

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2011

The eighth regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 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 [March 29, 2011](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Willson (Medicine) and Wilson (Sociology/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Willis for Reynolds (Academic Library Services), Mazow for Perry (Anthropology), Gibson for Paul (Business), Felts for Cooper (Health and Human Performance), and Roper for Fitzgerald (Medicine).

B. Announcements

John Toller, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources provided an [update](#) on the State Health Plan.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the March 29, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting:

- 11-28 Approval of the Spring 2011 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the complete of degree requirements.

Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by May 1, 2011.

Following the Scholarship Workshop last month, the Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee has worked with the Financial Aid office to provide an online list of University Scholarships available to students at:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/financial/scholarbycollege.cfm#a4>.

A preliminary call for nominations for the *Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching*, *Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award*, *East Carolina Alumni Association Outstanding Teaching Award* and *Robert L. Jones Teaching Award* will be distributed soon to all academic unit heads. Nomination materials will be due September 1 and portfolios due November 1. Information on the different award nominating procedures are available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/aa/academicawards.cfm>.

Faculty interested in periodically receiving issues of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* are asked to call the Faculty Senate office at 328-6537 and place their name on a list for distribution.

Thanks to Chancellor Ballard for the refreshments provided at each Faculty Senate meeting.

C. Chancellor Steve Ballard announced that the QEP that has been chosen is “The Vertical Writing Curriculum: Integrating and Aligning Writing Instruction at ECU He stated that he had asked the Provost to move forward on also implementing the Mathematics QEP proposal “Support for Students in High Enrollment Courses.” The Chancellor stated that the other QEP proposals were excellent but were as central to what we need to do first as a University.

The Chancellor thanked the Senate for the work of the various committees this year; he mentioned in particular the recent meetings and report of the EPPC. He said that there were justifiably a lot of questions about what the EPPC report suggests. The Chancellor reported that EPPC did what they were asked to do by defining the framework and the guidelines by which we can move forward in defining all the costs that are not related to the academic core and start to develop an agenda to cut what is not in the academic core. The purpose is to save money in overhead costs to protect the academic core and faculty positions. The Board of Trustees also requested consideration of consolidation of programs over the next five to ten years. The Chancellor stated that he had asked the Vice Chancellors to look at all consolidations, in all university services, in an effort to protect faculty positions. Chancellor Ballard also stated that ECU is in “inning one of a long ball game”. He promised that there will be a full vetting of everyone’s ideas and there will be no rush to make decisions unless required by the state budget; he stated that he wants to “get it right” even if it takes months and months past the deadline of the end of June this year. The Chancellor summarized that from here on out there are tough decisions. The Chancellor asked that everyone who is potentially impacted by reorganization to bear with and participate in the process. He stated that we are in a period where we must consider that austerity is to be expected in state support. He concluded that ECU will have to find a better way to do business even if we differ from the traditional approach. We have to protect what means the most to ECU.

The Chancellor will be in Raleigh all day tomorrow working with other chancellors in an effort to have an on impact the House of Representatives and the NC budget. The emphasis will be how higher education is treated in the House budget. He said that he expects the worst of the budget projections. The budget reduction may be as much as 17.7%, and we will give back some enrollment growth funding. There is also no impact on F&A money by the proposed budget at this time. The House budget removed the line item cuts and the micromanaging of university operations and called for management flexibility in which the campuses make the choice of how to administer the eventual cuts. He stated that he expects the house bill to pass in about one to six weeks and then to go on to the Senate for their considerations over the following four to six weeks.

Chancellor also reported that he is chairing a committee for the University system on athletics focusing on academic support services and standards for admission and treatment of student athletes. The Chancellor stated that this was one of the most important topics that he had been involved in over the last several years. Although this committee will not issue a final report until mid June, the Chancellor stated that this effort is already having an influence on ECU. He reported that ECU is already doing business differently and better than most schools and hope that we are seen as a model of protecting academic integrity and institutional integrity based on the management of the athletes. ECU is third in Conference USA on the honor roll after Rice and UCF, and we are very close to Rice if their women’s rowing is taken out the honor roll equation. The Chancellor stated that it is easy for athletes to commit academic difficult to detect

it. ECU suffered from a case of academic fraud about a year ago. Currently Director of Compliance, Mr. Jamie Johnson, reports directly to the Chancellor, which provides a degree of protection for the compliance officer from influence by coaches or others. There are also quarterly reports from the Director of Compliance to the Faculty Senate committee and to the Provost. The organizational structure of tutoring has also changed to report directly to the Provost. The Chancellor's goal is to do all we can to protect the academic integrity of ECU by considering where athletes live, what support services they are offered and how to help those who are at most at risk.

No questions were posed to the Chancellor at this time. Chair Walker thanked the Chancellor for his advocacy of the faculty, especially in these crucial budget times.

D. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

Looking within - Today is the last Faculty Senate meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year. In fact, for many of our senators, this will be the last Faculty Senate meeting. I'd like for those faculty senators, who are rotating of the senate this year and not returning to the Faculty Senate next year - to stand and be recognized. We truly appreciate your service to the university and for being part of our faculty body. I'm not sure if you are aware of the many contributions our Senators make behind the scenes. I thought I'd share a few as a reflection of the service they have made. Please rise as I speak your name and remain standing until the end.

- Sherri Jones – (Allied Health Sciences) – served for two years as senator. Has been extremely active in Admissions and Retention Committee and on the Agenda Committee.
- Cynthia Bickley-Green (Art and Design) – served for two years as a senator. Has been on 5 university committees since 2001, including University Budget and Student Scholarships committees.
- Bill Grobe (Education) - served for two years as a senator and two years as an alternate, beginning in 2006. Also served on the Faculty Grievance committee.
- Elizabeth Fogarty (Education) - served for two years as a senator and served on the Student Academic Appellate committee for three years.
- Puri Martinez(Foreign Languages and Literatures) - served for 8 years as a senator and 2 years as an alternate, beginning in 1999. She is known as “the Dr. of Shared Governance” – and has served on as a member and Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee for 5 years, and is a Faculty Marshal. She is also rotating off The Faculty Governance Committee this year. Puri, we will miss you!
- Hunt McKinnon - served for four years as a senator, and for four years as an alternate. Hunt has also been the Secretary of the Faculty for the past two years, and has been a Faculty Assembly delegate. He has been extremely active in the University Environment and Libraries Committees, including representation and interest in Master Planning and advocacy for fixed-term faculty. Thanks Hunt for all your service.
- Mike Spurr (Mathematics) served for two years as a senator and two years as an alternate, serving also on the Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee.
- P.J. Schenarts (Medicine) - served for four years as a senator, despite his tours in Afghanistan and is our first Faculty Marshal from Medicine.

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 19, 2011

Page 4.

- Charles Wilson (Medicine) - served for 6 years as a senator and two years as an alternate and is serving on the Agenda Committee.
- Jon Wacker (Music) - served for two years as a senator and has served on the Libraries and Student Academic Appellate Committees and Grievance Board.
- Mark Taggart (Music) - served for six years as a senator & 5 years as an alternate and of course, for two terms as Chair of the Faculty. He now serves on the senate as Past Chair of the Faculty. Since 2001, Mark has served on 8 university committees and has been a Faculty Assembly delegate and is a Faculty Marshal. Thanks Mark for your continued dedication and service.
- Maura McAuliffe (Nursing) - served for four years as a senator.
- Kim Larsen (Nursing) - served for two years as a senator and two years as an alternate and also on the Agenda Committee.
- Jay Morris (Political Science) - served for four years as a senator and three years as alternate.
- Tarek Abdel-Salem (Technology and Computer Science) - served for two years as a senator and three years on the Research/Creative Activity Grants committee.
- Leslie Pagliari (Technology and Computer Science) - served for four years as a senator and has served on EPPC and Continuing and Career Education committees.
- Deedee Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) – served as a Faculty Marshal, Faculty Senator, Faculty Assembly representative for six years, and officer on the Faculty Governance, Student Academic Appellate, University Environment, and Agenda Committees.
- Wendy Sharer (English) – served as a Senator for four years, Admission and Retention Policies Committee for 6 years, and on the Agenda and Committee on Committees.
- Elaine Seeman (Business) – served three years as a Faculty Senator and member of the Faculty Information Technology Review Committee, Continuing and Career Education Committee and Grievance Board.

Let's show our appreciation for these faculty members who have provided service to the university as part of the legislative body of the faculty and its committees. We look forward to your continued involvement on university wide initiatives and hope you will mentor other faculty to follow in your footsteps.

We have all been extremely busy and productive this year, as individual faculty, within our departments, units, colleges, committees, and Faculty Senate. We are aware of the myriad of initiatives, charges, policy review, and tasks, in addition to the review of the Faculty Manual! Last week I updated the Board of Trustees regarding our progress of the Faculty manual, and they praised our productivity and truly remarkable work. Believe it or not, following today's meeting and pending the actions of the faculty senate and ultimate approval of the Chancellor, 75% of the Faculty Manual will be completed this year. I cannot provide enough praise for the many, MANY faculty who have assisted in getting this task accomplished. Next year, following the final edits to the FM, we will embark on a reorganization of the manual.

The Faculty Senate has been very productive this year, with agendas between 30 to 60 pages long and at least one meeting actually lasting 4 hours (without losing quorum)! Our legislative body has received many accolades during the year, but just who "are we"? As our university

has grown larger, the makeup of the Faculty Senate has changed over time. There are 58 senators based on the number of faculty in coded units. This year, our senate contains the following: Divisions of Academic Affairs – 44 senators or 76% of senate and Division of Health Sciences – 14 or 24% of senate. The professional colleges and schools made up the majority of the senate having 39 senators (for 67% of the senate), with Arts and Sciences having 19 or 33% of the senate. For the elected senators, 43 or 74% have graduate faculty status, and for the Total FS body, consisting of senators, alternates, and ex-officio members (127) – 69% have graduate faculty status. Interesting stats!

This year, the Faculty Senate, and university standing committees (academic and appellate) have been called on to engage in university initiatives that have required additional efforts and increased levels of productivity. The faculty have stepped up and have successfully embarked on increased requests relating to established charges, and have allowed the university to address contemporary challenges. Not only have we made needed changes to the Faculty Manual, but we have examined our committees, committee representatives, and charges to meet the needs of the university as a whole. I applaud all who have been involved this year, as well as the senators for their service.

Faculty influence through Shared governance has taken on an expanded dimension this year in light of the looming state budget cuts, with the Chancellor's decision to obtain direct involvement of the faculty and faculty senate in the initial stages of academic program prioritization. As a result, EPPC was given a charge by the Chancellor to initially provide a set of criteria which could be used to examine program productivity and prioritization, in addition to initially considering (brainstorming) potential program/unit consolidations, in the event of severe budget cuts. As you will hear in a few minutes, this committee embarked on the challenge and has provided a proposal for discussion today. While this proposal will undoubtedly generate much discussion on campus, it is just the first step to examine potential consolidations as we manage potential budget cuts. We must not lose sight that faculty within the Senate as well as within the individual units will be involved as our university develops plans for organizational changes, from the ground level. This has not been the case with other universities in North Carolina, where reorganization involved limited opportunity for faculty senate and unit involvement. EPPC has done a fine job of providing a starting point for these important campus-wide discussions.

In addition to EPPC's report, the University Budget Committee will outline its involvement in this process. These two committees will also have representation on a Program Prioritization Committee, newly formed by the Chancellor, which will provide continuity and communication with the committees and the faculty as a whole.

So – what about next year? We will begin the discussion with a faculty forum next Tuesday following the Faculty Senate Organizational meeting (4:15 in Mendenhall Great Room). Over the summer, we will establish electronic forums to allow interactive communication relative to the budget situation and its effects on our university. Please share with us any other suggestions for how we can continue to ensure we fully represent faculty perspectives as we address the pressing challenges ahead. For only with that full understanding can we truly represent all faculty to administration and “Come Together” on these issues.”

No questions were posed to Chair Walker at this time.

E. Special Report on Budget and Academic Program Prioritization

Chair Walker noted that next on the agenda was a [special report](#) by the Educational and Policies and Planning Committee and the University Budget Committee, which was available for each Faculty Senator. The Agenda Committee recommended this special report from these committees considering the situation with the budget and the roles these committees are playing in the university, in lieu of task forces. As previously heard from Chancellor Ballard, our state is experiencing budget deficits and UNC is anticipating significant budget cuts. While we do not know what the actual cuts will be, our university is preparing for various budget cut scenarios including possible consolidations of programs to reduce administrative costs, while saving faculty positions. To anticipate these needs, Chancellor Ballard decided to begin with an established elected university academic committee (EPPC) to explore criteria and potential program consolidations. In addition, the University Budget Committee has taken on a role previously assumed by an appointed Budget Task Force (two years ago), and to communicate important budget information with the faculty. Recently, the committee put out a call to the campus regarding suggestions for budget cuts. There will be a faculty forum on the budget and program prioritization/consolidation on April 26 at the Senate's organizational meeting. The EPPC proposal was distributed to the senators.

Professor Scott MacGilvray (Medicine), Chair of the University Budget Committee stated that the budget committee has been attempting to keep the Senate updated over the last few months . At this time, Professor MacGilvray stated, there is not a lot of additional news to report about the state budget bill. The good news is that micromanaging may be disappearing from the budget negotiations. The University Budget Committee will continue to meet throughout the summer and will make sure that all information is conveyed to the faculty and the Faculty Senate. The committee will also be involved in interviewing for the permanent selection of a Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance. An effort will also be made to solicit input from the faculty perspective and the committee meeting is in two days looking for cost savings to offset budget cuts coming to the university. The University Budget Committee and EPPC met in joint session last Friday for the first time. Several items came out of that meeting, although the proposal by EPPC was not discussed in this meeting. The University Budget Committee feels that more working knowledge of the state budget should be shared, especially with EPPC so we can get the best advice to the administration. Professor MacGilvray mentioned that the Program Prioritization Committee will hold its initial meeting on May 5th. The University Budget Committee will seek input from other committees in an open and transparent process. In summary, we are all in this together. Having members of the budget committee on the PPC and hosting budget forums will help represent the faculty perspective. Every effort will be made to help make ECU a better academic institution that runs efficiently.

Professor Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee stated that the charge from the Chancellor was to address reduction of potential administrative costs with no loss to faculty or staff positions and protect the academic core. He reminded the Senators that this was a preliminary exercise.

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 19, 2011

Page 7.

Professor Gordon stated that the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) was appointed in Spring 2011 by Chancellor Ballard with the specific purpose to thoroughly review and evaluate options for program consolidation (need to check on this, I thought it was just for academic programs), using the framework of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate. The results of the work of this committee are intended to protect faculty positions, academic programs, and the academic experience of our students. The Committee membership will be: Ron Mitchelson (Chair), Marilyn Sheerer, Phyllis Horns, Deirdre Mageean, Rick Niswander, Marianna Walker, Scott Gordon, Ed Stellwag, Scott MacGilvray, Todd Fraley, Mike Dorsey, and Sylvia Brown.

Professor Howard (Communication) asked why productivity with teaching was aligned with peer institutions when ranking, etc. was an internal matter. He wondered what the reason was to look outside the University when trying to compare. Professor Gordon agreed and stated that he did not see why we could not use a UNC funding formula to assist with the compilation of numbers.

Professor Theurer (Music) noted that he knew that the work of the committee was done with the best of intentions and that there was clearly faculty representation. He stated that he would have loved to have had this report prior to the Senate meeting in order to prepare formal remarks. He stated that the ramifications to this were so significant and hard to hold back. Quoting a poem, "The arts are like a rare flower ..." he stated that an earlier reorganization 10 years ago occurred with little faculty input and caused a lot of disruption within the School of Music. He stated that this report was done without representation from Music and asked how his school was different from English, also considered essential. He stated that the School of Music operates one-on-one with one teacher teaching one student at a time. There is no other way to do it. He stated that rearranging schools, colleges, and departments now just to save money does long-term damage to the School of Music and the students. Professor Gordon replied that the arts were highly recognized at ECU and the committee understood the nature of Music faculty in their teaching and interaction with students. He stated that the committee had multiple meetings on this with top administration and understood the sensitivity of the issue. Professor Gordon stated that he chose to provide complete transparency, by not sending it out via email but holding it until this morning – not in an attempt to hide work, but avoid damage to units without open discourse. Professor Gordon clarified that the School of Music was not being torn apart, but suggested as a move in its entirety to another academic unit.

Chair Walker reminded Senators that an open faculty forum was scheduled for next Tuesday, April 26 at 4:15 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Rooms to openly discuss this report and preliminary suggestions.

Professor Rigsby thanked the committee and agreed that the suggested preliminary report was thorough. She asked what was the University's core philosophy? She stated that ECU had disseminated liberal arts (math, literature, philosophy) and how they relate. If we split them up then we are breaking apart connected fields of study. UNC Tomorrow stresses liberal arts and in reference to budgets, some units bring in a lot of students and other units bring in research dollars, noting that it took two different sets to make the University work.

Professor Novick (Medicine) stated that he was not going to debate the merits and asked about where the Department of Public Health, currently with the School of Medicine, would go. Professor Gordon replied to the College of Allied Health Sciences.

Professor Sharer (English) stated that in response to reorganizing arts and sciences, might we combine the foundations location and see how we could refigure the liberal arts and college of arts and sciences on campus. She suggested that a group also look at other institutions and see how they handle liberal arts.

Professor Sharon Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) stated that she knew that this was preliminary and for initial discussion but wanted to stress that CDFR has a strong history and philosophical and theoretical foundation. She also noted that an unintended consequence of the reorganization would be the negative reaction from the strong alumni base of the department. She also noted her confusion that CDFR, a large faculty body, was just told by their Dean to consider how they could split the department into two units/departments. Professor Ballard then advocated for more transparency from the body that takes this preliminary report forward since she was uncertain with the direction of her Dean.

Professor Popke (Geography) wanted to see a cost savings report that all of these reorganizations would create.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked what was the timeline for the organizational changes? Chancellor Ballard responded by mid-July, stating that if the legislature passed a very negative budget then something may happen faster; otherwise, the recommendations would be formalized mid-July through August then handled accordingly.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) reminded the group that there has to be "a day one". Professor Glascoff stated that EPPC put much thought into how best to publicize this preliminary report and it was suggested that it was best to provide it here today to the Faculty Senators. EPPC was not charged to do anything else and that there was no effort to keep this proposal a secret.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that he understands that preliminary report and idea about the synergy but wanted to know how this will save money. What administrative costs would be saved, especially if deans, etc. lost their administrative jobs and returned to teaching. Chancellor Ballard stated that he would ask Rick Niswander (Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance) about how to quantify this preliminary report. If it breaks down that the amount of savings is minimal, Chancellor Ballard stated that he was hesitant to reorganize the entire University. He reminded the Senators that the newly formed Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) would be the ones who take this proposal forward and work with numbers.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that he felt the tension in the room and would have liked to have seen more open communication at the beginning of this process. He understood that faculty were asked to do this and that this was an opportunity for faculty to be involved at the start, but thought that representation from all colleges should have been involved. He stressed that he thought that EPPC was put into a bad position and unfortunately seen negatively and that faculty were caused unnecessary angst. He noted that the entire exercise

seemed more like of a centralized decision. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that she was not aware of this information prior to today. Chair Walker reminded the Senators that EPPC had no choice but to address the Chancellor's request and charge.

Professor Bauer (English) stated that she understood that there had to be a day one but was concerned with the idea about a recommendation being made over the summer. She stressed that she comes from a big department and there was not time for the department to meet and have discussion before the faculty forum next Tuesday. She stated that humanities and fine arts had a lot in common and that the sciences help fund literature and art. She was bothered that no one from either academic unit was involved in the work of EPPC.

Chancellor Ballard stated that he was in no hurry to finalize this preliminary report and that he agreed that a college-by-college review of the report was necessary. He stated that if the budget reduction remained high and there was no tuition increase, the money had to come from somewhere and that that is the scenario that may cause something to happen over the summer. He stated that he will lay out a timeframe whereas the newly formed PPC may report and that other groups will also be involved in the discussion. He reminded the Senators that if the suggested reorganization would not provide substantial budget savings, cuts in other areas would need to be increased to meet the needs.

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) expressed his appreciation for the committees work and does not doubt the Committee members' high integrity. He stated that the Math faculty would want to stay in Arts and Sciences or in physical sciences and that he supported Professor Rigsby's statements. He asked that the University think carefully about splitting the College of Arts and Sciences with the synergy currently taking place

Professor Bailey (Philosophy/guest) reminded Senators that this was a draft and drafts are always problematic. He asked how we could get reasonable input to the committee to help the committee make this the best possible solution before the next draft comes forward? He stated that faculty have no choice but start work on this since this represents the interest of the University. Chair Walker replied that we need more discussion before faculty leave for the summer. She asked the Senators to take this proposal back to academic units and send any input to EPPC at epc@ecu.edu. She stated that faculty should discuss solutions, possible scenarios, combinations, etc. within the units and encouraged the faculty and faculty senators to attend the open forum next week.

Professor White (Technology and Computer Science) stated that he sees this as a big puzzle and that it does not always save money to consolidate units and/or create new ones. It does not make sense right now to make changes unless we see that there are substantial cost savings.

Professor Taggart (Music) thanked Professor Scott for the report and thanked colleagues for speaking about the differences among liberal arts and professional disciplines. There are two different models and he stated that he agreed with Professor Rigsby that this may "gut the University" and cause damage to the schools. He noted that compatible models may not be attainable and that these initial reorganization suggestions may only damage the professional schools in the long run.

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 19, 2011

Page 10.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked about the relationship of the two reports, i.e. will the prioritization address savings? He noted that, as a member of the University Budget Committee, they have input into the prioritization. On the newly formed PPC, the four faculty members are from large academic programs and reminded Senators that life in small programs was different. He suggested that a faculty member from a small program should also be represented on the PPC. Professor Gordon replied that he did not have time to integrate the two reports and agreed that the PPC should start with the prioritization report prior to reorganizing the University.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated that the prioritization report may cause a loss of faculty, whereas, the reorganization /consolidation report may cause administrative loss, but not faculty or staff.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) spoke about the prioritization criteria for programs, department, units, schools, and colleges and stated that she liked the way productivity measures began the report. She also applauded the Committee on acknowledging teaching, scholarship, and service as work of the faculty.

Professor Christian (Business) asked if the whole process needed to be quantified by the budget savings before too much effort was put forward. Professor Gordon replied that this was the EPPC's intent.

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) sees the EPPC proposal as an IF it comes to this, will it save money. With all potential issues being addressed today, if it does not save money it does not make sense to cause all of this upheaval. If moving forward with this large amount of work, then there must be evident savings..

Professor Bailey (Philosophy) stated that he understood that the PPC would make recommendations on prioritization and consolidation. He stressed that whoever does the money crunching needed to know and understand the inner workings of the various academic units. Some UNC campuses have larger classrooms so numbers are different.

Vice Chancellor Niswander stated that he would make sure that there was no stone left unturned. The issue of costs versus benefits was important. Mentally as you think about this, the academic units being combined makes a difference. Administrative overhead within a college does not stop the work. Most administrators are tenured so salary is not saved. The more restraints we place on the fact finding, the less savings we may have.

Chancellor Ballard stated that the discussion had been very helpful and that his leadership team would take all of the time necessary as long as the legislature gave the University time. He stated that he wanted to study the report to see what made sense. There may be a better way to organize the University that saves money. He has to address several questions from the Board of Trustees, i.e. cut 10-15% of low-performing programs, reduce administrative costs to save faculty and academic core.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that this EPPC exercise had nothing to do with the Jim Woodward Initiative that General Administration is overseeing, noting that both activities

were different. She noted that the Faculty Assembly was told that Woodward's work and dialogue on proposed changes would not take place until the Fall. She understood that Dr. Woodward had started talking with ECU administration about his findings and that whatever he recommends will be considered by General Administration and may affect us later within 2-3 years.

Chair Walker noted that both Committee reports were received for information and that the Faculty Senate looked forward to receiving more input and in participating in Faculty Senate sponsored forums, with the first one on April 26 following the Senate's organizational meeting. She noted that the Senate office would send official notification on the forum and asked that the Senators inform their unit colleagues.

F. Question Period

Professor Van Willigen (Sociology) asked about the State Health Plan and if adult children would still be covered? Associate VC Toller (Human Resources) responded that COBRA would be an option for adult children and that affordable healthcare options would be available no matter what since that was not a State-controlled activity.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked that if a faculty member opting out of the State healthcare plan would receive a payment to apply for an independent plan? Associate VC Toller replied no, So far the State pays \$5,000 estimated cost for each employee. He stated that his fear came from the fact that, with a lot of State employees leaving the State healthcare plan, the cost for others remaining could increase. Open enrollment will be a short turnaround since the payroll must be adjusted in June to allow time for everything to be in place by July 1.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked outgoing SGA President Tremayne Smith to provide a brief overview of SGA's accomplishments this year. He began by thanking the Faculty Senate for an opportunity to recognize the achievements made in the past academic year. The Judicial branch of SGA had made great strides in the shipmate program, which stresses academic and leadership development. The Legislative branch passed a resolution against the downtown tax and worked on a resolution for the meal plan deal, and a resolution to increase technology and athletic fees. In the executive branch emphasized student engagement and community outreach while having a strong emphasis on dollars and sense. We have been committed to being good stewards of the students' money. He summarized with his slogan for the year "let's do work".

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

Academic Standards Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology) Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations.

The proposed new section has been approved by the Faculty Senate on several occasions and either rejected and/or returned by the Chancellor for additional review (February 2010/#10-08; April 2010/#10-52; November 2010/#10-78). The Faculty Senate returned the most recent proposed text to the Committee in February 2011 (#11-16) and again in March 2011 for further review. The policy listed in the agenda represented additional review and revisions to the text.

There were no questions and the proposed new section to the *ECU Faculty Manual, Part V. Academic Information*, entitled Final Examinations was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-51**

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

Professor Taggart (Music) moved to reorganize the Faculty Senate agenda in order to move the Committee on Committees report earlier in the meeting. The Senate voted no by voice vote.

A. Academic Standards Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology) Chair of the Committee, first presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior*. Proposed revisions were approved by the Faculty Senate on several occasions and either rejected and/or returned by the Chancellor for additional review (March 2010 #10-27 and February 2011 #11-14). The policy listed in the agenda represented additional review and revisions to the text.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked about with a student using a cell phone, and whether she should have a private meeting with the student to address this issue? Professor Brown (Psychology) replied yes, that a meeting with the student is included in the process. Professor Rigsby replied that if a faculty member had to take the time to take the students outside to handle a situation, time was wasted and that maybe those examples should be deleted from the proposed policy.

Professor Jenks (History) stated that he thinks that the 2nd paragraph does not stop a faculty member from addressing this student, i.e. using a cell phone and noted that he does it all of the time.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that there was a misunderstanding that a professor cannot tell the student to stop using his/her cell phone. This should be handled by the faculty member privately. The policy does not dictate the way a faculty member can run his/her class

Professor Sharer (English) stated that, in response to the examples included in the text, it says "frequently" or would it clarify the policy better if we put "repeatedly" using the cell phone, so if the student continues to misbehave after being given a warning then the professor would follow the procedure. Professor Sprague (Physics) expressed his disagreement with Professor Sharer's suggestion to add "repeatedly" to the text.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior* were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-52**

Professor Wolfe then presented the proposed Peer Review Instrument for On-line Courses. She noted that the proposed process and instrument were presented to the Faculty Senate in March 2011 (#11-32) and returned to the Committee for additional review. The instrument below represents the Committee's additional review and final revisions to the instrument. She noted that the 3-year review cycle had already been approved by Chancellor Ballard in December 2010. She also asked Senators to ask their faculty whether all faculty would like to review their

face-to-face courses every 3 years and if so, a proposal should come to the Academic Standards Committee for action during the next academic year.

Professor Jones (Allied Health Science) asked if a department already had a peer review instrument, were they free to use their instrument? Professor Wolfe replied that if it was an instrument that had been approved for face-to-face teaching then it needed to be approved by the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences. Professor Wolfe noted that academic units would not be asked to revise their instrument unless it was written for face-to-face and was now trying to be used for distance education courses too. Professor Jones also asked, in reference to the propose instrument, if the numbers could be switched around? Professor Wolfe replied yes, within the academic unit as long as it was clear to all involved. Professor Jones stated that the accountability component placed more work on the faculty member and not the student, i.e. group projects, essay exams and asked if these were merely suggestions? Professor Wolfe replied yes, but that SACS wanted to know that the students who signed up for courses could find a proctoring center.

Following discussion, the proposed [Peer Review Instrument for On-line Courses](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-53**

Professor Wolfe then presented a request to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from HNRS 2116, 2216, 2316 and 2416. There was no objection and the request to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from HNRS 2116, 2216, 2316 and 2416 was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-54

B. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Jonathan Reid (History), Chair of the Committee, first noted that the Department of Education has changed financial aid for students taking courses for the 3rd time that goes into effect July 1, 2011. New course numbers must be on the books so that students can take different, yet similar courses (i.e. orchestra courses are generally taken up to 8 times) so the committee will address this issue in early Fall.

Professor Reid then presented a brief report on updated committee procedures when alerting the University community to curriculum activities noting that anything relating to committee activities will be clearly designated in any correspondence to the faculty.

Professor Reid then presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the [March 24, 2011](#), and [March 31, 2011](#) meetings. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the [March 24, 2011](#), and [March 31, 2011](#) meetings were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-55**

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance) first provided a report on Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of [Anthropology](#). He noted that in Fall 2011 the following units will go through an academic program review: Biology, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Exercise and Sport Science, Anatomy and Cell Biology, and Physiology. There was no discussion on the Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of [Anthropology](#).

Professor Gordon noted that the request to change the name of the Department of Hospitality Management to [School of Hospitality Business Leadership](#) within the College of Human Ecology was deleted from consideration at this time.

Professor Gordon then presented the request for authorization to discontinue a [Certificate in Aquatic Management](#), within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance. There was no discussion and the request for authorization to discontinue a [Certificate in Aquatic Management](#), within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-56

Professor Gordon then presented the criteria for Reviewing Unit Academic Program Reviews. He noted that in its April 8, 2011 meeting, the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) developed and approved criteria for its review of Unit Academic Program Review materials. The EPPC sought Faculty Senate approval for these criteria.

The criteria are:

1. Did the unit response acknowledge each of the external reviewer's recommendations?
2. Did the unit response address each of the recommendations in an action plan that is specific, measureable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound?

Link to current Procedures for Unit Academic Program Review:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/ep/reviewguidelines.pdf>

There was no discussion and the criteria for Reviewing Unit Academic Program Reviews was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-57**

Chair Walker thanked Professor Gordon for his leadership, hours of work, and sincere deliberation during this year. She noted that he and his Committee were commended for all the dedication and work provided to the University.

D. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Amy Frank (Technology and Computer Science), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the formal faculty advice on interim Religious Accommodation University Regulation noting that she reviewed the proposed interim regulation and offered no wording changes. The Committee does wish to bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate that the Dean of Students should be contacted by the student when needing to miss a class due to a religious holiday in order to have the Dean verify the holiday according to the current [Class Attendance and Participation Regulations](#), located in the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations.

There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice offering no wording changes to the interim Religious Accommodation University Regulation was accepted as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-58

Professor Frank then presented the Committee's review of University Excused Absence Policy. She noted that, at the request of the Chair of the Faculty and University Faculty Athletics Representative, the Committee reviewed the current [Class Attendance and Participation Regulations](#), located in the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations to address the below question:

Is it consistent with the university excused absence policy for instructors to declare on their syllabus that there will be no make-up exams and the lowest grade on quizzes/exams will be dropped?

She noted that without specific recommended revisions to the current regulations, the Committee did not see a need to offer revisions at this time. The Committee did suggest that members of the Athletics Department consider drafting a generic form for instructors to sign and return to either the Department or student verifying that the instructor agrees to honor valid university excused absences and provide reasonable and equitable means for a student to make up work missed as a result of those absences. The Committee also reminded the Athletics Department of the appeal process included in the current [Class Attendance and Participation Regulations](#). There was no discussion on the Committee's review of the policy and the review and suggestions were accepted as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-59**

Chair Walker thanked Professor Frank for all of the Committee's work this semester.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Katrina DuBose (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section I. Employment Policies, Subsections H. Phased Retirement, I. Retirement and K. Emeritus Faculty Privileges. She noted that revisions to this section were presented in March 2010 (#10-37) and returned to the Committee for further review. The policies listed in the agenda represented additional review and revisions to the text.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section I. Employment Policies, Subsections H. Phased Retirement, I. Retirement and K. Emeritus Faculty Privileges were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-60**

Professor DuBose then presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts. She noted that the revisions to this section were presented in December 2010 (#10-98) and returned to the Committee for further review and inclusion of information on disability income. The policies listed in the agenda represented additional review and revisions to the text.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization

Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-61**

F. Committee on Committees

Professor Catherine Rigsby (Geological Sciences), Chair of the Committee, first presented the second reading of proposed changes to the Standing University Academic Committee Charges of the Academic Awards Committee, Academic Standards Committee, and Educational Policies and Planning Committee.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked about statement on diversity being added to the Academic Awards Committee charge then moved to add under #7 of the Academic Awards Committee charge: "The committee should consider the diversity of nominees and should seek and recommend qualified women and minority faculty." The motion to amend was approved as presented.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that he supported a statement about diversity in the charge but wondered if it would force the Committee to only recommend females for awards. Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that the proposed additional sentence does not do that. Following discussion, the Academic Awards Committee charge was approved as presented.

Following discussion, the proposed changes to the Standing University Academic Committee charges of the [Academic Awards Committee](#), [Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee](#) (Academic Standards), and [Educational Policies and Planning Committee](#) were approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #11-62**

Professor Rigsby then presented the first reading of proposed new Standing University Academic Committees entitled Writing Across the Curriculum Committee and Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee. Professor Rigsby reminded Faculty Senators to contact her with suggested revisions prior to next week's Faculty Senate Organizational Meeting when the body would consider these new committee charges.

Professor Sharer (English) expressed concerns with the WAC Director not being involved in the Committee and stated her intention to propose an addition to the committee at the second reading of the new committee charge.

There was no discussion on the proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee. It was noted that the new Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee was a reorganization of the Continuing and Career Education Committee and Faculty Information Technology Review Committee.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked how the revised committee charge would be handled in relation to starting things in the Fall. Professor Christian (Business) asked how will the new Writing Across the Curriculum Committee be formed? Professor Rigsby replied that we have

plenty of volunteers for both new committees and enough from the two combined committees to make it all work out. The Committee on Committees had prepared for this prior to the Senate meeting.

Professor Rigsby then presented the first reading of proposed changes to the Standing Academic University Curriculum Committee Charge. There was no discussion, and the proposed revisions to the Committee charge will be acted on at next week's Faculty Senate organizational meeting. Again, Professor Rigsby reminded the group to contact her with suggested revisions prior to next week's Faculty Senate Organizational Meeting.

G. Faculty Information Technology Review Committee

Professor Nasseh Tabrizi (Technology and Computer Science) presented formal faculty advice on the Social Media Use Regulation and offered no wording changes. He noted that the proposed regulation references many items included in the [Social Media Guidelines](#). The guidelines would contain information that changed more frequently. Joe Norris, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer stated he was asked to chair a task force in social media policy; the task force was faculty members including Professor Walker and support from legal, marketing and student affairs representatives. A number of meetings were held resulting in the policy now before the senate for consideration and will be part of the University Policy Manual.

There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice offering no wording changes to the Social Media Use Regulation was accepted as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-63**

Agenda Item VI. New Business

There was no new business to come before the body at this time and the meeting adjourned at 5:30 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 APRIL 19, 2011, MEETING

11-51 New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations, as follows:

Place in the Faculty Manual.

"Part V. Final Examinations

The normal expectation is that the completion of both face to face and online courses will include a final examination or an alternate method of evaluating student progress. Final examinations are required at the discretion of the faculty member and must be scheduled in the course syllabus made available to students. If a final examination is not given during the final examination period, the scheduled time for the exam should be treated as regular class with appropriate instructional activity. Online courses that do not give a final

exam must use the final exam week for instructional purposes. The chair of the unit is responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.

The University establishes a final examination schedule each semester to reduce conflicts in course final examination and to meet the UNC established course hour requirements. There will be no departure from the printed schedule of examinations except for clinical and non-traditional class schedules, including graduate level courses. Changes for individual student emergencies of a serious nature will be made only with the approval of the instructor. A student who is absent from an examination without excuse will be given a grade of F for the examination. An incomplete (I) for the course will only be given in the case of a student absent from the final examination who has presented a satisfactory excuse to the instructor.

No test intended to substitute for the final exam may be given during the week preceding the final examination period. Faculty may not give an examination or an assignment in lieu of an examination on Reading Day.”

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-52 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

“Disruptive Academic Behavior

East Carolina University is committed to providing each student with a rich, distinctive educational experience. Disruptive academic behavior impedes the learning environment and hinders other students’ learning. The course instructor has original purview over his/her class and may deny a student who is unduly disruptive the right to attend the class. Students who repeatedly violate reasonable standards of behavior in the classroom or other academic setting may be removed from the course by the instructor following appropriate notice. Students removed from a course under this policy will receive a “drop” according to university policy and are eligible for tuition refund as specified in the current tuition refund policy.

This policy does not restrict the instructor’s prerogative to ask a disruptive student to leave an individual class session where appropriate or to refer the student to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities for violation of the Student Code of Conduct.

Disruptive Academic Behavior

Disruptive academic behavior is any behavior likely to substantially or repeatedly interfere with the normal conduct of instructional activities, including meetings with instructors outside of class. Examples of such behavior include, but are not limited to, making loud or distracting noises; using cell phones and other electronic devices without prior approval; repeatedly speaking without being recognized; frequently arriving late or leaving early from class; and making threats or personal insults. A verbal expression of a disagreement with the instructor or other students on an academic subject matter discussed within the course, during times when the instructor permits discussion, is not in itself disruptive academic behavior.

Procedure for Instructors

A student who does not follow reasonable standards of academic decorum should first receive a private verbal warning from the faculty member. The instructor should describe the behavior of concern to the student, explain that it is inappropriate, and ask the student to stop the behavior. If the behavior continues, the instructor should give the student a written warning indicating that the student will be removed from the course if the behavior does not cease. If the behavior persists, the instructor should discuss the situation with his/her department chair. If it is decided to remove the student from the course then the instructor should schedule a meeting with his/her department chair and the student to inform the student that s/he is being removed from the course. This decision must be communicated in writing to the student with a copy promptly forwarded to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The department chair must promptly communicate the decision in writing to the Office of the Registrar so that the student's schedule will be adjusted accordingly. Instructors should keep written documentation of all actions taken during this process.

If the behavior is threatening in nature or is likely to result in immediate harm, the faculty member should contact the East Carolina University Police Department for immediate assistance.

Student Appeals

The student may appeal the decision of the instructor and the department chair to remove him/her from the course to the academic dean of the college in which the course is located. The appeal must be received by the dean, in writing, within three working days of the date of the receipt of the decision by the student. The dean or dean's designee will review the appeal and the documentation, will discuss the appeal with the faculty member and, after discussion with the student and instructor, can affirm, reverse or modify the decision made by the instructor and department chair. The student, instructor and department chair will be notified of the appeal decision no later than three working days after receiving the appeal. The dean will provide written notification of the appeal decision to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and also, if the original decision is overturned, to the Registrar's Office. If the decision is made that the student is to return to the course then the student will be allowed to immediately return to the classroom without academic penalty and the chair will work with the student and instructor to facilitate the completion of any missed work. The dean's decision is final.

Footnote

ECU provides reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. When communicating a warning to a student, faculty should ensure the discussion is private and refer any student who discloses a disability to Disability Support Services."

Disposition: Chancellor

11-53 [Peer Review Instrument for On-line Courses.](#)

Disposition: Chancellor

11-54 Request to [Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit](#) from HNRS 2116, 2216, 2316 and 2416.

Disposition: Chancellor

11-55 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the [March 24, 2011](#), and [March 31, 2011](#) meetings.

Disposition: Chancellor

11-56 Request for Authorization to Discontinue a [Certificate in Aquatic Management](#), within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance.

Disposition: Chancellor

11-57 Educational Policies and Planning Committee Criteria for Reviewing Unit Academic Program Reviews, as follows:

1. Did the unit response acknowledge each of the external reviewer's recommendations?
2. Did the unit response address each of the recommendations in an action plan that is specific, measureable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound?

Disposition: Educational Policies and Planning Committee

11-58 Formal faculty advice offering no wording changes to the interim Religious Accommodation University Regulation.

Disposition: Chancellor

11-59 Review of [Class Attendance and Participation Regulations](#) to address the below question:

Is it consistent with the university excused absence policy for instructors to declare on their syllabus that there will be no make-up exams and the lowest grade on quizzes/exams will be dropped?

Without specific recommended revisions to the current regulations, the Committee does not see a need to offer revisions at this time. The Committee does suggest that members of the Athletics Department consider drafting a generic form for instructors to sign and return to either the Department or student verifying that the instructor agrees to honor valid university excused absences and provide reasonable and equitable means for a student to make up work missed as a result of those absences. The Committee also reminds the Athletics Department of the appeal process included in the current [Class Attendance and Participation Regulations](#).

Disposition: University Athletics Committee, University Faculty Athletics Representative

11-60 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. Section I. Employment Policies, Subsections H. Phased Retirement, I. Retirement and K. Emeritus Faculty Privileges, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual with other retirement information, including Phased Retirement and Emeritus Faculty Privileges.

“Retirement

All full-time faculty of the university with a permanent appointment must participate in the university’s retirement program. Information regarding the retirement plans can be found at the online links below:

Overview of retirement plan options:

http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/humanresources/customcf/Benefits/Benefits_Retirement_Plans.pdf

Statutory provisions for the State Retirement system:

http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/enactedlegislation/statutes/pdf/bychapter/chapter_135.pdf

NC State Treasurer’s Retirement home page:

<http://www.nctreasurer.com/dsthome/RetirementSystems>

Privileges for Retired Faculty

The following University websites provide information on privileges awarded to retired faculty:

1. ECU Retired Faculty Association

The East Carolina University Retired Faculty Association (ECURFA) provides retired faculty with a continuing link to the university and to colleagues and friends through social activities, receptions, and group travel. It also provides an opportunity to give back to the university through an endowment fund. Go to the following below to obtain further information: <http://www.ecu.edu/ecurfa>

2. Parking permits

The parking privileges for retired faculty are outlined in The Parking and Transportation Policy (200-0070) under “Special Parking Situations”, sections “Phased Retirement” and “Retired Faculty”. Refer to the link below to obtain current information on parking privileges for retirees: http://www.ecu.edu/parking/standard_manual.cfm

3. ECU 1 Card

The ECU 1 Card is the official university photo ID card. Some privileges for retired faculty require presenting an ECU 1 Card (Retiree version). Procedures for obtaining an ECU 1 Card for retirees can be found at the website listed below: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/1card/getthecard.cfm>

4. E-mail

Retired faculty may continue to use their ECU e-mail account in accordance with University guidelines. Details can be found at the ITCS website: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-itcs/email/FacultyStaffEmail.cfm>

5. Student Recreation Center membership

Retired faculty may purchase annual, semester, or summer memberships to the Student Recreation Center. They must present their ECU 1 Card when purchasing a membership. Refer to the website below to obtain further information: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-studentlife/crw/membership/fees.cfm>

6. Joyner Library access

Retired faculty may apply for borrowing privileges at the Joyner Library Circulation desk. They must present their ECU 1 Card to obtain services. Further information may be obtained at the website below: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-lib/accesssrv/circulation/circpolicy.cfm>

7. Laupus Library access

Retired faculty may apply for borrowing privileges at the Laupus Library Circulation desk. They must present their ECU 1 Card to obtain services. Further information may be obtained at the website below: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-dhs/laupuslibrary/circulation.cfm>"

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual with other retirement information, including Retirement and Emeritus Faculty Privileges.

"Phased Retirement

Participation in East Carolina University's Phased Retirement Program is available to tenured faculty who meet University of North Carolina Program eligibility criteria as detailed in the policy available online at:

<http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?tag=300.7.2>

Application Forms can be found at the following website:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/aa/AAPersonnelForms.cfm>"

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual with other retirement information, including Phased Retirement and Retirement. Also add LINK to this subsection in Faculty Marshals, Mace Bearer, and Academic Apparel subsections of the Faculty Manual.

"Emeritus Faculty Privileges

Upon the recommendation of the unit personnel committee, unit head, appropriate dean, and appropriate vice chancellor, in accordance with criteria defined in the unit code, the chancellor may grant the faculty retiree emeritus status (as defined in Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty, [Appendix C](#)) which includes the continuance of eligibility to march, wearing appropriate regalia, in University commencement exercises and other University formal processions, as active faculty."

Disposition: Chancellor

11-61 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section II. Welfare and Benefits, Subsections A. Hospitalization Insurance, B. Disability Income Plans, C. Mandatory Enrollment in Group Life Program, D. Group Insurance Plans, E. Social Security, F. Deferred Compensation Plan, G. Supplemental Retirement Income Plan of NC (401K), H. Tax Deferred Annuity, I. US Savings Bonds, J. Unemployment Compensation Benefits, K. Vacation and Sick Leave, L. Workers' Compensation, M. Flex Reimbursement Accounts, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"II. Benefits and Leave

A. Benefits

A variety of benefits are available to permanent employees of ECU, based on specific eligibility criteria. All benefits are subject to state regulations, university policies and

procedures, and individual plan documents. Employee benefits are subject to change and reasonable notice is provided to employees by Human Resources when changes occur. Information about benefits may be obtained from the University Benefits Office in Human Resources located online at:

http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/HumanResources/Staff_Faculty.cfm.

See the [University Policy Manual](#) for more information.

B. Workers' Compensation

All university employees, including paid student workers, are covered by workers' compensation that provides for certain benefits in the event there is an on-the-job injury or illness. If and when an on-the-job injury or illness should occur, it should be reported immediately to the supervisor who will notify the appropriate university offices. For additional information about workers' compensation and related forms see the [University Policy Manual](#) and Environmental Health and Safety website <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/oehs/ih/workerscomp.cfm>.

C. Disability Insurance

ECU has disability insurance coverage for both short-term (2 to 12 months with the possibility of a 12 month extension) and long-term (greater than 12 months) situations. The specific details of the disability insurance options can be found at the HR Benefits website: <http://www.ecu.edu/hr/benefits.cfm>. Questions regarding disability coverage should be directed to a University Benefits Counselor listed online at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/HumanResources/HR_Staff.cfm

D. Vacation and Sick Leave

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

E. Faculty Serious Illness and Parental Leave Policy

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

Disposition: Chancellor

11-62 Revisions to several Standing University Academic Committee Charges:

[Academic Awards Committee](#)

[Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee](#) (was Academic Standards)

[Educational Policies and Planning Committee](#)

Disposition: Faculty Senate

11-63 Formal faculty advice offering no wording changes to the Social Media Use Regulation.

Disposition: Chancellor