-23**

G. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Marianna Walker (Allied Health Sciences), Chair of the Committee, presented first proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VII, Section III. Research Conduct and explained the rationale for the change. In summer 2012, ECU was informed that their current policy was not in compliance with federal regulations thereby necessitating the change.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VII, Section III. [Research Conduct](#) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-24**

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) moved to allow two additional new reports from the Faculty Governance Committee to be considered at this time in the meeting. Chair Sprague reminded the Senators that new matters may be considered in any order upon a two-thirds vote of faculty senators present and voting.

Following a vote of the Senate, Professor Walker presented first the Checklist for the Review of Unit Post Tenure Review Procedures by the Provost's Review Panel and stated this checklist was to assist post tenure review committees.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy), Vice Chair of the Committee stated that this is not a new policy, but a checklist on the policy currently in the *ECU Faculty Manual*.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) remarked that the faculty member would be evaluated with the standards that were in place when the person was tenured.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked in reference to the definition for deficient, did the word "and" mean that the faculty member must be deficient in both areas? Professor Bailey replied that it means both. Although the confusion is there and one would have to ask those who drafted the original policy in 1997/1998 what was meant at the time. Professor Boklage (Medicine) agreed that the wording relates to both items.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) asked if units could ignore the suggested sample format. Professor Bailey reminded Senators that there were no new requirements being added and that both items of business were being presented to aid faculty in this very important issue.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) stated that his unit submitted a post tenure review policy over a year ago to the Provost for review that was later rejected by the Provost. If the unit uses this sample format and checklist, is there a guarantee that their next proposed policy will be passed? Professor Bailey replied that he was unsure.

Professor Walker then presented the sample format for documenting the Criteria and Standards governing a Unit's Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration and the *ECU Faculty Manual* and stated that the Faculty Governance Committee reviewed this document word for word and line by line.

Following discussion, the [Checklist](#) for the Review of Unit Post Tenure Review Procedures by the Provost's Review Panel and a [sample format](#) for documenting the Criteria and Standards governing a Unit's Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration and the *ECU Faculty Manual* were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #13-25**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to IDEA Chair Survey, stating that following a review of the material, the Faculty Governance Committee supported the revisions including the addition of two questions (20) *Ensuring the assessment of student learning outcomes is meaningful and ongoing* and (21) *Actively supporting student recruitment and retention efforts* but objects to (41) *Looks out for the personal welfare of individual faculty members*.

There was no discussion and the proposed [revisions to IDEA Chair Survey](#) were accepted with revisions as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #13-26**

H. Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee presented formal faculty advice on proposed revisions to the University Patent Policy.

There was no discussion and the [proposed University Patent Policy](#) was accepted with revisions as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #13-27**

Agenda Item VII. New Business

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McFadden
Secretary of the Faculty
College of Education

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE FEBRUARY 26, 2013, MEETING

#13-14 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the [February 11, 2013](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

#13-15 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the [January 16, 2013](#), Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

13-16 Revisions to the University Academic Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee [charge](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

- #13-17 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [January 24, 2013](#) University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-18 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the [February 11, 2013](#) Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-19 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [February 8, 2013](#) Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including a request for termination of the [Certificate in Employee Assistance Program](#) (EAP) in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitations Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-20 Formal faculty advice on the proposed [Co-Curricular Endorsement Policy](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-21 Curriculum matters included in the [February 18, 2013](#) Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes, including approval of Foundations Credit in Writing Competency for ENGL 2201 Writing about the Disciplines, in Fine Arts for ENGL 2815 Intro to Creative Writing, and in Humanities for ENGL 3460 Literature and Mythology, ENGL 3470 Popular Literature, ENGL 2570 The Supernatural, and ENGL 3280 African Literature and removal of Foundations Credit from all of the upper-division (3000 and 4000) Sociology courses
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-22 [Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog](#), Section: Academic Advisement, Progress and Support Services, Subsection: Additional Requirements for all Degrees.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-23 [Report](#) on the Policy on Awarding Undergraduate Degrees with Distinction.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-24 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VII, Section III. [Research Conduct](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-25 [Checklist](#) for the Review of Unit Post Tenure Review Procedures by the Provost's Review Panel and a [sample format](#) for documenting the Criteria and Standards governing a Unit's Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration and the *ECU Faculty Manual*.
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-26 Formal Faculty advice on [revisions to IDEA Chair Survey](#).
Disposition: Chancellor
- #13-27 Formal Faculty Advice on [Proposed University Patent Policy](#).
Disposition: Chancellor