The eighth regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, April 20, 2004, in the Mendenhall Student Center, Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order
Rick Niswander (Business), Chair of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
Approval of the March 30, 2004, meeting minutes were postponed until September 2004.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Dobbs (Medicine), Cox (Nursing), and Pozzuto (Social Work).

Alternates present were: Professors Scott for Kim (Art), Ciechalski for Preston (Education), Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Glascoff for Estes (Health and Human Performance), Robinson (Mathematics), Childers for Hall (Psychology, for a brief period), and Gemperline for Lehman (Research and Graduate Studies).

B. Announcements
1. The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the March 30, 2004, Faculty Senate meeting:
   04-11 Spring 2004 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the completion of degree requirements.
   04-12 Curriculum matters contained in the February 12, 2004, and February 26, 2004, University Curriculum Committee minutes.
   04-14 Change name of the School of Art to the School of Art and Design.
   04-15 Support of a University Childcare Facility.

Dr. Shelton has refrained from making a decision at this time on the proposed revisions to the 2004-2005 University Calendars' common exam schedule and 2005-2006 University Calendar (Faculty Senate Resolution #04-13) in consideration of Chancellor-elect Steve Ballard's review and recommendation.

2. A preliminary call for nominations for the Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching, Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award, Alumni Award for Outstanding Teaching, and University Award for Outstanding Teaching will be distributed soon to all academic unit heads. Copies of the different award nominating procedures are available in the Center for Faculty Development (124 Ragsdale) and Faculty Senate office (140 Rawl Annex). The nomination materials will be due in September 2004, with the award winners recognized in Spring 2005.

3. A special thanks was extended to Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton for covering the cost of refreshments throughout the year for the Faculty Senate meetings.

4. Both 2005-2006 applications for Research/Creative Activity Grants and Teaching Grants are available on the Faculty Senate web sites noted below and in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex. Please call the Faculty Senate office at 328-6537 if you have any questions.

   Research/Creative Activity Grant Applications
due 12:00 noon on Wednesday, September 15, 2004
http://www.ecu.edu/fs/online/AcademicCommittees/rg/researchgrants.htm
Teaching Grant Applications
due 12:00 noon on Friday, October 1, 2004
http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/tg/teachinggrants.htm

Following the announcements, Chair Niswander stated that this past year at least twelve faculty members had passed away. They were Professors Lenore M. Morton (retired, Nursing), David C. F. Lunney (retired, Chemistry), Oscar W. Brannon (retired, Mathematics), Dannelet "Dee" Archer Alley (retired, Mathematics), Donald Sexauer (retired, Art), Ernest Schwarz (retired, Health and Human Performance), W. James Smith (retired, Biology), Svetoslav Lalov (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Don Spence (Education), Frankford M. Johnson (retired, Computer Science), Myree Dunn Jolly-Hayes (retired, Psychology), and George E. Williams (retired, Education). A moment of silence was held in their memory.

C. Bill Shelton, Interim Chancellor
Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton announced legislative briefings for delegations for Pitt and surrounding counties have been scheduled to share some of our concerns as the next session begins. These include capital projects and primary issues related to compensation. Board of Trustees would be meeting day before commencement although no major issues are expected at this meetings. Saturday, there would be two commencements: one for undergraduates and one for graduates. We also reverted, at request of students and faculty, to the former model of department ceremony where individuals are recognized. We anticipate enrollment growth money and should be able to address some issues related to instruction. He further reported that university would be facing a crisis of sorts in office space and would be looking at alternatives for both short and long terms. He then expressed appreciation to Senators and all faculty for their contributions to the university during this year.

Hall (Psychology) questioned information she had about salary increases. Shelton agreed to comment if information could be provided to him. Hall did so.

Rigsby (Geology) moved to suspend the rules to consider a resolution from the Faculty Officers that was included with the agenda as attachment 8. The motion was accepted. Chair Niswander then presented the resolution supporting interim Chancellor Bill Shelton. There was no discussion and the resolution was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #04-16

D. Jim Smith, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Interim Vice Chancellor Smith stated that there were rumors of a 2% raise in budget but proposed budgets have not yet been released. Campus based tuition increases would be used toward some faculty raises. Since we haven't had raises in several years, criteria for determining raises might include a multi-year review. He added that a certain percentage should be across the board.

Agenda committee expressed interest in collaborative teams and Smith reported that he met with team leaders in program development, regional and campus academic initiatives, service learning, SACS requirement, faculty credentialing, and institutional effectiveness. Teams are still working and reports are due soon.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literature) expressed concern about unfair treatment of the whistle blower and if there were any reason that he should not request university review.
Smith did not recall being asked specifically to do this. He was satisfied with removal and reassignment and felt Knickerbocker should proceed as he thought best.

Long (History) questioned the availability of funds for administrative raises and stipends but not for faculty. Shelton responded to the list he was given and responded to the first four names on the list. He, Interim VC Smith, Richard Brown, and Bob Thompson were all given stipends to compensate for additional duties and he will investigate the others. Smith added that he respected Faculty Senate questions about administrative salaries. He pointed out [in response to Long] that they have saved some money, i.e. Chancellor and Provost salaries, but we need to justify increases.

Robinson (Mathematics) supported Knickerbocker’s comments about the whistle-blower situation emphasized the seriousness of this matter. Shelton responded that the university takes seriously all aspects of employment including legal issues. He would direct the University attorney to notify internal auditors and look into allegations.

Gares (Geography) questioned if stipends would improve with the admissions into new PhD programs. Smith reported that the OP shared our concerns about tuition waivers and increased funds for research. Graduate assistants should be doing tasks relevant to programs.

Cope (Psychology) expressed concern about losing faculty because issues and problems were not being addressed. Smith responded that he was not aware of this and encouraged faculty to let him know.

Tigsby (Geology) responded to Gares questions, and reported that academic program development team is looking at the issues just expressed and asked if Ballard had been informed of salary issues and what other issues have been discussed. Smith responded positively, that Ballard had expressed concern over the dean searches, research structure, and the athletic director search.

Warren (Education) commented on the need for office space and asked Smith to elaborate on the option. Smith replied that Bruce Flye would be meeting with the Deans and would have better answer next week. Shelton added that some of the options include rental opportunities off campus, conversion of buildings or resident halls, and some classrooms might be taken offline but these would only be temporary solution. Fall of 2005 would be a major crisis. Smith further added that with 100 faculty positions dedicated to Distance Education anticipate 75 more which might free up office space.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) pointed out a discrepancy in the treatment of international students compared to American students. American students who registered to complete their research requirements and earn their degrees during the spring semester were not required to register and pay any fees in the summer if they take an incomplete in the spring and finish it in the summer. Because of INS regulations, international students could not do this. If international students fail to complete their research in the spring, they must register (and pay the required tuition and fees) during the summer while they remove their incomplete. Smith agreed to discuss this inequity with Charles Lyons.

Tabrizi objected to increasing salaries of only those faculty members who fall in “fear of losing faculty to other universities” category, and stated that ECU should correct inequities in salaries of those
dedicated and productive ECU faculty who chose to stay and work hard for a longer term. Smith replied that among the uses of tuition based increase monies was the retention of faculty. He would be meeting with the Deans soon to address some of these issues.

E. Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty
Chair Niswander reminded Senators of the Teaching Awards Ceremony on April 27. Reminded faculty members about his request to forward information on faculty ECU lost due to salaries and benefits or those we did not even get interviews with due to the same.

Chair Niswander also briefly discussed what he and incoming Chancellor Steve Ballard discussed informally last week. He stated that 80-90% of the conversation dealt with the ECU Faculty Manual, Faculty Senate, faculty salaries, and the importance of following the manual and processes. He stated that Dr. Ballard was a quick study and aware of the important issues facing faculty and the University.

Rigsby (Geology) asked what were the top three or four faculty issues discussed. Chair Niswander responded that the biggest discussion involved understanding the processes in place and that they needed to be followed.

F. Bob Morrison, Faculty Assembly Delegate
Professor Morrison (Chemistry) provided a written report on the Faculty Assembly meeting of April 16, 2004. He clarified the question concerning the recommendations from the Task Force on Fixed Term Faculty. The recommendations were endorsed by the board and policies would be implemented by OP in cooperation with the faculty. Senate supported the report from Faculty Welfare Committee at the February meeting and any changes to the Faculty Manual as a result would come before the Senate. Within the report also is a resolution and power point presentation on athletics. All faculty were encouraged to read the report.

Varner (Academic Library Services) expressed concern about issues of distance learning and what planning had taken place. Morrison reported that the Assembly heard reports on e-learning, which covered a spectrum from having an internet component to a 100% online course, but there was no discussion.

Painter (Allied Health Sciences) asked if the Assembly had addressed the question of free tuition for faculty dependents in order to help retain faculty. Morrison replied that nothing came to floor in Faculty Assembly.

G. Question Period
Robinson (Mathematics) asked about faculty salaries and the lack thereof. ECU “owed” fte’s from legislature. What “stagnation with faculty salaries” really means? Vice Chancellor Smith responded that the University has been behind in positions for a long time. Some areas have been over funded and the attempt would be made to remedy. The administration would continue to make a pitch each year for equity in funding of all campuses.

Cope (Psychology) asked, with the transition to the new Chancellor, how faculty would be ensured a voice on challenges facing them. Smith replied that faculty must depend on those present who would
list priorities in conjunction with Ballard. Niswander added that he had discussed with Ballard the consequences of no salary increase in 3 years and urged serious attention to relief for faculty

Wolfe (Anthropology) asked if Dr. Smith would stay on as Interim Vice Chancellor or Provost for another year? Dr. Smith responded that he did not know, because he had not discussed an end date with Dr. Ballard.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time.

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee
Tim Hudson (Mathematics), Chair of the Committee first presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the March 11, 2004, and March 25, 2004, University Curriculum Committee meetings. There was no discussion and the minutes were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #04-17

Professor Hudson then presented a revised Course Proposal Form and proposed instructions on completing the form. Rigsby (Geology) asked if this form was set up to have information keyed directly into a database. Professor Hudson responded that no, this was a word document that could be saved on a person’s office computer, then completed and emailed electronically to the University Curriculum Committee. There were no further questions and the revised course proposal form and instructions were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #04-18

B. Academic Standards Committee
Catherine Rigsby (Geology), Chair of the Committee presented first a recommendation to conduct a study of the web-based student survey during the summer sessions. She noted that the Committee had met with Dr. Mike Poteat from the Department of Institutional Planning and Research and sees a positive outcome from this request.

Wall (Philosophy) asked if the web-based student survey would be used in the future, stating that it may lack empirical support and he did not know what it measured. Rigsby responded that she had argued against the SOIS but conceded that we have it and it was to be used only to determine feasibility of a web-based survey and wanted a smaller database. Any permanent changes, such as moving to a web-based survey during fall and spring semesters, would come to the Senate. Wall then moved to have a reference to the current 2004 year added. Rigsby accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Morrison (Chemistry) moved to remove the word “all” and replace it with “2004” and delete the words “this year.” There was no objection.

Cope (Psychology) asked if they anticipated any content changes to the survey in the web version. Rigsby replied that no, there was not. Ullfers (Music) questioned the contradictory nature of “all” courses although participation by faculty is voluntary. Rigsby replied that they wanted to make it available to all of the courses, although it would be up to the faculty member.
Robinson (Mathematics) asked about the validity and fairness of a web-based survey since students who don't come to class might respond as well as problems of validity and reliability of the survey itself. Rigby responded that the committee was concerned about these same issues but agreed that in terms of logistics and finances, a pilot study of web-based survey format would be more feasible during the summer.

Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) suggested the word “all” be dropped from the resolution, and questioned SOIS and asked that an effort be made in fall to determine the validity and reliability of the instrument. Rigby accepted the friendly amendment.

Brown (Education) supported the request but also pointed out the use of DE classes since they are more problematic in term of time line for change and implementation and asked if a time line for change existed. Rigby reported that the time line was not discussed and that she was aware the survey might need to be changed to accommodate DE classes.

Toppen (Technology) supported the resolution, reminding Senators this would be a pilot study only. Decker (Health & Human Performance) reiterated that the proposal was intended to study the method of responding to the survey and there had been no discussion of content or timeline. Twarog (Art) asked if there would be feedback that survey was received. Rigby said that the study would address these types of questioned. Faculty members would see the results.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literature) spoke in favor of the report but questioned the ability to relate summer results to what may happen in spring or fall semesters. Response rate would be very different. Rigby maintained that the purpose of the survey is to test feasibility of web-based survey, not compare results.

Pravica (Mathematics) questioned the logistics and the window for responses. Rigby responded that committee approved the study and brought the resolution to Senate for action. Continuing Education committee is looking at other issues related to this.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) asked whether or not the study would include the response rate, which was a problem. Rigby replied that it would only report on feasibility. Tabrizi then asked that the university study the difference in the response rates. Rigby suggested that he contact Dr. Poteat who was unable to be here today.

Tovey (English) also reported that several of her DE students reported problems accessing One Stop, which affects their ability to respond to the surveys. Rigby noted that these physical difficulties should come out in the study.

Scott (Academic Library Services) moved to add the word “pilot” in the title. Rigby accepted his suggestion as friendly amendment.

Wall (Philosophy) asked if faculty would be required to give the reports to the chair and questioned its legitimacy as a “pilot” study. Rigby responded that it specifically stated that results would be sent to faculty member and that they could not be given to the chair, except by the faculty member.

Sprague (Physics) called the questioned. Motion was approved as amended. RESOLUTION #04-19
Professor Rigsby then discussed briefly the draft Goals of the Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum. She noted that in March 2002, the Committee was asked (via the Educational Policies and Planning Committee) to examine the University's general education policy before EHST 2110/2111 or any other non-natural science general education course was approved (Faculty Senate resolution #02-11). Open hearings on this report would be scheduled and announced in the Fall, with Faculty Senate consideration by Spring 2005. She asked that any questions be directed to her at 328-4297.

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Charles Hodson (Medicine), Vice Chair of the Committee, first presented the proposed *University Undergraduate Catalog* interpretation and Policy for Transfer of Credits from Non-regionally Accredited Institutions.

Wall (Philosophy) asked what the motivation was for this move. Hodson replied that it would provide college credit for some military training. Some areas would be appropriate but acceptable credits would be dependent on the agreement of the particular departments. Guidelines would be available from ACE. Niswander added that university already makes provisions for validating exams and each unit had dealt with specifics for its particular program.

Scott (Academic Library Services) asked about credit by transfer section, specifically how students would know about grades of D or F if the courses do not transfer. Muller responded that transfer credits would continue to be evaluated and awarded according to current policy. All transcripts would be used to determine magna cum laude honors; even if credits had not transferred, they remain on the transcripts.

Following discussion, the proposed *University Undergraduate Catalog* interpretation and Policy for Transfer of Credits from Non-regionally Accredited Institutions were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #04-20**

Professor Hodson then presented a report on Streamlining Reporting Processes, including a proposed modification to the Current Five-Year Unit Evaluation Cycle.

Morrison (Chemistry) moved to add “three representatives of the Faculty Senate on staggered terms” after “Graduate School,” in #1. There was no objection.

Following discussion, the report and recommendations were approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #04-21**

Professor Hodson then presented for information the Committee's approval of the Notification of Intent to Plan a BS degree in Sports Studies, Notification of Intent to Plan a MA degree in Communications, and the Permission to Establish a DPT Degree in Physical Therapy. There were no questions.

D. Faculty Governance Committee

Dee Dee Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix Y. Grievance Policies and Procedures.*
Chair Niswander recognized Professor Gene Hughes (Business), Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee, for his tireless efforts and dedication to the Committee and revisions to the University faculty grievance procedures.

Nasea (Health Sciences Library) moved to revise Section III.B., 5th paragraph to read as follows: "Upon completion of the Petition for Redress, the grievant shall provide a copy to the respondent and the chair of the committee. The grievant, by way of memorandum to the committee chair, shall indicate his or her intention to continue with the grievance. The Petition for Redress must be provided to the respondent by certified mail or by another means that provides proof of delivery." Motion approved.

The proposed revisions to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix Y. Grievance Policies and Procedures were approved as amended. RESOLUTION #04-22

Glascoff announced that open hearings on revisions to Appendix D would be scheduled in the fall and presented to the Senate for a vote at the September meeting and she also stressed the importance of this appendix to all faculty.

Niswander thanked Glascoff for her dedicated work on the Faculty Governance Committee.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee
David Lawrence (Geology), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for Faculty. He noted two major changes from the previous version: 1) Section III. B. now reads 1st request may be leave “up to 15 calendar weeks” and Section III.C. Addresses request for extension beyond 15 weeks, and 2) Section V. would not prohibit other faculty from covering classes of the faculty on leave.

Wall (Philosophy) questioned whether there was a one year cap under Section III.E and asked about illnesses for longer that one year. He stated that the BOG policy did not mandate a one-year cap. Lawrence agreed that this was arbitrary but had to consider the economic impact on the university.

Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) questioned the need for the statement of two-week period in Section III.E. The units would generally cover more than 15 days and would we have to come under this policy. Lawrence responded that the addition was made because of the situation Glascoff described, particularly if the department were unable to find a substitute with the appropriate specialty.

Ciesielski (Industry & Technology) asked when the individual would activate the benefit and also questioned the interpretation of “total maximum allowable paid leave” of one year would be applied to one illness or total for any and all illness amounting to a year’s time. Lawrence directed Senators to Section III. E. ... “total maximum allowable paid leave for all such serious illnesses may not exceed one year in length.”

Nasea (Health Sciences Library) raised the issue of status of paid leave for staff who had exhausted their sick leave.
Scott (Academic Library Services) questioned the language that suggested the maximum leave would be for a lifetime and not for new illness. Scott then moved to amend the first sentence under Section I. to read "For purposes of this policy a brief absence is defined as fourteen (14) or less working days as defined in the UNC Code." There was no objection to this amendment.

Hall (Psychology) asked about the appropriateness of the university acquiring medical records in light of new privacy laws. Cook responded that, since any files would not be shared with a third party, the privacy laws would not be violated.

Robinson asked for clarification concerning Sec. III. E. and the amount of time in one twelve-month period. Lawrence pointed out that the phrase "as long as the second illness is not related to the first."

Morrison (Chemistry) moved to amend Section III.E. to read "all such serious illnesses originating in a twelve month period." He explained that he wanted to clarify that the maximum leave should not be interpreted as total for a lifetime. Motion approved.

Scott offered an amendment by adding "total annual maximum leave ...” The amendment failed.

Ciesielski (Technology and Computer Science) moved to add to Section III.E. "shall not exceed one year per illness or five years per lifetime." Scott (Academic Library Services) again questioned under what circumstances additional leaves would be granted. Niswander responded that a second leave might be granted for another cause. Lawrence added that each leave would have a time limit. No mention was made of a lifetime leave.

Ciesielski (Technology and Computer Science) moved to add to Section III.E. "shall not exceed one year per illness or five years per lifetime." Motion was not seconded.

Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) moved to return the report to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further discussion and review. Cope suggested that legal issues need to be considered by the committee. Wetherington replied that she had worked on the first draft.

Anderson (Education) spoke against the motion to return the report to the Faculty Welfare Committee because the committee had worked very hard to get this policy done especially following the discussion by the Senate at an earlier meeting, has solved problems and the Senate needed to take into consideration those employees who need maternity leave or leave due to an illness. She also expressed concern about what employees would do without the policy in place since the OP had requested that we have a policy. Nasea (Health Sciences Library) noted OP policy supposed to reflect FMLA. Scott (Academic Library Services) noted that FMLA provides minimum standards, not maximum. Niswander stated that FMLA did not provide for paid leave.

Glascoff (Health & Human Services) expressed appreciation for Anderson’s comments but does not agree that we can pass a policy if the body doesn’t understand it. She further suggested that the policy needs to be simplified so that all can understand it. Willson (Medicine) supported the motion and stated that we cannot “wordsmith” in this forum.

Jiffers (Music) suggested that we accept the policy and amend in the fall, which would be better than no policy. Pravica (Mathematics) asked how long it might take to amend. Glascoff (Health & Human
Performance) reminded the group that the process included Chancellor, Board of Trustees and OP approval and we would not be able to discuss again until September anyway.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) supported the motion to send back to committee. Scott (Academic Library Services) spoke in favor of going back to committee for uniform benefits since last sentence in Section III. E. allows non-uniformity in benefits. Rigsby (Geology) spoke in favor of sending report back to committee to address contradictions since that could be troublesome.

Following a lengthy discussion, the proposed Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for Faculty was returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further discussion and review. RESOLUTION #04-23

Niswander asked Senators to consider that OP might impose a policy if Senate did not take action. He also reminded Senators of their responsibility to read and understand reports prior to the meeting and reported that none of these issues were brought out in the hearings scheduled by the committee.

F. Unit Code Screening Committee
Christine Zoller (Art), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented new unit codes of operation for the Departments of Child Development and Family Relations, Criminal Justice, and Interior Design and Merchandising and a revised School of Social Work unit code. There was no discussion and the unit codes were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #04-24

Agenda Item VI. New Business
There being no further business to come before the Faculty Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Tovey
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate office

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE APRIL 20, 2004, MEETING

04-16 Resolution Supporting Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton as follows:
Whereas, Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton unselfishly stepped forward to lead East Carolina University at a time of uncertainty and turmoil, and
Whereas, Interim Chancellor Shelton provided a calming influence, promoted and supported free and open discussion, encouraged the University community to continue positive forward progress, and
Whereas, Interim Chancellor Shelton practiced inclusive and collaborative decision making with faculty, staff, and administrators, and
Whereas, Bill Shelton demonstrated clear leadership and served with high distinction and integrity as Interim Chancellor during a critical time in the history of the institution,
Therefore Be It Resolved, that the faculty of East Carolina University expresses its collective thanks and heartfelt appreciation to Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton for his leadership, guidance, enthusiasm, steadying hand, belief in the faculty, and adherence to the precepts of shared governance during his tenure as Interim Chancellor.

Be It Further Resolved, that the faculty looks forward to Dr. Shelton reassuming his full-time critical role in the Office of University Advancement as East Carolina University approaches its 100th anniversary.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

04-17 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the March 11, 2004, and March 25, 2004, University Curriculum Committee meetings.

Disposition: Chancellor

04-18 Revised Course Proposal Form and instructions.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

04-19 The Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness should be permitted to perform a pilot study of the web based student survey during 2004 summer session courses. The pilot study should compare the web-based survey with the traditional SOIS forms by surveying the same class both ways. Participation in the study should be on a voluntary basis. Individual faculty results should not be made available to anybody other than the faculty member.

Disposition: Chancellor

04-20 Interpretation to the University Undergraduate Catalog and Policy for Transfer of Credits from Non-regionally Accredited Institutions.

Interpretation
Up to ½ the hours of credit required for graduation can be taken at regionally accredited community colleges and/or non-regionally accredited institutions, provided in the latter case that the credit is validated by unit testing, credit by exam, or unit acceptance of ACE (American Council on Education) recommendations pertaining to that credit. All granting of credit must be approved by the faculty in the discipline of the course.

Procedure
• During the 2004-2005 academic year, the faculty in each academic unit will review ACE Guide recommendations for awarding of credit in their disciplines. Each unit shall determine and publish its approval process for awarding of credit according to ACE recommendations. Units may not approve awarding of credit for courses not in their discipline.
• The Office of Undergraduate Admissions will solicit additional unit review of transfer student records for enrolling students whose transcripts include such previously disallowed credit.

Disposition: Chancellor

04-21 Report on Streamlining Reporting Processes, including the following recommendations.
1. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies the formation of a new Administrative Committee, the
Process Improvement Committee, consisting of the Director of IPRE, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of Institutional Research and Testing, a representative from the Division of Academic Affairs, the Division of Health Sciences, the Faculty Senate, ITCS, the Graduate School, and three representatives of the Faculty Senate on staggered terms and a dean's representative from each college or school. The charge of this administrative committee should be to review the reporting process and make recommendations to the vice chancellors to coordinate reports, reduce duplication of effort, and enhance the usability of information requested. The committee will develop a charge and membership with staggered terms.

2. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies that graduate and undergraduate program review should be initiated using a 10-year cycle beginning in fall 2005. The reviews should be coordinated with external professional accreditation reports whenever possible. For programs that have professional accreditation, the program review process will not involve external reviewers and will consider the accreditation agency's standards. It is possible that the accreditation report would suffice for internal review purposes. Both internal and external reviewers will review programs without professional accreditation.

3. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs a significant revision of the Unit Annual Report to be used in spring 2004. The revised report eliminates requests for information that is provided in other reports or that is no longer being used.

4. The committee recommends that the Process Improvement Committee continue to move toward developing relational databases to improve efficiency in report preparation and analysis and to provide units more access to information.

5. The committee recommends that the Process Improvement Committee develop a staggered schedule for the Five-Year Unit Evaluations to begin in 2004-05.

Disposition: Chancellor

Disposition: Chancellor and Board of Trustees

04-23 Proposed Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for Faculty was returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further discussion and review.
Disposition: Faculty Welfare Committee

04-24 New unit codes of operation for the Departments of Child Development and Family Relations, Criminal Justice, and Interior Design and Merchandising and a revised School of Social Work unit code.
Disposition: Chancellor