The Board of Trustees met in the Great Room, Mendenhall Student Center, on Friday, May 6, 2005, at 12:35 p.m. Mr. James R. Talton, Jr., Chair, presided and called the meeting to order. The Board convened earlier in the day at 8:00 a.m. for Closed Session by Chairman Talton asking Mr. Showfety to read the Closed Session motion in keeping with our new format.

Mr. Showfety moved that we go into Closed Session:

1. to prevent the disclosure of privileged information under NC General Statues #126-22 to #126-30; and
2. to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, or conditions of appointment of prospective employees and employees; and
3. to consult with our attorney and to protect the attorney-client privilege and to consider and give instructions concerning potential claims and judicial claims entitled: Medical Mutual Insurance Company v. East Carolina University, et al.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ward and passed by a voice vote with no negative votes.

Upon returning from Closed Session, the Trustees boarded a bus and were transported to Hendrix Theatre to attend Convocation. Following their participation in Convocation, the Trustees returned to the Great Room where Chairman Talton stated the Board expressed appreciation to the founding Dean of the Brody School of Medicine and his wife, Dr. and Mrs. Laupus. He also extended his thanks to Mr. Bodenhamer for his suggestion to attend Convocation and then asked for individual committee meetings to begin. At
the conclusion of the committee meetings, the Board met in regular session
for the full Board meeting where Chairman Talton called the meeting to order
and Mr. Dan V. Kinlaw, Secretary, called the roll.

Roll Call

Members present:

William H. Bodenhamer, Jr.  Dan V. Kinlaw
David S. Brody               J. Fielding Miller
Joel K. Butler              E. David Redwine
Robert J. Greczyn, Jr.       Stephen D. Showfety
M. Cole Jones               James R. Talton, Jr.
Michael W. Kelly             Margaret C. Ward

Members absent:

Robert O. Hill, Jr. (departed meeting at 11:30)

Also present:

Chancellor Steve Ballard
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and
   Assistant Secretary to the Board James LeRoy Smith
Vice Chancellor Kevin Seitz
Vice Chancellor Garrie W. Moore
Vice Chancellor Michael J. Lewis
Vice Chancellor William E. Shelton
Acting Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
   Glen Gilbert
Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and
   Interim Director of Economic Development and Community
   Engagement Robert J. Thompson
Interim Chief Information Officer Jack Brinn
Chief of Staff Austin W. Bunch
EEO Officer Taffye Benson Clayton
Director, Internal Audit Stacie Tronto
Chair of the Faculty Catherine Rigsby

OATH OF OFFICE

It should be noted that due to time constraints with the Assistant Pitt
County Clerk of Court, SGA President M. Cole Jones was sworn in earlier in
the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Kinlaw and seconded by Mr. Bodenhamer that the minutes of the April 1, 2005 full meeting of the Board of Trustees be approved as submitted. The motion passed with no negative votes.

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, I would like to primarily address diversity and the budget situation today. The budget situation will be a follow up of things I said in the last meeting and also a little elaboration of what Mr. Seitz reported earlier and I intended to say a few things about integrated planning but I think they’ve been largely covered. I’ll just mention one or two things on integrated planning.

I would like to start by talking about diversity in our community. In my remarks today I would like to talk about the quality of the commitment that we have as an institution to be the right kind of place for our students and our faculty and our staff. Following our search for Dr. Sallye McKee, who is joining us as the Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Diversity, I had a few questions about this position and some comments and I think it’s appropriate that I address them in general rather than individually and yesterday I sent out to the University community a statement on diversity in our institution so today’s remarks will be intended to brief the Board on what I’ve been saying to the community and also the goals that I’ve established for Dr. McKee.

The most frequently asked question I receive about diversity is the difference between a diversity office and that function compared to affirmative action. There is some overlap but in most public universities these offices are separated into two positions and I think for the right reasons.

Diversity – and here at ECU is very capably led by Taffye Benson Clayton, who is with us today – has several functions but they include implementing federal guidelines on hiring practices and equal opportunity, insuring the openness of hiring processes, investigating issues that might arise related to employment practices and so in short, that office (affirmative action) is not entirely but certainly has a major compliance function associated with it. That is very important to the institution.

In contrast, the diversity office, I think, is about the quality of our workplace and a new diversity officer will help us realize the values that I think have existed
here at East Carolina University for a long time especially regarding how we respect everybody in our community and how we provide world class experiences for our students. That, the bottom line, is really while we are here.

So Dr. McKee knows that her primary role in this new office starting July 1 would be to build the capacity of East Carolina University.

Let me tell you one very important indicator that I look at as we think about building our capacity. Currently our student body consists of 20% of students of color. We don't have absolute predictions on this, but I think that percentage will rise to 25% by the year 2008 and probably to 33% within the next 10 years if you take seriously the demographic changes in the state of North Carolina.

The Office of the President also compares every one of the 16 campus institutions on a diversity index. This is comprised of a numerator that is the percentage of faculty of color divided by the percentage of students of color. A perfect score on that index is a 1 so that if you had 20% undergraduate students of color and 20% of your faculty of color – and that is not by itself the only thing to look at, by any stretch of the imagination but it does get to the nature of our workplace and the nature of our learning experiences as if that ratio gets wildly out of line, then you start to wonder whether or not the people who are teaching our students have the right make up.

Unfortunately at ECU we are next to the last in the UNC system on this diversity ratio. Our ratio is .48. Only one school is worse than us and the average across the 16 institutions is .65 so .48 for us compared to .65 of the average let alone the schools with a better diversity ratio is not acceptable in my view. We know that a 4.8 ratio is not good enough and we are committed to improving that and the Office of the President has asked us to pay particular attention to that and I think that is a very appropriate question that we have received.

So that is one indicator that we pay a lot of attention to. I have also received questions on how we think about diversity and I know of no standard definition about that but I would like to say a few words about how we think about what diversity really means because it is subject to many different interpretations and sometimes misinterpretations about it’s implications for an institution.

I think diversity means that we prosper as an institution and a society with free, open, and respected exchange of ideas from different perspectives. These different perspectives can be intellectual, spiritual, or demographic. If we restrict our dialogue, let alone our decision-making, to narrow perspectives, the results are almost always flawed. Vital and robust learning communities must have the exchange of diverse perspectives and experiences.

At ECU we hope to be measure by which we include, not who we exclude. As I said in my message to the campus, if we are successful in being measured by who
we include, people throughout the state – and we hope the nation – will want to work with ECU graduates because they are respectful, knowledgeable, and thoughtful leaders and a good bit of that comes from the experiences they have both in the classroom and in their out of classroom engagement with our community.

I also believe the future of our economy depends on our ability not only to educate our entire population, but to provide 21st Century competencies and skills to our entire workforce. We no longer have an economy that’s dependent on a few great entrepreneurs or leaders, but one that requires great skills and 100% of our workforce if we’re able to compete in a global economy. That workforce must be skilled and knowledgeable in science and math, in multiple problem-solving tools, and in communication with varied, diverse audiences that comprise our work environment today.

ECU prides itself in preparing our students to be tomorrow’s leaders. Let’s never forget how good we are at that.

As W.E.B. Dubois said, “Of all the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for 500 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.”

We are committed to providing environments with diverse people, ideas and background necessary for the success of our students and to have a great learning community. We started our commitment this past year with a recommendation that Vice Chancellors Smith and Moore gave to me at my first Executive Council meeting last June and I congratulate them for bringing it forward. I congratulate Dr. Moore for chairing the committee that led to three great interviews on campus – respected national leaders from Los Angeles, Washington, and Minneapolis, St. Paul were brought to this campus to interview for this position and we are very lucky to have Dr. Sallye McKee join us in a little over six weeks to not only take on this critical role in improving diversity but also improving our community engagement and our inner institutional partnerships between this institution and many other institutions in our state.

Let me just briefly identify a few of the recent awards and recognitions that Dr. McKee has received that led to her choice.

- Outstanding Service Award, 1993, U. of Minnesota
- Innovative Leadership Award, 1994, University of Colorado
- Outstanding Faculty Award, 1995, University of Colorado
- Leadership in Educational Partnerships, 1998, Northwest Ohio
- Community Builder of the Year Award, 1999, Bowling Green State U.
- Human Relations Award, 2000, BGSU
- National Service Leader Award, 2001, St. Paul, Minnesota.
So we have attracted to ECU a person of great national stature. We have a commitment in our institution to bettering diversity. We know we have work to do in terms of the diversity index I mentioned but more importantly than that, this is part of our commitment to a great student experience and it is central to where we are going in leading eastern North Carolina to a better place in the future.

It is important that I spent a minute on what diversity means to ECU. Having said that, let me transition to the budget situation.

I appreciate the data Mr. Seitz gave us all at the last meeting. I talked to you about a concern that I had that was at the interplay between our great concern at ECU with the price of a college education for our students. We have more students with a demonstrated financial need than any other campus in our 16 campus system. That is of great concern to us. Nine thousand of our students have a demonstrated financial need. We are also very concerned about the state’s ability to pay for cost increases. I have been very concerned about our inability to get the quality of education factored into our discussions. Who pays and who pay how much for education because we are not competing with Fayetteville State or Wilmington – we are competing internationally for the quality of our educational services and we will not succeed in that if cost and price let us go to mediocrity. We will only succeed if the quality of what we do remains high.

I am especially concerned with the situation in North Carolina because of continuous budget cuts. It looks without question now that this will be the fifth straight year of permanent based budget cuts to our budget. While this is no different for the other 15 institutions (I want to recognize that) it is different with us because we are the fastest growing institution in the North Carolina system by far. More students have come to ECU in the last three years than any other instruction – over 3350 and we cannot continue to meet the access and affordability issues of providing our educational services to our students at the same time that we continue to face such serious budget cuts.

I want to thank the Senate for reducing the size of the projected budget cuts from about $10 million to $5.7 million and we should be thankful for all of the work that the Senate has done on this. However, I must say that a $5.7 million cut, which many people are now saying is the best we could hope for, is a devastating loss to ECU because of the increased opportunity that we have for more students. I find it very difficult in the eastern region for us to say that we cannot admit more students when so many students want the services that are here at ECU. But we are close to having to face up to that question. The reason is this: we have met the budget cuts (over $15 million of base budget cuts) over the past four/five years largely by sacrificing the infrastructure that is necessary to provide the services. What we have done is increased the faculty in order to serve these 3300 new students as well as our existing students, and so we've kept the faculty largely up to pace with our enrollment growth but we've done in almost every case is used the general instructional funds based upon enrollment money provided by the state to
meet these budget cuts. So what we have is enrollment increasing faster than any other institution, we have our faculty also going up by about the same number (and that in many ways is a good thing) but then the third thing is that we have not been able to keep up with virtually any of the infrastructure improvements that are necessary to provide the support services.

So we are probably at the limit of our ability to continue to meet this enrollment growth without taking seriously into consideration the quality of our infrastructure and I think that every constituency in East Carolina University knows that we are close to the limit of that.

So we are at a place on the budget situation where there are no good options left if we continue to lose $5-10 million of base budgets cuts each year and this year it looks like $5 million is the best we can hope for if it goes back to the levels that the joint legislative committee was talking about it would be closer to $10 million.

The medical school campus has no new enrollment monies to use so even now the $500,000 cut that is projected by the Senate, which is the best case, really has a devastating impact on the Brody School of Medicine. That’s not because of anything that is or is not happening at the Brody School; it is because of the environment it faces virtually every academic medical center across the country. 72 of 75 public academic medical centers face similar financial environments as does our Brody School. The leadership of Brody – Vice Chancellor Lewis and Dean Johnson -- have been not only diligent but aggressive in managing these issues but they too have reached the limit in which they can effectively manage it.

So we will keep the Board apprised of this. The question I would ask you to consider is what can the Board do to help us at this point. I want to assure the entire board that the administration is working with the Office of the President, our local delegation, and with every ECU graduate in the legislature to try to understand the impact of the state financial situation on higher education. Most people understand that they are two major discretionary items in the state budget; social services and higher education. We are upset that we are therefore targeted for a disproportionate share of the cuts but that is the nature of state budgets in all but perhaps one state this year and the last five years, which is Wyoming due to their oil and natural gas resources.

The Board can help us with this. The three things that make the most difference in reducing these cuts are first, I think, calls from business leaders about the impact of education cuts on the quality of the graduates that they are getting. Calls from business leaders, in my experience, make the most difference in reversing these.

Secondly, calls and letters from parents of students about the impact of the fee increases on students. The parents’ concerns can make a big difference.
Third are Boards of Trustees and Foundation Boards that are managing and governing public institutions. They can have a big impact on how this moves forward.

So we solicit you active participation in trying to make these cuts as small as they possibly can be understanding that they will certainly not go to zero this year.

On integrated planning, we had a good report and have a lot of materials. We look forward to the July meeting. I just want to thank the planning committee who continue to work—a group of 16 or 18 people—which is doing a lot of great work and really integrating the need for strategic directions with specific goals of the institution so I look forward to the July time period.

Finally today let me just pay tribute to the leadership that exists in this room. Starting first with someone who will not be leaving us but who has changed positions—Dr. Smith as you know is our new permanent Provost. As I said at the last meeting I am tickled to not only have Jim Smith on the team but I think in a major leadership role at ECU. The bad news for the Board is that I’ve asked him to no longer be the Assistant Secretary to the Board. But to do both jobs—both are full time jobs—would be cruel and unusual punishment and even though Jim seemed to smile all the way through it this year, I don’t think I could continue to have him do that. I do not have a replacement for Jim yet in part because we both recognize that he cannot be replaced but we do intent to have a recommendation to the Board for Assistant Secretary in the July meeting and Jim will, in two respects, continue to be active in that role both in training the new person but also I want my Provost to be a major policy/force on the Board so Jim will be with us on every meeting and in many ways will continue to have a significant policy part to play as we move the institution forward.

Thanks as well to Vice Chancellor Shelton, as Chairman Talton has recognized, for his great work on my team over the past year. Bill, you have done not only great week as being a member of my Executive Cabinet, but you have made a huge difference to the institution, especially in the last two years as we’ve gone through some difficult times and he has been extremely valuable to me with his 11 years with experience as President of a major institution. A lot of perspectives which were very valuable to me—more than once he kept me in less trouble than I would have been otherwise and that’s been great and the culture of giving that Kathryn Yandell and Dr. Shelton reported on today is Bill Shelton’s idea and we are getting very close to 100% participation on the Culture of Giving and that is a foundation from proving our fund raising in the future. If we do that well, I think every other aspect of fund raising will improve so, Bill, we will miss you and thank you for all of your service.

Three members of the Board I want to pay special recognition to: Shannon O’Donnell—I know we have thanked you but I want to personally thank you for the contributions you have made this year. I don’t know if I have said it before, but in
the Wilmington Board of Governors meeting in January we had a 7 hour committee meeting over tuition cuts and there were probably 50 speakers during that 7 hour meeting. The Chairman of that committee told me on the next day that by far the star of the 50 presenters in that 7 hour meeting was not a Chancellor, was not a Board of Governors’ member but the only student representative who spoke at that 7 hour meeting was Shannon O’Donnell. So Shannon, if everybody could just one more time give you a round of applause.

Today is the last meeting for secretary, Dan Kinlaw. Dan, I’ve known you since the interview process here. Your blood bleeds purple, no question about that. We appreciate your passion, your commitment and personally, your friendship over the last year. You could always rely on you for your opinions and we appreciate that and know that your eight years of commitment here has helped improve the institution. I know I can rely on you in the future as issues come up and as I need advice and the political help you provided about a month ago was extremely valuable to me so Dan, thank you very much.

Dan, we have a plaque for you as well.

The last person I would like to thank today is someone that I greatly hope will remain on the Board for four more years. We are waiting for the Governor’s reappointments and we certainly hope Jim Talton, you are on that list. We will be shocked, dismayed and in a fighting mood if you are not. But we certainly expect that to be the case. This is your last meeting as Board Chairman. You have been tremendously valuable to me in my first year here. The transition was made twice as easy I think because of your commitment, personal friendship that Myrtle showed and your passion for ECU and your leadership is something I think is a model for board governance and for leadership on the critical state aboard and I just want to personally thank you for all you have meant to me this year. Thank you, Jim.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

Chair Talton commented that we also hoped to have Mr. Miller back and Chancellor Ballard agreed.

Mr. Greczyn said he would like to make a comment regarding Dr. McKee coming to East Carolina and Dr. Ballard’s leadership and thanks to Garrie and Jim for really making this a front burner issue. I think it is your leadership that is moving this university forward in diversity and I know a lot of people sometimes don’t understand the difference between affirmative action and diversity and there is a very real difference. In particular to me, diversity is a long race, it is not a sprint and I really want to encourage our focus on that going forward. The population of this state and this country is changing dramatically. North Carolina in the next 30 years is projected to be almost 50% people of color. It will be joining states like California, New Mexico and Florida in that regard and I think as the student body
changes it is very important that we get the best and the brightest from a wide array of people and I really want to just say thank you in a very strong voice of support of diversity.

Mr. Butler agreed with Mr. Greczyn’s statement and applauded the direction in which Chancellor Ballard was heading.

Chair Talton also agreed and commented that Chancellor Ballard continues to emphasize quality over quantity and continues to build a great team. He then thanked Shannon again and concluded his remarks by stating that you could not find anyone with a bigger heart or deeper commitment to ECU than Dan Kinlaw.

Mr. Talton asked Professor Rigsby for her comments to the Board.

CHAIR OF THE FACULTY REPORT

Thank you Chairman Talton. I have only three topics today.

When I started presenting profiles of tenure-track faculty to you in September, my aim was to introduce you to the variety of experiences and abilities our faculty bring to the university – to introduce some of our energetic, interesting new faculty and their many types of scholarship.

I’d like to continue that today by telling you about Dr. Rebecca Benfield. Many of you met Dr. Benfield last night. She is an assistant professor in the School of Nursing and an assistant clinical professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology in the Brody School of Medicine.

We all know about the nursing shortage, but what most of us don’t consider is that there is also a shortage of PhD-level university nursing faculty— the people who move the discipline of nursing forward and who train our new nurses. Rebecca is one of those faculty members – a PhD Nurse doing research that will benefit both our nursing students and those in need of care.

Rebecca has been a Certified Nurse Midwife since 1986 and she earned her PhD in Nursing, with a cognate in physiological measurement (exercise physiology), in 1993. She wanted the PhD because she wanted to study clinical practice phenomena.

Her research focuses on the use of hydrotherapy in reducing the pain and anxiety of labor. In the 1980’s, when she worked as a nurse midwife intern in a birthing center on the Mexican border in south Texas she learned that by simply bathing in warm water during labor women may experience great pain and anxiety reduction.
The reasons for this are not well understood. So, Dr. Benfield uses a special hydrotherapy tub and waterproof instruments to study the physiological changes that occur when a women in labor is bathed in warm water. She does this by hooking women in labor up to water-proofed EMG instruments to measure the strength of contractions during labor. (By the way, she tells me that Liquid Bandage is the best way to waterproof EMG (electromyography) needles and cables! This could be very useful information for other things as well!) Her hope is that she will be able to understand how this natural technique could be used to help avoid complications during labor. She also hopes to determine if this technique actually reduces the need for epidurals and increases the rate of cervical dilatation (which may lead to a shorter labor). Rebecca’s work is funded by NIH – the National Institutes of Health.

Rebecca has been at ECU since 1999 and she says her favorite thing about her work at ECU is interacting with colleagues from across campus. She works with Ed Newton, from the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Tibor Hortobagy, Director of the Biomechanical Laboratory. And, in case you’re thinking she’s “just a researcher,” you should know that she continues to practice as a Nurse-Midwife. She is also the director of the Nurse-Midwifery Distance Education Program and she teaches medical students, off-service residents, and interns. Her teaching has earned her numerous awards, including the School of Nursing’s Outstanding Graduate Faculty Award, the American College of Nurse-Midwives Foundation’s Excellence in Teaching Award in 2001, and a 2003 ECU Scholar-Teacher Award. In 2003, she was also a nominee for the Board of Governor’s Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award.

Dr. Benfield is one more example of ECU’s energetic, innovative scholars – faculty with a wealth of experience, ideas, and real-world knowledge to share with our students and our community. And, she is also an example of the close relationship between research, teaching, and practice that is a major strength of our university. Research moves the disciplines forward, adding slow, steady improvements. And it is often active, involved researchers that make the best teachers. Their expertise and their excitement about their work are obvious to their students, transforming their classrooms into dynamic, active-learning environments.

One thing of concern to all research faculty is “research infrastructure.” Research infrastructure is the support system that enables faculty to conduct world-class research like Rebecca’s – research with the potential to move their field forward.

Research infrastructure means laboratory space, technicians to keep laboratory equipment up and running, a dependable source of university support for graduate assistantships and tuition waivers, a well-staffed office of
sponsored programs and grants administration (so once the faculty get grant money, they can spend it as it intended), and much more. These things do cost money, but the return to the university is well worth the cost. They allow us to keep our successful, talented young faculty members. They help us grow research, which brings dollars to our coffers, status to our reputation, and the best and brightest students to our classrooms. By becoming more research intensive we can benefit the University in a lot of ways.

The faculty are excited that we have a new VC for Finance and Administration that understands the importance of research on campus and that we will soon have a new VC for Research that will work to improve our research infrastructure. We hope that the Board, the community, and the state understand and support this endeavor so that ECU can continue to achieve excellence in research.

That’s my first statement of the “Faculty Mood”, I guess and is the good news. We are also worried, as are you, about the budget situation . . . But, we are encouraged by the open, transparent way budget issues are being communicated and the willingness of the administration to ask for, and listen to, the feedback of the campus community. The Faculty Senate’s University Budget Committee has worked closely with VC Seitz and is pleased that their input will be considered if/when difficult decisions must be made.

The bottom line is we’re all in this together and the better we communicate, the more we listen to each other, the better of we’ll be.

I reported on many Senate activities last month, so I’ll be very brief here today. The one “new” issue that has sparked concern throughout the faculty is campus greenspace. Recent concerns resulted in extensive discussion in the Faculty Senate an in a resolution calling for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Greenspace. The Senate asked me to appoint 5 faculty members to this committee and, for the first time in my year as chair (and maybe the first time in Senate history!) I was literally mobbed by volunteers – right there in the Senate meeting room at the end of the meeting! This told me, obviously, that the faculty thinks that maintaining our greenspace is extremely important. VC Seitz has begun calling the committee together. They will meet soon and will work toward collaborative, imaginative solutions to our greenspace usage problems. So “mixed mood” is the mood of the faculty this month.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Talton asked for any comments and Mr. Brody asked if this was a difference in how things have been handled before and Dr. Rigsby responded that there had been forums before but open forums for the whole
campus community including faculty, staff and students was extremely well received.

Chair Talton congratulated Dr. Rigsby on her recent reelection as Chair of the Faculty and said the Board was proud of her accomplishments and leadership. He also stated the Board shared her concerns about budgetary matters and about the emphasis and direction of East Carolina toward enhanced research—the Board supports that totally.

Mr. Talton drew attention to materials at the Trustee’s workspace which was distributed by President Broad to Board Chairman this week regarding the budget. This will require input from each of us. President Broad and the Board of Governors are asking for the Trustees assistance – not only on budget matters but also on the senate element of the budget which currently frees the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill and NC State on setting and adjusting their own tuition rights. That is a direct undermining of the University of North Carolina system, the Board of Governors and while we certainly have our challenges, we have one of the most highly recognized systems of higher education in the country and once we begin to dismantle that mechanism, I think it will be detrimental for all of us, including ECU. So keep this in mind when you are talking to your friends, colleagues and legislators—that while there are certain people that would like to have freedom for the two flagship research focused universities, which, in Mr. Talton’s view, would be detrimental to the system as a whole.

Mr. Talton called on Henry Ferrell for his thoughts.

HISTORICAL MOMENT BY UNIVERSITY HISTORIAN

Dr. Ferrell thanked Mr. Talton for the invitation and began his comments by saying the kinds of things that institutions like ECU have to deal with, of course, is that they are not singular—there are a great host of people and elements and other things that are historical in nature that affect the way we see it. Steven Woodward, the great southern historian – he would rank probably in the top 6 of the 20th century American historians – said history is really rather simple. There are two things you have to look for. One is change and the other is the same. The change can make things different but tradition may well hold it together. In East Carolina’s case, it’s an institution that’s really young. I would argue that change has made more impact on our place than it has on a lot of other places that do higher education.

So how do we identify every time we change? We’re always changing but this time there are certain places that you can say, “that was a change, this was a change”...you don’t have to go to the medical complex to see that kind of change. Well, we deal with symbols. We hope that those symbols are
more permanent than perhaps some of the things that we count. If you were an undergraduate of East Carolina – and my trust is that most of you were – when you think of your days as a scholar on campus, you can remember well your school days. And the thing that always surprises you when you come back is that it is not the same place and it’s not necessarily because a new building has been built or something has happened on campus – a new parking lot – the people aren’t there. It was the people, of course, that made the experience so valid.

So without those people, without those classmates, without those professors, whom you knew much better than deans and vice chancellors—those people—what do we use for symbols? Well, one thing we do is we use colors and every college and every university has particular colors and I was looking up how we got to our colors.

There are several stories on this and the one I’m going to tell you sounds really good. First of all it was during a time when women ruled – there were very few male undergraduates – but in 1916 President Wright, who was very sensitive to the students, he was as sensitive to students in his timeframe as any Chancellor we’ve had – they decided they were going to vote school colors. They had been voting class colors and they had a great variety. And so they had the meeting and all stood up and decided that their colors would be royal purple and old gold. Now royal purple is not purple. Royal purple is a reddish color. If you watch those old Hollywood movies and you see the king come floating in on his cape and it looks red, it’s supposed to be royal purple. As close as I can tell – seeing as how there were very few color pictures taken in that day – those colors were used up until the 1960s. One of the problems they had with the old gold was they didn’t have the technology to put it together and make it stick. Some time in the 1960s we went from the royal purple to the purple we have now – which is fine – but that shows you the change in operating perhaps due to technology.

Students voted in 1963 to have purple and white as the school colors since that was basically what the football team wore. They had very little yellow. Yellow becomes more prominent in the 1980s in the big helmets which was the result of technology – purple and yellow as it turns out. So we’ve come and even changed the colors themselves. This is not an argument
for old gold – although it is a handsome color and we do have the technology
today to do that – I spoke to Athletic Director Holland and he immediately
rushed out and ordered some…..

But this is a symbol that we live by and even it has evolved.

There is one other that you are very familiar with and you have
probably read about it in all of the graduation programs that you had to read
up on the stage in the case of the mace, which we have had not too long. It
was put in action in 1978. The first time it was put on public display was in
Chancellor Brewer’s installation in October 1978. It too, reflects East
Carolina. The planning commission that was putting together the installation
said we don’t have a mace. At that time several other schools had maces.
They were all reconstructing 18th century type maces with the filigree and
things of that sort and the experience of one Trustee, John Bridgers, chaired
the committee to charter a mace.

It is composed of Mexican silver. It was bought on the downside of the
cost of silver and at the time it had been finished by my colleague John
Satterfield, it was worth five times more than what we had paid for it. That
was back in the days when the Hunts were trying to corner the silver supply
so when you see that mace, you can pat it and say we have a bargain here, at
least!

The purple crystal chlorite was found in the hills and it works very well.
If you look very closely at it, the gold is on the inside of the cage and what
purple there is, is there. This is not anyone else’s mace; this is East
Carolina’s mace. You cannot find anything like it anywhere. John did an
outstanding piece of work.

One other thing that time changes, Dr. Bridges stated we would call
this the Trustee’s mace. This is one of the few places that I see Trustees
mentioned with some honor, generally, piece and part of the University, but
because of continuity and the nature of history, it’s changed its name. I
would suggest that you think of changing it back to the Trustees’ mace given
its origin and structure in 1978.

One other thing that was done, and this was something also that Dr.
Bridgers wanted, was to put it on display continually. It was put on a sink
display, glass display cabinet in the library, with security on it and students
who have no idea what East Carolina is until perhaps 5 or 10 years later
would really enjoy looking at that. I think the reason it was taken out was
due to the renovations in the late 90’s....98......and it was not put back. To
make your history continuous here, it would be nice to bring it out of the
darkness of the safe and once more mount it in a prominent place like Joyner
Library.
Do you have any questions on this? I think everyone is pretty well installed now so I think we can speak of these traditionally things with some trust.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

Chancellor Talton thanked Dr. Ferrell for sharing with everyone
Moments of history and said he looked forward to his report at each meeting.
Mr. Talton suggested we refer to the Faculty Senate or some committee Dr. Ferrell’s suggestion of redesignation of the mace. It was noted that Chancellor Ballard had – at this time – delegated this item to Provost Smith.

Chairman Talton asked Mr. Kinlaw to read any report items that action had been taken on by the Board since the last meeting.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS and RECOMMENDATIONS**

**EXECUTIVE and AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT**

Mr. Kinlaw stated there were no items approved by the full Board since the last meeting. The following items were acted on by the Executive and Audit Committee on behalf of the full Board since the April 1 meeting:

--Approval of request to sever house at 506 East Ninth Street,
--Approval of request for property lease—Pediatric Subspecialty and Healthy Weight Clinic,
--Approval of request for initial appointments with permanent tenure for Frank Romer, Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; and Deidre M. Mageean, Professor, Department of Geography.

Mr. Kinlaw stated Dr. Mageean’s appointment was amended to “Associate Professor” rather than “Professor” as was stated on the initial paperwork.

Mr. Talton remarked that there was action resulting from the meeting
this morning and asked for a motion.

Mr. Showfety moved approval of the Serious Illness and Disability Policy as previously presented in our materials. (Faculty Senate Resolution #05-21; Attachment A)

Mr. Butler seconded the motion and it was approved by a voice vote with no negative votes.

Chairman Talton then asked for a motion regarding the Board of Visitors.

Mr. Kelly moved that the eight individuals listed below be elected as ECU Board of Visitors.

- Eric Miller Reeves of Raleigh
- Allen Thomas of Winterville
- Brenda Turner Lewis of Greenville
- David H. Englert of Norfolk, Virginia
- Tom Southern of New Bern
- Tully Ryan of Edenton
- Billy Mills of Jacksonville
- Robert Brinkley of Charlotte.

Mr. Greczyn seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NAMING OF BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, and OTHER RECOGNITIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Bodenhamer stated there were no action items.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chair Ward stated there were two items that required action and moved that the candidates for degrees, as approved by the Faculty Senate, be authorized for conferral on Saturday, May 7, 2005, at the annual Spring commencement.
Mr. Kinlaw seconded the motion and it passed with no negative votes.

Mrs. Ward then moved that we endorse the internationalization goals for the 2009 and the plan for achieving them as presented in our Board books. (Attachment B)

Mr. Greczyn seconded the motion and it was approved by a voice vote.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE REPORT

Chairman Talton asked Committee Chair Miller for any action items from his committee. Mr. Miller responded that all of their action would be on the field.

FINANCE and FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. Talton asked Committee Chair Kelly for any action items. Mr. Kelly responded that there was one and moved that the Board of Trustees reaffirm its support for the construction of the Family Medicine Center and approve the university’s plan to make this a self-liquidating project.

Mr. Brody seconded the motion and it was approved by acclamation.

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Chairman Talton asked Committee Chair Brody for any action items from his Committee. There were none.

HEALTH SCIENCES COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Talton reported on behalf of Committee Chair Hill who had to leave early for his daughter’s graduation that there were no action items.

RESEARCH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT and COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Committee Chair Greczyn reported no action items from his Committee.
OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business brought before the Board. However, Mr. Talton stated he had established a Nominating Committee at the April 1 to present officer nominations for the 2005-2006 year. The committee consisted of Mr. Kelly, Chairman, Mrs. Ward and Mr. Miller. He asked Mr. Kelly for his report.

Mr. Kelly commented that approximately 3 ½ - 4 hours was spent discussing this matter – it was not a situation taken lightly -- and thanked Mr. Talton for his confidence in the appointment. Mr. Kelly reminded the Board that these were one year nominations and said there was a great deal of support in his conversations with the Board members. Mr. Kelly stated if a person on the nominating committee was a candidate for an officer there was a feeling of possible conflict but again stressed that communication was the key. Therefore, the nominations are: Chair, Stephen D. Showfety; Vice Chair, Robert J. Greczyn, Jr.; and Secretary, Michael W. Kelly.

Chair Talton thanked the Committee and remarked that the communication, collaboration and cooperation of the Board over the last year or two while facing a number of challenges was outstanding and he applauded the committee on their recommendations. He further stated this slate of nominees would be brought forward at the July 19th meeting.

Mr. Miller asked that this item be brought forth at the next retreat and asked that some research be done to see how some other institutions handle this matter.
Mr. Showfety remarked that there was a lot of talent on this Board and no one individual was particularly trying to push an individual objective and this contributes to the ineminity of our Board. He further stated that in the last year or two the informal but well recognized job description of the Chairman has been rewritten and he was certain that everyone appreciated and respected the tremendous amount of time that was invested by Mr. Talton by accepting the responsibility of the position. If elected, Mr. Showfety would ask and look forward to the support of the Board and would share the responsibility of the Board to engage everyone to help in that position. In his six years on the Board, a lot of “heavy lifting” has been done to get us to where he wanted us to be and you can’t help but be excited about the prospects for the future. We are clearly positioned, with our administrative leadership to move forward and with the placement of the infrastructure; hopefully we can concentrate on the mission at hand and accomplish all of the things that we wish our institution to accomplish.

Chairman Talton agreed that it was a group effort and reiterated Mr. Showfety’s comments.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business brought before the Board.

ITEMS FROM CLOSED SESSION

Per instructions from the Chair, Mr. Showfety moved that the rank on Deidre Mageean be changed from Professor to Associate Professor as stated earlier.
Mr. Brody seconded the motion and it was passed by a voice vote.

Hearing no further business, Chairman Talton announced that the next full meeting of the Board would be on Tuesday, July 19, 2005. He thanked each of the Trustees for their commitment, their interest and their participation.

Mr. Kelly asked to make a personal comment and stated that on Sunday, June 12th at 5:00, he would be married and everyone was invited.

__________________________________
James R. Talton, Jr. Chairman

__________________________________
Dan V. Kinlaw, Secretary

Minutes of the Committee meetings are on file in the Executive Assistant’s office and shall be retained for the term of this administration.
Faculty Senate Resolution #05-21
Approved by the Faculty Senate: March 22, 2005
Approved by the Chancellor: April 13, 2005
Approved by the Board of Trustees: pending
Approved by the UNC General Administration: pending
Approved by the UNC Board of Governors: pending

East Carolina University Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for Faculty

Introduction and Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to provide permanent faculty who do not currently earn sick leave with paid leave for cases of a serious health condition, maternity leave, or parental leave as defined under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The purpose of this policy is also to coordinate leaves granted under federal and state acts such as the FMLA [29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq.], the North Carolina Family Illness Act (NCFIA) [SB1115, Section 28.3B], and the UNC Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for Faculty [UNC Policy 300.2.11(G)]. All three policies cover the same serious health conditions, maternity leave or parental leave. This policy supplements the FMLA and NCFIA to provide for a period of paid leave rather than such leave being unpaid.

This policy does not apply to brief absences of 14 calendar days or less that are usually accommodated informally. This policy is intended to apply to short-term and intermediate-term disability of up to one year. Exceptional cases may be considered by the University.

All eligible East Carolina University faculty members with a medically verifiable serious health condition as defined below are covered under this policy. The review by university administrators focuses exclusively on verifying the documentation of the condition.

Granting or denial of a request for a leave under this policy shall be made without regard to the faculty member's race, color, national origin, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation, political affiliation, disability, or personal malice.

1. Definitions

For purposes of this policy a brief absence is defined as fourteen (14) calendar days or less.

The following definitions are applicable to the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), the North Carolina Family Illness Act (NCFIA) and ECU's Policy on Serious Illness and Disability Leave for faculty:

A serious health condition is defined as (a) an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves either inpatient care in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility, or that involves continuing treatment by a health care provider; (b) any period of incapacity requiring an absence from work of more than fourteen calendar days that also involves continuing treatment by a health care provider; or (c) continuing treatment by a health care provider for conditions so serious that, if not treated, would likely result in an absence of more than ten workdays. Prenatal care is also included. The period of actual physical disability associated with childbirth is considered a serious
health condition and must be taken as family/medical leave, whether as paid or unpaid leave.

Immediate Family - spouse, parents, children (including step relationships), or other legal dependents who require the faculty member’s care.

Parent - a biological or adoptive parent or an individual who stood in loco parentis (a person who is in the position or place of a parent) to an employee when the employee was a child.

Child - a son or daughter who is under 18 years of age or is 18 years of age or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability. Child would include: (a) biological, (b) adopted, (c) foster, (d) step-child, (e) legal ward, and (f) child of an employee standing in loco parentis as defined above.

Immediate Supervisor - Normally, the immediate supervisor is the individual who is the head of the code unit. However, in code units that describe department structures, the immediate supervisor is the department head/chair.

FMLA provides for a period of up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for a serious health condition, maternity leave, or parental leave. NCFIA provides for up to 52 weeks of unpaid leave in a five-year period in cases of serious illness of a child, spouse, or parent.

Applicable vice chancellor - The applicable vice chancellor is the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, whoever is appropriate for the particular faculty member.

Start Date - The period of paid leave under this policy begins with the first day of the absence from University contractual duties resulting from such illness or disability. If a leave begins as a brief illness, then results in a more serious condition that warrants use of the Serious Illness Leave policy, the period of paid leave under this policy will revert back to the first day of absence.

II. Eligibility

This policy applies to persons holding regular full-time faculty appointments who are eligible for participation in either the North Carolina Teachers and State Employees Retirement System or the Optional Retirement Program, and who are not eligible to earn sick leave under any other state or institutional leave policy. If a faculty member has been in a previous leave-earning position and has an accumulated sick leave balance, the faculty member must exhaust any previous sick leave balance prior to requesting coverage under this policy. Part-time permanent faculty holding appointments of at least 75% are also covered under this policy.

III. Benefit

(A) In all cases, leave granted under this policy shall be in increments that are appropriate to the facts and circumstances surrounding the illness or disability, the academic calendar, the needs of the unit, and the responsibilities of the faculty member. Leave taken under this Serious Illness policy shall run concurrently with FMLA leave
and/or with the statutory provisions of the North Carolina Family Illness Act. Any leave under this policy will count as part of the 52 week allowable total under the NCFIA and/or as part of the 12 week allowable total under the FMLA.

(B) A faculty member who has a medically verifiable illness or disability, with proper medical documentation, as defined under FMLA, or whose immediate family member has a medically documented, verifiable illness, may elect to request a paid leave of absence for up to 15 calendar weeks in accordance with Section V. Such a request must be reviewed by the immediate supervisor and the dean with notification of the action taken submitted to the appropriate vice chancellor and the Office of Human Resources.

(C) If the illness or disability requires an absence from faculty duties in excess of the 15 calendar weeks, the faculty member may elect to petition for an extension of paid leave (see (E) below) or for a leave of absence without pay under procedures described in the Faculty Manual or under University policies implementing the FMLA or under statutory regulations of the NCFIA.

(D) The faculty member should consult with the Office of Human Resources regarding existing benefits through the Disability Income Plan or through other disability programs that may be offered to University employees on an optional basis.

(E) A faculty member who provides the appropriate additional medical documentation and whose illness or disability, or that of the family member, extends beyond the 15 weeks provided for under this Policy, may elect to submit a written request to the immediate supervisor for an extension of leave with pay up to a maximum of one year (determined by counting forward 12 months from the date the leave begins) at the discretion of the University. More than one serious illness or disability leave may be granted in a 12-month period, but the total maximum allowable paid leave for all such serious illnesses may not exceed one year in length. Such requests must be reviewed by the appropriate dean, vice chancellor, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. Additional leave with pay in excess of the limits may be granted in exceptional cases at the discretion of the university.

(F) Additional leave requires leave of absence without pay.

(G) The immediate supervisor may require such medical documentation or certifications, second or third medical opinions (at the university's expense) or other documentation of the need for leave, probable length of absence from normal duties, ability to return to work, or intent to return to work as it may deem necessary.

(H) When the request is to care for a member of the faculty member's immediate family, the University will also require satisfactory evidence that the faculty member will exercise primary responsibility for the care of those who would qualify the faculty member for leave under this policy.

(I) Leave offered under this policy is not allowable as terminal leave payment when the faculty member leaves the employment of the University. Unused leave shall not accumulate nor be carried forward from one academic year or calendar year to the next. It may not be used to extend years of creditable state service for retirement benefits.
However, it may be exhausted prior to participation in the Disability Income Plan of North Carolina that is provided to eligible state employees.

(J) It is the intent of this Policy that faculty members receive the benefits defined herein during the period(s) in which they have a contractual commitment to the University.

IV. Use of Leave

The period of leave provided under this policy may be used for medically verifiable sickness or injury as defined under the FMLA. Use of such leave includes the birth of a child and to care for the newborn child after birth or for temporary disability connected with childbearing and recovery, which prevents the faculty member from performing usual duties. Leave also may be used for the placement of or to care for a child placed with the employee for adoption or foster care, and/or for a serious health condition of the employee that prevents the employee from performing the essential functions of his/her job. In accordance with ECU's policy on leave granted under the Family and Medical Leave Act, a faculty member may seek leave needed as a consequence of a medically verifiable illness/disability of a member of the immediate family, as defined in Section I. of this policy.

A faculty member who anticipates the need for a temporary leave shall notify his or her immediate supervisor in writing as soon as possible.

If the faculty member's request is for the purpose of caring for an immediate family member, the immediate supervisor may request medical verification of the illness or disability of that person and may also inquire about the circumstances which make it impossible or difficult for the faculty member to carry on with normal duties.

When the request is for the care of the faculty member's family member or dependent, the immediate supervisor may base the recommendation on other factors, including the needs of the unit, timing within the academic year, effect on students, ability of the unit to compensate for the absence, etc.

Female faculty shall not be penalized because they require time away from work caused by or contributed to by pregnancy, miscarriage, abortion, childbirth or recovery. Disabilities resulting from pregnancy shall be treated the same as any other temporary disability. The type and nature of the faculty member's duties during pregnancy shall be determined by the faculty member's immediate supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and upon advice she receives from her physician.

V. Administration of Benefit

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to request the use of leave provided by this policy as soon as possible upon learning of the need for the leave. This request will be made to the faculty member's immediate supervisor. The request for leave shall include an estimate of the amount of time the faculty member is expected to be on leave. The faculty member will notify his or her immediate supervisor if the estimate materially changes.

Such requests must be in writing, but there may be instances where the employee is unable to make the request by completing the necessary forms at the Office of Human
Resources website or via a letter. All conditions covered by this serious illness and disability leave policy cannot be anticipated. The policy provided herein is expected to be appropriate in most situations. However, in unusual cases, the faculty member or other responsible party may be unable to provide the necessary notification. In those rare instances where the employee or a member of the employee’s family is unable to make the necessary request, it is the responsibility of the immediate supervisor to consult with a Human Resources benefits counselor for direction.

The immediate supervisor will review the request and forward the documentation to the dean. The dean is responsible for reviewing the documentation and consulting with the Office of Human Resources. The dean will provide written notification of the decision to the immediate supervisor, who will then advise the faculty member. The dean will provide a copy of the notice to the appropriate vice chancellor and to the Office of Human Resources. If leave is denied, the written notification will include the grounds for denial.

In the case of a request for leave beyond the initial 15 week period, the request must also be reviewed by the appropriate vice chancellor and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. The person responsible for notifying the faculty member is the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. If leave is denied, the written notification will include the grounds for denial.

The immediate supervisor is responsible for securing, to the extent possible, substitute personnel for the duration of the faculty member’s leave. Any adjustments in work schedules within the unit are at the discretion of the immediate supervisor with the approval of the dean and are subject to departmental and institutional needs and resources. In recommending approval of a leave, the immediate supervisor will develop a written plan to cover the responsibilities of the faculty member for the duration of the leave. Funding of substitute personnel is the responsibility of the appropriate vice chancellor.

Nothing in this policy shall prohibit other faculty members from "covering" for the faculty member on leave but only so long as the faculty member on leave complies with this leave policy.

VI. Appeals

A decision not to grant a request for leave under this policy may be appealed to the appropriate vice chancellor. The vice chancellor’s decision may be appealed to the chancellor. Appeals of a negative decision must be made by the faculty member to the next higher level within ten (10) business days of receipt of the negative decision. The vice chancellor and chancellor must respond to an appeal within ten (10) business days of receipt of the appeal.

VII. Confidentiality

Communications concerning leave requested or granted under this policy are subject to the same confidentiality requirements as other personnel records in accordance with North Carolina law.

VIII. Record-Keeping
Because this policy provides an important financial benefit, accurate records on all requests for leave, whether or not the request is granted, must be maintained. The immediate supervisor shall be responsible for forwarding all records pertaining to the use of this policy to the Office of Human Resources. The Office of Human Resources will maintain the official records concerning requests for leave under this Policy, and may, from time to time, be required to make general reports on its use to other University administrators and to the Faculty Senate.

IX. Coordination with Other Policies

ECU’s Faculty Manual indicates that leaves from all employment obligations which are granted to probationary-term faculty may include extension of the length of the probationary term. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to review the pertinent sections and determine the impact such leave would have on their probationary term.

A permanently tenured faculty member granted leave under this policy may have his or her five-year cumulative review delayed by a period agreed upon by the faculty member, the faculty member’s immediate supervisor, the dean, and the appropriate vice chancellor.

The terms of this policy pertain only to a leave for a specified period because of illness or disability. This policy has no effect on provisions for other types of leave as described in the Faculty Manual.

The leave provided for under this policy shall have no effect on the faculty member’s other employment benefits.

X. Effective Date

This policy shall become effective immediately upon approval by the President of The University of North Carolina and shall supersede any previous authority granting leave for faculty, if any.

The policy, once approved by the Faculty Senate, Chancellor, Board of Trustees, UNC General Administration, and UNC Board of Governors will be placed in the ECU Faculty Manual under Part VI. Section VII. and referenced in Section I.D.
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Internationalization Goals for 2009

Goal One:
Incorporate International Education into the ECU’s Mission Statement

Goal Two:
Expand and Diversify Overseas Opportunities for ECU Students

Goal Three:
Increase and Diversify ECU’s International Student Population

Goal Four:
Internationalize the ECU Faculty and Staff

Goal Five:
Promote more global awareness through the ECU Curriculum
East Carolina University
Strategies for Internationalization Goal Two

Goal Two:
Expand and Diversify
Overseas Opportunities
for ECU Students

- Increase to 300 the number of students participating in international swap programs
- Establish new internship and service learning opportunities
- Expand summer study abroad options
- Create new, cost-effective, study abroad options
- Establish 30 international linkage agreements with foreign universities
- Initiate exchange programs with new countries and regions
- Increase participation in ISEP and the UNC-EP
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Strategies for Internationalization Goal Three

Goal Three: Increase and Diversify ECU’s International Student Population

Increase the number of degree-seeking international students to 500

Increase the number of international exchange students on the ECU campus

Create an intensive language program on the ECU campus

Diversify the international student body

Make better use of international students as an educational resource
East Carolina University
Strategies for Internationalization Goal Four

Goal Four: Internationalize the ECU Faculty and Staff

- Provide intramural support for faculty to get international experience
- Establish new internship and service learning opportunities
- Increase the number of externally funded international projects to five
- Consider international experience as one criterion in promotion and tenure
- Consider evidence of global awareness as a factor in hiring new faculty
- Provide awards that encourage faculty excellence in international education
- Triple the number of ECU faculty receiving Fulbright and other such awards
- Establish an international faculty swap program
- Increase the number and make better use of international visiting scholars

Attachment B
Goal Five: Promote More Global Awareness through the ECU Curriculum

- Create a committee on international curricular initiatives (CICI) within academic affairs
- Integrate and expand the teaching of foreign languages and cultures
- Broaden ECU’s offerings in international interdisciplinary programs
- Utilize distance education to globalize the curriculum
- Expand the programs in international studies
- Internationalize the general education curriculum
- Increase the overall number of internationally related courses

East Carolina University
Strategies for Internationalization Goal Five
Introduction

Our Charge.

In January, 2004, Interim Vice Chancellor James LeRoy Smith created the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee for International Affairs and named us as its members. His charge to us was:

“[E]xamine where we are right now with respect to our several international programs: what are our strengths, weaknesses and opportunities. I then ask you to determine a set of realistic goals that we should achieve by 2009 and to devise a plan of action whereby we can achieve those goals. In particular, I hope that the Committee will look into such important areas as study abroad opportunities for our students; the size and character of our international student body; our linkages with sister universities overseas; the global interests and experience of our faculty; the internationalization of the curriculum; and indeed possibilities for internationalizing the very fiber of the University.”

Dr. Smith asked that we examine these several topics over Spring Term and that we give to him by May 15, 2004, a report detailing our recommendations. This document is that report.

Our intent is to provide a blueprint whereby, over the next five years, the University might better enable students, faculty, staff, and indeed the wider community to become more aware about the world in which we live. Our blueprint indicates ways in which the University’s people might gain the knowledge and skills to be effective global citizens. More to the point our document outlines a series of steps to develop at ECU a truly international campus culture.

The Timeliness of Our Report

We are not alone in seeking to internationalize a campus culture. Since 9/11, colleges and universities throughout the nation have placed high priority on international education. In preparing our report, we have profited from the thinking and experience of others. In particular we have benefited from the advice of colleagues in the UNC Office of the President and at several of our sister UNC institutions. Indeed, our Report, like so many others in the University System, is a conscious response to "Strategic Direction 5: Internationalization" that was adopted by the UNC Board of Governors (BOG) in January 2002 and recently reaffirmed in the BOG’s Long-Range Plan 2004-2009. The aim of that Strategic Direction is to “[p]romote an international perspective throughout the University community to prepare citizens to become leaders in a multi-ethnic and global society.” We are indebted to the Board for its leadership in this important area, and we are grateful for the assistance of the Office of the President in helping us create our ECU response. In particular, we relied heavily on UNC Senior Vice President Gretchen Bataille's paper, "Internationalization and the University of North Carolina."

Our report is timely in other respects as well. We write just as ECU is developing its next Five-Year Plan covering the period 2004 to 2009. Indeed, our document is designed to form an important part of the Five-Year Plan for the Division of Academic Affairs. We seek to elaborate on several of the goals cited in the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan of February, 2004, notably: AA#2 “Expand opportunities for ECU students to study abroad”; AA#4 “Investigate and support development of international education and global initiatives”; AA#15 “Foster and develop diversity through effective hiring and student recruitment”; AA#16 "Expand and diversify ECU’s international student population”; and AA#17 “Expand undergraduate and graduate D[istance] E[ducation] offerings.”

The document was also written with an eye toward defining a more useful role for the ECU Office of International Affairs (OIA). The Office is now at a crossroads. Particularly over the past few years it has been buffeted a great deal; some have even suggested that it has lost its sense of direction. It is time that we examine and redefine its role in the internationalization process, clearly identifying those tasks which are and are not the responsibility of the OIA. Equipped with a better understanding of the Office’s role, we can more intelligently begin the search for a permanent Director of International Affairs. It is our hope that
within the next five years the OIA will be so successful and international affairs so important a campus activity that the Director of the Office will merit the title of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Meaning of Internationalization.

We define internationalization in the same way as does UNESCO, the International Association of Universities, and many campuses including our sister University in Greensboro. Internationalization is “a range of activities, policies, and services that integrate an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.” [Jane Knight, "Internationalization: Management Strategies and Issues," *International Education Magazine*, IX, 1 (1993), pp. 6, 21, and 22]. This definition gives clear indication that the international aspects of the university can no longer be compartmentalized into discrete departments, centers, and programs. Rather, internationalization must touch on all aspects of the campus and inform its several functions. Internationalization should permeate, in the words of Dr. Smith’s charge, “the very fiber of the University.”

The Purpose and Structure of this Document.

The purpose of this document is to outline a series of goals to be achieved by the year 2009. We recommend that these goals be interpreted within the context of the *University Plan, 2004-09*. For each goal we outline a series of strategies for its achievement, and then a set of benchmarks by which progress toward achievement might be measured.

Five Goals for 2009

Goal One: To Incorporate International Education into the University's Mission Statement.

No doubt in response to the BOG’s Strategic Direction 5, over half of the institutions in the UNC System now include some reference in their Mission Statements to international education or global awareness. Unfortunately, ECU is not among those institutions, and that should be corrected forthwith. ECU’s Mission Statement needs to indicate briefly but clearly that the University is committed to international education, and that internationalization is an institutional goal.

Strategy. To accomplish this objective, we recommend that:

♦ **International education be included in the Mission Statement.** The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should request the ECU Advisory Committee for International Programs to review the current Mission Statement and make recommendations of appropriate wording to be incorporated in it. **Benchmark:** This task should be completed by May, 2005.

Goal Two: To Expand and Diversify Overseas Opportunities for ECU Students.

While ECU may be justly proud of its numerous summer study abroad programs, the University’s semester and year-long study abroad options are another story. Over the past five years we have witnessed a steady decline in the number of ECU students participating in academic year abroad programs, particularly student exchange programs. That is particularly disturbing because UNC institutions—as a result of their extremely low in-state tuition and fees—are admirably positioned to offer extremely cost-effective student swap programs. Other institutions in the System capitalize upon that advantage, and we should as well. Getting our numbers up is clearly the responsibility of the Office of International Affairs, and this ought to be top priority for that office.

**Strategies.** We recommend several strategies to achieve this goal:
♦ Increase twenty-fold the number of ECU students participating in international swap programs. That is not as ambitious a goal as it sounds because we start from such a low base. This year (2003-04), only fifteen ECU students went overseas on student swap arrangements. It would be ambitious but not unrealistic to increase that number to 300 by 2009. Other UNC institutions much smaller than ECU regularly send overseas over that number every year, and indeed five years ago ECU itself sent almost 40 students annually on international exchange. We need to get back on track. Benchmarks: The Office of International Affairs, working with faculty, the administration, and development will increase the numbers of students going on study abroad by 60 in each of the five years, 2004-09 so that by 2009 300 students will be on academic term and academic year study abroad.

♦ Enlarge the endowment to provide travel grants for study abroad participants. To achieve the numbers indicated in the previous paragraph the OIA should have a larger endowment, at least $2 million more than we have now, that would provide travel funds to enable more students to go on study abroad. The creation of such an endowment is quite feasible as has been shown by the success of our sister institutions in the UNC system in raising sizeable funds for this purpose. Indeed we already have in place the Rivers Endowment and the funding in the EC Scholars program that is now earmarked to support Study Abroad. But we need more resources. Benchmarks: In close cooperation with University Development and as part of the upcoming Centennial Capital Campaign, OIA should aim to raise an average of $400,000 in each of the next five years.

♦ Expand our linkages with overseas universities. The mechanism that enables most international student swaps is the bilateral exchange agreement. At one time or other, ECU had 40 such agreements with partners all over the world. By the end of 2003, we were down to only five active agreements. If we are to be successful in sending students (and indeed faculty as well) overseas, we should plan over the next five years to establish at least five new and active agreements each year so that we have at least 30 new agreements by 2009. Benchmarks: ECU should negotiate and sign five new bilateral student exchange agreements with overseas partners in each of the next five years.

♦ Initiate exchange programs with new countries and regions. There has been an unfortunate tendency at ECU (as well as at many other institutions) simply to respond to initial student demand rather than to build new interests. Thus, ECU has over the years sent a disproportionate number of students to such places as Australia and the United Kingdom. But the world is a bigger place and we need to exert some leadership to entice students (perhaps with the offer of additional Rivers or other scholarship money) to take the less-well-traveled paths to such destinations as Brazil, China, Japan, Central and Eastern Europe, and the Middle East. Benchmarks: Of the five new bilateral agreements to be signed each year from 2004-2009, at least two should be with institutions outside Western Europe.

♦ Increase participation in ISEP and the UNC-EP. While we recommend that priority be placed upon the expansion of our bilateral student exchange programs, we ought also to take full advantage of two important student swap programs in which ECU participates. One is the International Student Exchange Program, or ISEP; the other is the University of North Carolina Exchange Program, or UNC-EP. Both are tuition and fee (and in ISEP’s case room and board as well) swap programs. Thus they are comparable in cost to bilateral programs. Our participation in these programs has been in steady decline over the last five years: this year, we sent only three students on the UNC-EP program, and one on ISEP. We should reverse this decline and resolve to send at least ten students per year on each program in each of the next five years. Benchmarks: Over the period 2004-09, ECU will send each year ten students overseas on ISEP and the UNC-EP.

♦ Create new, cost-effective, study abroad options. While the heart of ECU’s study abroad program will remain the exchange program, we should not rely solely on that mechanism alone.
For example, the ECU Department of Foreign Languages relies on our participation in the cost-effective Consortium programs organized by UNC-Wilmington and UNC-Charlotte to get its language students to, respectively, France and Spain. Programs like these should continue, and perhaps we might look to other, equally economical—although non-exchange—options for groups of ECU students to study abroad. For example, we might send our students to Mexico in cooperation with the North Carolina Center for International Understanding, a unit of the UNC System. We recommend the development of two new such programs by 2009. Benchmarks: ECU will create one new, cost-effective, non-exchange training site by 2006, and another by 2008.

♦ **Expand summer abroad options.** The bright spot in ECU study abroad has been the vibrancy of our summer programs. Last summer (2003), 176 students went overseas on a dozen programs. The success of those programs was primarily due to the enthusiasm and dedication of the 16 ECU faculty members who organized and led them, sometimes in the face of bureaucratic hurdles that would discourage lesser spirits. While we do recommend that considerable attention be paid to our student swap programs—because that is where the needs are most critical—we hardly wish to leave the impression that our emphasis in that area implies a diminished interest in summer programs. There is a place for each in ECU study abroad; they are not in competition. The need to get more ECU students overseas is so great that we should employ and expand all opportunities. Benchmarks: Increase the number of summer study abroad programs by two in each of the next five years so that an additional ten will be added by 2009 as to increase overall student participation to 250.

♦ **Establish new internship and service learning opportunities overseas.** We recommend that a new kind of overseas experience—internships in overseas companies and service learning in international organizations—be added to the store of student opportunities. To be sure the establishment of such a new program is fraught with difficulty: placement of our students in internships and service learning positions is hard enough in the United States, let alone overseas. But for some programs—international business is one, the MAIS is another—international internships are a necessity. Benchmarks: From 2004-09, we should place five ECU students per year in internships in overseas environments.

**Goal Three: To Increase and Diversify ECU’s International Student Population.**

The number of international students on the ECU campus remains embarrassingly small. In Fall Term, 2003, we counted 188 international students (degree-seeking and exchange)—a mere .85% of our total student enrollment of 22,000. To give a little comparison, among our 15 peer institutions, the average international student population is around 850, representing an average of 4.6% of total enrollment (please see Appendix I). If 4.6% of ECU’s current enrollment were international students, we would have an international student population of just over 1,000. Getting to such a number will take some time, but surely we can get at least half way there over the next five years. Numbers alone are not the whole story, of course. We should also take steps to diversify our foreign student population and make better use of it as an educational resource. The campus unit that should lead the recruitment (and retention) effort is the Office of International Affairs. It should bear the primary responsibility for implementing all of the following strategies.

**Strategies.** To accomplish these objectives we propose to:

♦ **Increase the number of degree-seeking international students to 500.** In Fall Term, 2003, ECU had 159 degree-seeking international students: 50 undergraduates and 109 graduate students. The main reason why our numbers are so low is that, hitherto, we have been reactive rather than proactive in international student recruitment. We recommend a change in that approach and ask that the Office of International Affairs, in close cooperation with the Undergraduate Admissions and the Graduate School, embark on an ambitious and vigorous marketing and recruitment campaign. Benchmarks: The degree-seeking international student population should be increased to 199 by Fall Term 2004; 259 by Fall Term 2005; 336 by Fall Term 2006; 420, Fall Term 2007; and 500 by Fall Term 2008.
Increase the Number of International Exchange Students on the ECU campus. As indicated in the section on study abroad, we advocate an expansion of ECU’s various international student swap programs such that 300 ECU students will be participants by 2009. One of the great benefits of such swap programs is that they bring to our campus an equal number of international exchange students. Thus, in expanding our swap programs for ECU students, we improve our international student numbers as well. Benchmarks: The number of international exchange students coming to ECU should increase by 60 in each of the next five years until 300 are enrolled by 2009.

Create an Intensive English Language Program on the ECU Campus. To assist in recruitment, we need an Intensive English Language Program (IELP). We recommend that a reputable IELP (such as the INTERLINK Language Centers that operates on five U.S. campuses including UNC-Greensboro) be invited to set up and run our program. The benefits would be many: an experienced IELP can help in our recruitment efforts; in connection with it we can offer such attractive options as the institutional TOEFL and conditional admissions; and the program would add at least 35 students to our international student population. Benchmarks: Open an Intensive English Language Program on the ECU campus by Fall Term 2005, and assist its growth so that by 2009 it would enroll at least 35 students.

Diversify the international student body. We ought not to be obsessed with numbers alone. We should also be concerned with the diversification of our international student body. Of the 159 degree-seeking international students enrolled in Fall Term 2003, 62 (39%) came from only two countries: China and India. Likewise, 80% of our incoming exchange students are from Europe. We lag in student representation from the Caribbean and Central and South America, and host only a handful of students from the Middle East and Africa. While much of this picture is determined by economic and political circumstances beyond our control, we could still take steps—for example, by implementing the proposed Graduate School Support Plan—to provide financial aid to needy international students. We should aim to increase to 100 by 2009 the number of international students coming from less-represented world areas. Benchmarks: In each of the five years 2004-09 increase by 20 per year the number of students from the Caribbean, Central and South America, the Middle East, and Africa.

Make better use of international students as an educational resource. The reason we want more international students on our campus is not for tuition dollars. Rather, it is because of the tremendous educational opportunity that they present to our students, faculty, and community. Up until recently, however, ECU has not done a very good job in deriving educational benefit from its international students. We applaud recent efforts to reverse things: the new Honors/International Students’ dormitory that will open in fall 2005; the Office of International Affairs’ weekly gatherings of international and American students that started last fall; the international festival held in April 2004. But we can do more. We could, for instance, utilize foreign students as language informants; create programs of outreach into the local schools and into New North Carolinian immigrant groups; and make better use of our international graduates who could assist in recruitment activities overseas. Benchmarks: In each year, 2004 to 2009, add one new international-student learning program.

Goal Four: To Internationalize the ECU Faculty and Staff.

Faculty members who have spent time overseas invariably incorporate an international perspective into their teaching and research. Such faculty members also become firm advocates for internationalization throughout the University and enthusiastic volunteers for all kinds of international projects. If internationalization is an institutional priority, it is crucial to invest in the faculty. As is indicated below, the Office of International Affairs should bear the responsibility for implementing some of the following strategies while other campus bodies should take the lead with respect to the others.

Strategies. We recommend several strategies for internationalizing the faculty:
♦ **Provide intramural support for faculty to get international experience.** The University must provide opportunity for faculty to acquire international experience. Indeed, international contacts by our faculty would increase ECU’s visibility that, among other things, would aid in international student recruitment. At the very least, there should be a budget within the Office of International Affairs that would enable faculty to travel overseas to inspect study abroad sites, to explore international linkage possibilities, to attend professional meetings in other countries, etc. An annual budget of, say, $50,000 would enable 50 faculty members to go overseas each year. **Benchmarks:** In each of the five years 2004-08, OIA should support 50 faculty members going overseas so that by 2009 upwards of 250 faculty members will have had the opportunity to gain international experience.

♦ **Triple the number of ECU faculty members receiving Fulbright and other such awards.** While short visits are better than nothing, the best kind of international exposure is an extended period of work and residence abroad; and there are several fellowship opportunities (Fulbright, NATO, NSF, DAAD, Rotary, etc.) that can provide support for such in-depth experiences. On average, ECU faculty receive only three such awards per year. We should triple that number by 2009. To get there, we should encourage and reward participation in such programs, and reduce the bureaucratic impediments that too often deter faculty from pursuing—or even accepting—such awards. The OIA, working with ECU’s Fulbright Committee, should take the lead in promoting Fulbright and similar programs. **Benchmarks:** In each of the years 2004-09, OIA should aim to increase the number of Fulbright and similar grants to faculty by one to two per year, until by 2009 we average at least nine such awards annually.

♦ **Establish an international faculty swap program.** While it is always pleasant to receive a Fulbright award, external funding is not a *sine qua non* for faculty exchange. Much can be done simply by rechanneling existing resources. In this regard, ECU should institute by this coming year (2004-05) a faculty exchange program whereby our faculty may swap places for an academic term or year with colleagues in universities overseas. Each would retain his or her regular salary and benefits while on exchange; thus the lion’s share of the costs of the program would be covered by existing resources. Once the program is up and running (in academic year 2005-06) we should aim to have three ECU faculty on faculty swaps each year. OIA should bear the responsibility for creating and conducting this program. **Benchmarks:** Establish the faculty swap program in AY 2004-05, and do three swaps per year thereafter, thus providing a total of twelve such exchanges by 2009.

♦ **Increase the number and make better use of international visiting scholars.** One added benefit of a faculty swap program is that it would bring to campus more visiting scholars that have expertise in regions where our resources are thin. This year (2003-04), ECU plays host to 13 visiting scholars from overseas. We should increase the number of such scholars by 100% (to 26) by the year 2009. Equally important, we should develop programs to make better use of these faculty members as an educational resource by asking them—as a condition of our hosting them—to make presentations to ECU and Eastern North Carolina organizations, meet with faculty and student groups, etc., to inform our community about their home countries and regions. That is particularly true of the Rivers Visiting Professorship. It should be revitalized by making it adhere more closely to the original intent of the program. We call on the OIA to organize these efforts. **Benchmarks:** In each of the five years 2004-09, we should increase the number of visiting scholars on the ECU campus by two to three per year, until by 2009 26 are resident on campus.

♦ **Provide awards that encourage faculty excellence in international education.** Right after the institution endorses internationalization in its Mission Statement, we ask that it then establish annual awards to honor faculty who have contributed significantly in the international arena. We are thinking of perhaps a Chancellor’s Prize for Excellence in International Education, and perhaps even separate awards for teaching and for research. That would be a clear message to faculty that ECU is committed to the globalization effort. **Benchmarks:** Beginning in 2005, ECU should annually award one internationally-related award in teaching and another in research.
Consider evidence of global awareness as a factor in hiring new faculty. One cost-effective way to increase faculty awareness of international matters is to include evidence of it as one of the factors considered in new faculty hiring. In allocating positions, administrators should give attention to world regions (e.g., Middle and South America and the Middle East) in which faculty expertise is thin. In some fields evidence of international expertise might be a key criterion. In others, it might be used more subtly, such as a determining factor when all other things seem equal. However the criterion is applied, we urge departments and search committees to take an awareness of international matters into account in their future hiring, and even to advertise position openings in overseas publications. *Benchmark:* We ask that this proposal be discussed in the Deans Council sometime during Academic Year 2004-05, and if there is agreement on our recommendation, we ask that the Council work towards its implementation as soon thereafter as practicable.

Consider international experience as one criterion in promotion and tenure decisions. We recommend that—should a candidate choose to cite it in his or her dossier—international experience become one of the evidences of quality (within of course the traditional categories of Research, Teaching, and Service) that determine promotion and tenure. We ask the Faculty Senate (or some other body deemed appropriate by Senate leadership) to study the feasibility of this recommendation; and, if the recommendation is accepted, we ask that units and departments be encouraged to implement it. *Benchmark:* During 2004-05, we ask the Senate to review the proposal that international experience be considered in the process of determining promotion and tenure.

Increase the number of externally-funded international projects to five. Some enterprising ECU faculty have had considerable success in applying for federal grants to support international programs (notably the several programs supporting exchanges with Russia and Eastern Europe, and those funding exchanges with Japan). But we can do better. ECU should aim to have, by 2009, at least five different, federally-funded, international projects with a combined dollar value of at least $1 million. While the Office of International Affairs and the Office of Sponsored Research can and should be supportive of this effort, the pursuit and execution of such grants, as well as the reaping of benefits from successful applications, should remain faculty prerogatives. *Benchmarks:* In each of the years from 2004-09, ECU faculty should aim to receive at least one new federal grant in support of the international activities.

Establish an international staff swap program. The process of internationalizing ECU ought not to neglect the ECU staff—the people who house our international students, deal with foreign credit and credentials, expedite faculty travel requests, etc. As they are very much part of the institution’s internationalization effort, we should provide them with a program, administered by the OIA, to gain an international perspective. Likewise, it would be very useful for staff from our overseas partners, who deal with ECU faculty and students on a regular basis, to become acquainted with how we do things in Greenville. *Benchmarks:* By Spring Term 2005, and in cooperation with our overseas partners, OIA should have in place a staff swap program involving at least two key staff members each way each year, so that by 2009 eight ECU staff members will have participated in the program.

Goal Five: To Promote More Global Awareness through the ECU Curriculum.

It would be wonderful if all ECU students could study abroad for a semester or a full academic year, but the reality is that for the foreseeable future the great majority of our students will not have that experience. For them, it is primarily the curriculum offered at the home campus in Greenville that will provide that global awareness so necessary in the twenty-first century. While the current ECU curriculum has much strength in international education, it can and ought to be improved. That improvement should build on existing strengths, while simultaneously expanding proactively into other areas, especially non-western ones that have been relatively neglected or marginalized. The overall goal is to provide ECU students with a balanced curriculum addressing the diversity of the world, traditional and modern. As the Office of International Affairs is an administrative unit, it would be improper for it to play a leadership role in curricular change and development. Rather, as the curriculum is a faculty concern, we look to the faculty to achieve this goal.
Strategies. To internationalize the curriculum we propose the following courses of action:

♦ **Create within Academic Affairs a Committee on International Curricular Initiatives (CICI).** If progress in globalizing the curriculum is to be made, the effort needs a structure and strong leadership; and for reasons just stated, it would be improper for the OIA to lead the charge. We therefore suggest the establishment of a Committee on International Curricular Initiatives, or CICI. The Committee should include faculty with recognized international expertise. It should report to Academic Affairs and be designed to work on curriculum development in international education, particularly as it cuts across departmental, school and college lines. It would also take leadership in seeking external funding for international education initiatives. It is essential that the Chair of the Committee be a respected member of the ECU faculty, hold senior rank, receive sufficient released time, and have adequate administrative support. He or she would work with dean-appointed, international education coordinators located in each of the Colleges. Their task would be to coordinate the efforts of their respective Colleges to internationalize the curriculum with the overall, University-wide effort. Further work of the new Committee, its Chair and the coordinators is described in the following strategies. **Benchmarks:** By December, 2004, Academic Affairs should create a Committee on International Curricular Initiatives, provide the Chair of that Committee with resources to implement its recommendations, and identify international coordinators for each of the Colleges.

♦ **Broaden ECU’s offerings in international interdisciplinary programs.** One of CICI’s most important tasks will be to encourage the creation of interdisciplinary programs focusing on hitherto-neglected world areas--Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East--and the expansion of the existing program in Russian Studies and the recently-approved interdisciplinary minor in Asian Studies. Where feasible, each program should have a director and draw on faculty expertise from throughout the University. As far as possible, those programs should be established or expanded with external funding and the CICI should assist them in questing after appropriate grants. **Benchmarks:** Working with faculty groups the CICI will seek external support such that, by 2009, at least two new area studies programs are established and existing programs are significantly expanded.

♦ **Integrate and expand the teaching of foreign languages and cultures.** We recommend that academic departments and programs be encouraged to incorporate foreign language and cultural studies courses taught by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, working responsive with the curricular needs of those department and programs. We also urge that departments and programs be encouraged to incorporate internationally-related courses offered throughout the University, as well as study abroad opportunities, into their curricula. In turn, we recommend that the Department of Foreign Languages expand or establish course offerings in less-commonly-taught languages such as Russian, Japanese, Portuguese, and Chinese. In particular we urge the Department to work with UNC System-wide efforts now underway to teach the less-commonly-taught languages through Distance Education and inter-institutional registration. **Benchmarks:** By 2009, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures should expand or establish course offerings in less-commonly-taught languages utilizing distance education instruction and other means now being developed in the UNC System.

♦ **Increase the overall number of internationally-related courses.** An important goal of CICI will be to increase the number of courses that have a significant international component. An immediate problem in implementing this recommendation is that there are not now any clear criteria as to what constitutes an international or global course. One of the first tasks of CICI, working with the coordinators and through them with the departments and the faculty, is to come up with such criteria. Once they are established, CICI should go through the current catalog and identify those courses that meet the criteria. CICI should then work with faculty so that the total number of internationally-related courses may be increased. **Benchmarks:** By May, 2005, CICI will draw up criteria to identify internationally-related courses, make an inventory of such courses in the catalog, and--beginning in fall, 2005—work with the College coordinators to increase the number.
♦ **Internationalize the general education requirements.** We recommend that the CICI work with appropriate Faculty Senate committees, such as the Academic Standards Committee, to incorporate an international dimension into the revised general education program. We additionally recommend that the University add a meaningful international education requirement into its future general education program. This task will be greatly furthered once the CICI has completed its task of identifying internationally-related courses in the ECU curriculum as many of those could then be marked as courses that might satisfy such a general education requirement.

*Benchmark:* As soon as is practicable, this international education requirement should be approved such that by 2009 it is in effect.

♦ **Expand the programs in International Studies.** We recommend that the undergraduate international studies minor be expanded and upgraded to a major, and that an integrated five-year B.A./M.A. program in international studies be created. We also recommend that two new concentrations for the MAIS (International Affairs Administration and Security Studies) be established by 2006, and that enrollment in the MAIS program be increased by actively recruiting more international students into the program.

*Benchmarks:* The relevant program directors, assisted by the CICI, should establish an undergraduate major in international studies by 2006, an integrated five-year B.A./M.A. in international studies by 2007, and two new MAIS concentrations also by 2007.

♦ **Utilize distance education to globalize the curriculum.** We are all proud that ECU is a leader in Distance Education, certainly in the state, and undoubtedly in the nation. We would be remiss, therefore, if we were not to consider how distance education might assist in the effort to internationalize the curriculum. First, we urge that some Distance Education courses be offered in conjunction with educational institutions overseas via interactive electronic technology. Second, we recommend that Distance Education enter into consortial arrangements linking institutions via interactive technology for the teaching of less-commonly-taught languages. Third, we urge the expansion of current efforts to use Distance Education to promote virtual cultural contact with people overseas as a way of enticing our students to think cross-culturally. We suggest that the CICI work with colleagues in Distance Education to implement these strategies.

*Benchmarks:* By 2009, Distance Education should conduct courses in cooperation with institutions overseas, offer instruction in less-commonly-taught languages, and expand the existing program in virtual cross cultural training to include students in a dozen different countries.

**Conclusion**

We are pleased to have had this opportunity to think about the future of international affairs at East Carolina University. Much needs to be done, but with careful planning, sufficient resources, and creative energy, we can achieve the ambitious goals set forth in this document. We have the potential to assert real leadership in international education and we should go for it! We owe it to our State, our region, and above all, our students. Let’s get on with the task.

Respectfully submitted,

Tope Adeyemi-Bello, Management  
Michael Bassman, The Honors Program  
Beverly Harju, Psychology  
Holly Hapke, Geography  
Mohammed Kashef, Planning  
Mary Kirkpatrick, Nursing  
Paul Knepper, Human Ecology  
Charles Lyons, International Affairs  
Calvin Mercer, Religious Studies  
Marilyn Sheerer, Education  
Paul Tschetter, The Graduate School  
John Tucker, History  
Gay Wilentz, English & Ethnic Studies  
Lester Zeager, Economics & MAIS Program
## Appendix I

### A Comparison of International Student Enrollment and the Percentage of International Students in Total Student Enrollment at East Carolina University and its Peer Institutions: 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>ISE 2001-2002</th>
<th>Percentage of International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Ohio</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>19,627</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>41,102</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>11,222</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri at Kansas City</td>
<td>14,244</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans – Louisiana</td>
<td>17,014</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota – Main</td>
<td>13,034</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Alabama</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
<td>8,093</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University – Kansas</td>
<td>14,854</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University-Main – Ohio</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>