The fifth regular meeting of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, January 26, 2016, in the East Carolina Heart Institute.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**
John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**
The minutes of both November 3, 2015 and December 1, 2015 meetings were approved as presented.

**Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day**

A. **Roll Call**
Senators absent were: Professors Zoller and Tierno (Art and Design), Del Vecchio (Business), Cotterill (Dental Medicine), Sigounas and Levine (Medicine), Hagwood (Nursing) Francia (Political Science), Dotson-Blake (Education/Vice Chair of the Faculty) and Gilliland (Medicine/Parliamentarian).

Alternates present were: Professors Ferguson for Broome (Dental Medicine), Loy for Cooper and Cortright for Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) and Kim for Gustafson (Music).

B. **Announcements**
The Committee on Committees is seeking faculty volunteers to serve on the various 2016-17 academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. Faculty are encouraged to go online to: [https://ecu.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1XMDzk16mKkm0Fn](https://ecu.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1XMDzk16mKkm0Fn) and volunteer to serve. Deadline for volunteer submission is February 29, 2016.

Due to the parking situation near Mendenhall, please note changes in meeting locations for the remaining Spring Faculty Senate meetings:
- February 23, 2016 Willis Building on 1st Street
- March 15, 2016 Harvey Hall, Murphy Center
- April 19, 2016 Harvey Hall, Murphy Center
- April 26, 2016 Willis Building on 1st Street

Are your students struggling with their verbal presentations in your classes? Are your group projects less impressive than you would like for them to be? Are you having trouble with a lack of professional communication when your students email you or speak to you in person? If so, we can help! Send your students to the Speech Communication Center! We are located in Joyner East 205, and our services are free. Students can make appointments at [www.ecu.edu/comm/center](http://www.ecu.edu/comm/center) or by calling 328-2790.

Each year Chancellor Ballard hosts a reception for Faculty Senators and Alternates and Academic and Appellate Committee members to thank them for their contributions. This year’s reception is scheduled for Monday, May 2 from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. in the Spilman Building Gallery (lobby). Please place this event on your calendar. Formal invitations will be forthcoming.

Faculty members are reminded that April 1, 2016 Chancellor Ballard will call for candidates for the prestigious Oliver Max Gardner award. University nomination procedures are available online at: [http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxjoyneraward.pdf](http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxjoyneraward.pdf). Please
contact Dorothy Muller, Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence with any questions.

The Chancellor has acted on the following resolutions from the October 2015, November 2015 and December 2015 Faculty Senate meetings:

15-84 Revised Department of Human Development and Family Science Unit Code of Operations (formerly Department of Child Development and Family Relations) which will be used as operational guidelines as part of the Provisional Code of Operations for the Reorganized College of Health & Human Performance.

15-87 Approval of Fall 2015 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

15-88 Formal faculty advice with no changes to curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in October 19, 2015 Graduate Council meeting minutes (GC 15-19) and supporting documents, to include the Dual Degree Program Policy revision, and the revised Master’s Pre-Thesis Research Approval Form; Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from October 7, 2015, September 16, 2015, September 2, 2015, August 26, 2015.

15-89 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee’s meeting minutes of October 19, 2015 including approval of global diversity designation for GEOG 2100 and foundations humanities credit for GRBK 3001.

15-90 Recommendation that a moratorium on consideration of courses for Foundations credit be instituted effective January 1, 2016 and lasting until January 1, 2017. The moratorium does not apply to revisions to courses that already carry foundations credit.

15-91 Recommendation to reduce required semester hours of general education beginning Fall 2016, which includes decreasing Humanities and Fine Arts from 10 SH to 9 SH; decreasing Natural Science from 8 SH to 7 SH (retaining the requirement of one laboratory hour); decreasing Social Science from 12 SH to 9 SH from at least two different areas; and requiring a 3 SH "general education elective" from one of the following categories (humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences or natural science/mathematics). Held for further study by the Chancellor noting: “While the recommendation is good, we cannot publish new requirements beginning in Fall 2016 as requirements in the degree programs will not align with the new gen. ed. requirements by that time. Faculty will need time to consider how the new gen. ed. requirements will impact degree programs and revise the programs accordingly.”

15-92 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of September 24, 2015 including curricular actions within the Department of History and College of Education and University Curriculum Committee’s October 8, 2015 meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Department of Physics.

15-93 Curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s October 9, 2015 meeting minutes including a Request to approve consolidation of the three programs in Physics (BS in Physics, BS in Applied Physics, BA in Physics); the discontinuation of the BS in Applied Physics and the BA in Physics; and the offering of three concentrations under the BS in Physics (Research, Professional, and Practical) all within the Department of Physics and program review revision response for the
PhD in Coastal Resources Management and Institute for Coastal Science and Policy within the Institute for Coastal Science and Policy and program review revision response for the Doctoral Program in Higher Education within the College of Education.

15-94 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee’s meeting minutes of October 20, 2015 including approval of service learning (SL) designation (with an asterisk) for KINE 1010.

15-96 Formal faculty advice with no changes to curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in November 16, 2015 Graduate Council meeting minutes, including the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from October 7, October 21, and November 4, 2015 which included Curriculum actions (GC 15-22) from the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Department of Public Health, College of Nursing, Department of Psychology and the Department of History; Programmatic actions (GC 15-23) forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, included the College of Nursing: discontinuation of the Alternate Entry MSN Option, discontinuation of the RN/MSN Option, discontinuation of Existing Concentrations within the MSN: Family Nurse Practitioner, Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, discontinuation of Existing Certificates: Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, Family Nurse Practitioner; School of Music: consolidation of the MM in Performance and the MM in Theory-Composition into one degree with three concentrations: Performance, Theory-Composition, Music History and literature; discontinuation of the MM in Performance and MM in Theory-Composition; Department of Literacy Studies, English Education, and History Education: consolidation of two MAED programs in ENED and HIED into one degree with two concentrations, discontinue the MAED in ENED and HIED; Department of Psychology, new graduate certificate in Quantitative Methods for the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

15-97 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of October 22, 2015, including curricular actions within the School of Communication, Department of Mathematics and University Studies Program and University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of November 5, 2015, including curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

15-98 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Service Learning Committee’s meeting minutes of November 10, 2015, including approval of service learning (SL) designation for ENGL 2201: Writing About the Discipline.

15-99 Request to Reorganize the Department of Criminal Justice from the College of Human Ecology into the College of Arts and Sciences and approve the Departmental Provisional Code.

15-100 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s meeting minutes of November 13, 2015, including Consolidation of the PhD in Anatomy and Cell Biology, PhD in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, PhD in Microbiology and Immunology, PhD in Pharmacology and Toxicology, and PhD in Physiology into one degree: PhD in Biomedical Sciences within the School of Medicine; Title Revision of Existing Certificate from Registered Health Information Administrator (RHIA) to Health Information Management (HIM) in the Department of Health Services and Information Management within the College of Allied Health Sciences; Addition of Applied Research
Option Within the MA in School Psychology in the Department of Psychology within the College of Arts and Sciences; Request to approve offering the Master of Public Administration via distance education (online) format through the Gateway Center in Rocky Mount in the Department of Political Science within the College of Arts and Sciences; Request to approve the consolidation of the MM in Performance and the MM in Theory-Composition into one degree: MM in Music - with two concentrations Performance and Theory-Composition; discontinuation of the MM in Performance; discontinuation of the MM in Theory-Composition; and the establishment of a new concentration in MM in Music- Music History and Literature in the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request to approve the consolidation of the MAED programs in ENED and HIED into one degree: MAED in Curriculum and Instruction - with two concentrations ENED and HIED; discontinuation of the MAED in ENED; and the discontinuation of the MAED in HIED in the Department of Literacy Studies, English Education and History Education within the College of Education; Request to approve the discontinuation of the BA in Art History and Appreciation in the School of Art and Design within the College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request to approve the discontinuation of the BS in School Health Education in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; and Program Review response for the Department of Political Science within the College of Arts and Sciences.

15-101 Revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, Part VI, Section V.III. Mace Bearer. (A word was added by the Chancellor and is noted below in bold underline)

“III. Mace Bearer

The mace bearer is a faculty member who leads University ceremonial events such as graduation and Founder’s Day processions. The eligibility requirements to be appointed East Carolina University’s mace bearer include:

- Senior faculty member in terms of years of service,
- Holds a full-time faculty position with East Carolina University, and
- Is not a unit administrator or an individual with one half or more of his/her load assigned to administrative duties.

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources prepares a list of the most senior faculty members in terms of years of service to the University and notifies the Chancellor and Chair of the Faculty. The Chancellor makes the appointment. The Chancellor makes this appointment taking diversity of the University community into consideration. If there is more than one qualified individual, the responsibility of the position should rotate annually among them.”

15-102 Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee’s meeting minutes of November 16, 2015, including approval of global diversity credit for GEOG 2110 World Geography – Less Developed regions, ECON 4740 – Urban and Regional Economics, IDIS 4600 – Strategic Global Sourcing, POLS 1050 – Politics and Global Understanding, POLS 2010 – Introduction to Comparative Politics, POLS 4382 – Politics of Terrorism and domestic diversity credit for POLS 3039 – Black Politics and POLS 3040 – Women in Politics.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that questions have come up regarding the Boston consulting group engaged by President-Elect Spellings to do a comprehensive survey of the organizational structure
and responsiveness of the UNC General Administration (GA). The consultants have been on most campuses and were at ECU the previous week, at which time they interviewed four people including the Chancellor. The Chancellor indicated that he could not predict what the consultants may or may not say or what the results of the review would be. The Chancellor expressed to the consultants that the GA should be in the business of serving the campuses, following Tom Ross’s model. He further suggested that the campuses know what goes on there; the role of the GA is to protect the campuses, to help coordinate our efforts, and to solve external issues such as funding. The Chancellor also made a point about the categorization system that treats ECU unfairly and puts limits on ECU in terms of hiring and other activities that are inappropriate and anachronistic. President Spellings has asked for a retreat with chancellors in April, at which time they may receive a report about the consultant’s findings.

The Chancellor has received many questions about the budget. The university administration doesn’t get a good sense of the budget until after the third quarter data is in, which is in mid-April when we find out whether tax revenues for three-quarters of the fiscal year have exceeded the projections. Some members of the House are quite optimistic that there will be a revenue surplus this year and that there would be salary increases to state employees. There are no certainties. The two worrisome things in the budget are a cap of $1 million on advancement, which is that no university can spend more than $1 million of state appropriated funds per year on any advancement personnel or projects. ECU spent $4 million and has had a great return on investment of about seven or eight to one. We have a better advancement team than we have ever had so a mandated cut is a blow to our ability to provide scholarship funds and other private monies that help us all. Last year giving was higher than it has ever been in our history, and we can expect steady growth in giving if we can fund the effort in some reasonable manner. A flex cut of 1% is already planned and ECU is ready to deal with it. A third concern is the NC Gap proposal—a mandatory elimination of a certain percentage of the first class that would go to community colleges. If students’ grade point averages are adequate, they would be automatically admitted after two years of community college. One representative wants that number to be 25% of beginning students, which would be devastating to our financial picture. The proposal doesn’t make a lot of sense, but it was shrewdly crafted. This proposal will get a lot of attention during the short session. A consulting group is looking at the implications and impacts on students.

The Chancellor stated that questions have come up about Elizabeth City State University. ECU is providing technical assistance. Their budget cuts—50%—mean that their back-office operations, IT, admissions, financial aide, enrollment planning, etc. are all below what they need. Other universities have also been asked to help. Vice Chancellors Niswander and Hardy have met with the newly-elected Chancellor and are working on a scope of work by which some of our people would train some of their people so that they are not breaking any laws and are addressing weaknesses. We have been providing 2 years of auditing, and we have helped other campuses in the past. Dr. Niswander can answer further questions.

The Chancellor presented the annual report on faculty employment (links provided below), which included a longitudinal profile of faculty tenure status and a report on full-time and part-time faculty by unit and tenure status. (Please refer to the footnote for different selection criteria for each table and note that temporary faculty are included in these reports as required by IPEDS reporting criteria.)

The Chancellor also stated that Provost Mitchelson was prepared to address any questions on the distributed report on faculty employment, which included a longitudinal profile of faculty tenure status and a report on full-time and part-time faculty by unit and tenure status.
There were no questions posed to Chancellor Ballard.

D. Mike Van Scott, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development and Engagement stated that the Graduate School moved out and is reporting to Academic Council, and the name change to Division of Research, Economic Development and Engagement was approved last summer. In November the restructuring was completed with Sharon Paynter moving over from the Chancellor’s Division to the Greenville Center and has already resulted in the development of a $100,000 grant proposal going out to NSF in support of the Community Fellow Program.

Kathy Hall, Director of Grants and Contracts, is retiring. She has been instrumental in keeping ECU compliant with federal regulations.

Addressing the status of centers and institutes, Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott stated that the Board of Governors completed their review and made specific recommendations to look at four centers and institutes. Three centers were moved out of the UNC system and into departments: the North Carolina Center for Biodiversity, Center for Health Systems Research and Development, and the Center for Diversity and Equality Research. This is mutually beneficial as the centers that moved get out from under new reporting requirements required by the Board for Governors, reducing the Centers’ workloads. The Center for Natural Hazards Research is critical to the proposal for a school of the coast, and ECU recommended to the Board of Trustees that they allow it to remain as a system center for now. That request was approved. GA revised their policy after the Board of Governors review, and the new revised policy has a very stringent reporting requirements, including annual reports and a formalized 5-year comprehensive review with expectations that centers and institutes will be bring in funding to offset the state funds that go into them. We need to develop realistic expectations for the level of extramural funding that comes into these units. The Centers and Institutes Committee is working on that now.

Mid-year funding is tracing almost where we were last year. That rate is good and indicates that faculty are continuing to submit successful proposals. The downside is that we are not meeting the aspirational goal of increasing research funding by 5% every year to get to $60 million in awards over a five-year period. The Division is looking at their operations and grant administration to figure out where efficiencies can be found while still providing excellent service to faculty soliciting extramural support. Another working group is looking at temporary variable supplements for faculty who can offset our salaries. The goal is to put state salary into grants if possible.

Another working group is looking at F&A. We generate about $5 million per year in indirect cost recovery from grants. About 40% goes to units, colleges, and departments. The rest stays centrally to support start up packages, scholarships, and research infrastructure. The Division has been spending down that central pot of money to the point that they will end this year with less than $3 million, which is less than the total budget that the Division needs to run next year. There is no additional money to invest right now. About $2 million per year is distributed to units and colleges, and they spend a portion of that. But a portion is accruing out in the units. Over the last five years, that pool represents
about $5 million that just sits there, not what units are spending. The division is looking to explore the idea to treat the unused funds like a savings account. Instead of sitting on the funds, put it in an account and make “loans” to departments that would be paid back. A board would approve requests and re-payment plans. The concern that most faculty will have is that they might need their money. But we haven’t used $5 million per year for five years. The College of Business suggested the proposal and the idea is being vetted across campus. The Division is considering starting small with 10% of the aggregated funds. The board would consist of people who have created the funds.

There were no questions posed to Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott.

E. Ying Zhou, Associate Provost of Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research

Associate Provost Ying Zhou presented the report on the Faculty Salary Equity Study and stated that the purpose of the salary survey was to determine whether there were any disparities in pay based on gender. The study was conducted by a consultant, and a task force was appointed to review the process, the analysis, and other factors including how the information is reported. The taskforce validated the data and methodology and investigated specific issues such as productivity. The consultant was receptive to the input and requests from the taskforce. The data set included 1033 full-time instructional faculty members from 43 departments in Academic Affairs. The data used were from fall 2014 as submitted to GA. Deans confirmed the data. Multiple regression analysis was used to consider how a dependent variable (9-month equivalent salary) is related to a series of independent variables (including rank, tenure, discipline, experience, and other pay factors as well as gender, race, and ethnicity). A variety of models used were able to explain 80 to 83% of variances in Academic Affairs salaries. The taskforce further recommended separate analysis of tenure/tenure-track faculty and fixed-term faculty. All of this information is included in the study report.

Three major findings resulted: (1) Once differences in other pay factors were taken into account, there was no systematic difference in pay based on gender or between minority and non-minority. (2) Regression models developed for Asian, African American, and Hispanic faculty did not raise pay equity concerns. The pay levels of African American faculty were found to be higher than those of other Academic Affairs faculty. (3) Results from productivity analysis revealed that average total faculty productivity doesn’t vary much by race or gender. Limitations include that the analyses do not reflect all factors in individual salary decisions. Overall patterns don’t apply to all individual cases. After the regression analysis, an outlier analysis was conducted to look more specifically at individual cases. Ninety-seven (97) faculty were identified based on residual analysis, but that doesn’t mean that all those people were underpaid. Individual factors were taken into consideration. Each dean was given two reports—an outlier report that included the identified individuals and a full residual report. The consultant came to campus Nov. 5, 2015, to meet with the taskforce, senior administrators, and all Academic Affairs deans to review the results. Reports were published and posted Dec. 2. On Dec. 8, the Provost conducted two open faculty forums following which staff from IPAR met with Deans individually to assist with interpretation of report results. Academic Affairs deans have reviewed and analyzed all outlier cases and reported to the Provost. All that information is now with the Provost. The Provost has emphasized that the need for salary adjustments will be based on non-discriminatory factors regardless of the gender, race, or ethnicity of the individual. Approved adjustments will be made over one to three years. Each Academic Affairs faculty member included in the study will receive a letter based on the study results.

A sub-group of the task force has been working with consultant on the Health Sciences Division faculty salary analysis. The taskforce has responded to questions and provided additional data
requested by the consultant. On Feb. 4, 2016, the consultant will come to campus to present the preliminary results to the task force. The analysis is expected to be complete by the end of March. Faculty salaries are considered public information and ECU faculty salary information is available through Pirate Port. IPAR does a faculty salary benchmark report by discipline each year. These are available from IPAR.

Professor Montgomery (English) asked about using disciplines as a variable given that some disciplines have been historically been populated by women and lower paying. Could discipline be masking gender inequities. Associate Provost Zhou replied that it is assumed that some factors are gender neutral when they may in fact not be.

Professor Aysel Morin (Communication) expressed appreciation for the work on the report. She concluded from the remarks that faculty are equally underpaid regardless of gender, race, etc. and asked whether the task force considered making some market comparisons with peer institutions? In reference to the 80 or 90 faculty members found as outliers, would that information be made public and would the faculty members included in the report have an opportunity to make a case for the salary inequity? How would the benchmarks and its effect on salary be publicized to the University community? Associate Provost Zhou replied that only those individuals within the report as outliers would know about their own situation and that the list of outliers would not be made public. She indicated that every year IPAR analyses faculty salary against benchmark reports because they are mandated by a Faculty Senate resolution from 2010 or 2011. We cannot assess how useful the old reports on salary analysis are. Associate Provost Zhou suggested that the Faculty Senate consider revising the data request for all of the reports currently being compiled and decide which are useful and which IPAR could stop doing.

F. John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Stiller provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

As you just heard from Vice-Chancellor Zhou, and in greater detail if you attended Provost Mitchelson’s presentations at Public Forums last month, the results of the consultant’s salary study did not find evidence of systematic gender-based salary bias at ECU.

Since the results of the study were posted, however, I’ve received a lot of questions and feedback from faculty, basically along the lines, “the report does not seem to jibe with my own experiences or what I’ve seen in my home department.” Therefore, I would like to focus my remarks today on some of the key limitations of the Salary Equity Study, and what they mean for us moving forward.

Let me point out, up front, that the report itself highlights these limitations, but indicates that addressing them was beyond the scope of the study. Therefore, it is essential that we, as an institution, give them due consideration as we consider our next steps.

First, and I quote the report here, “a statistical conclusion for a group as a whole, either positive or negative, does not necessarily apply to every individual within the group or even to every subset of the larger group.” In other words, individual cases of bias, or even systematic biases within individual units, may not be evident when included in a broad analysis across all ECU faculty. Let us say, for example, this analysis was performed at a University where each department chair, and chairs have primary responsibility for determining merit increases in salary, that each chair is biased toward his or her own gender. Male chairs favor male faculty, female chairs favor female faculty. If there are relatively similar numbers of chairs of each sex, an institution-wide study of this kind would not find
any gender-based discrimination, even though it could be occurring in every single unit in the University. Now this hypothetical example may not be realistic, but it is meant to highlight the potential for specific cases of bias to be masked within global analyses of salary variation. For individuals in those situations, the institution-wide conclusion is of no comfort. Only additional, careful and more granular analyses can determine whether and where such localized problems need to be addressed at ECU.

With respect to a second key limitation, the report notes that, "...questions might legitimately be raised as to whether rank, tenure, or other classification decisions that impact compensation comparisons could themselves be tainted by race or gender bias." This analysis assumed no gender biases in any of these variables, but I believe the results do not simply raise a legitimate question, they provide a statistically robust answer. That is, these variables, which account for most variation in ECU faculty salaries, clearly indicate gender-based disparities.

Under the simplest model analyzed, with gender as the only variable considered, female faculty are paid, on average, $8626 a year less than male faculty. That is a substantial difference and it is highly significant. So what accounts for this difference? Most of it reflects gender disparities in two major areas: academic rank and discipline. When academic rank and tenure eligibility are included in the model, the difference between female and male average salary remains significant, but shrinks substantially down to $2339 a year. In other words, the salary equity study clearly shows that we have significant gender differences in academic rank, and that this accounts for much of our overall gender-based salary disparity. It is imperative that we follow up on this finding to determine whether these biases reflect only historical practices in hiring, or whether they indicate ongoing practices in hiring, and/or tenure and promotion. If the latter, it is essential that we address these practices aggressively as an institution. Given that faculty play a large role in determining the colleagues we hire, retain and promote, we must take the lead this endeavor.

The other major source of gender-based salary disparity is academic discipline. When discipline is included in the model along with rank, the two effectively erase any difference in average salaries between males and females. So what does this mean in plain English? It means that our female faculty tend to be more concentrated in units where salaries are lower, and males in units where salaries are higher. We need to take a long and serious look at this issue. Obviously if this reflects biased hiring and retention in certain disciplines, it needs to be addressed quickly. But even if we chalk up salary and gender differences across academic disciplines to "market forces that are beyond our control", I don't believe we're off the hook. As I’ve noted in previous remarks about salary issues, “market rates” for university salaries do not come down from on high…they result from conscious decisions by individuals and groups of individuals that define how much we value a given area of study. Why female faculty are more concentrated in lower paying fields may be a broad social question that is difficult to address, but that doesn’t mean we should shrug our shoulders and move on. As an intellectual driver, it is the University’s responsibility to tackle the most difficult problems and find solutions. And, if we truly are the “Leadership University”, then we should not simply follow and reinforce existing disparities, in salary or otherwise, but take the lead in overcoming them wherever they exist.

If tomorrow starts here, then we should make it our mission to have less disparity here tomorrow than we have today. This, I believe, is the most fundamental take-home message from the Faculty Salary Equity Study.

Thank you, and I'll be happy to take any questions.
Professor Stillers remarks were met with considerable applause, and no questions were posed.

G. James Holloway, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate
Professor Holloway provided highlights on both the December 4, 2015 and January 15, 2016 UNC Faculty Assembly meetings. The following links provide additional information shared with delegates during the December 4, 2015 and January 15, 2016 meetings. Professor Holloway stated that the purpose of the faculty assembly meeting on December 4th was to inform faculty about mental health issues facing our students and the challenges of students’ success. It was a great discussion that the assembly appreciated. They heard a quick presentation on community and economic engagement and experimental education. The most informative presentation was the Academic Affairs update including that the Board of Governors has an interest in our salaries, degree program productivity, and student advising. The Government Relations update covered the successes and failures of the UNC system and influencing legislative policy. Less favorable budget matters discussed included new investment for strategic planning, management flexibility cuts, cuts to advancement funds, NC GAP, and Board of Governor term limits. The Assembly is considering topics that they may need to advise the president on. The meeting on January 15 consisted mainly of panel discussions including two panels about the state of the future of the UNC system including issues and challenges.

There were no questions posed to Professor Holloway.

H. Question Period
Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked Associate Provost Zhou about assessment. He noted that he received email from IPAR stating that assessment procedures were changing again; we have to do 5-year plans, workbooks, and curriculum mapping. He stated that this work will take a lot of effort and is time consuming for faculty. Although noting the importance of the work IPAR does on assessment, and recognizing the importance of assessment and that the faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum and student learning, Professor Popke is concerned that the seemingly yearly mandates about assessment don’t have enough context or rationale, but just requirements and deadlines. He asked how the University ended up with a number of new procedures this year, why they are important, who was involved creating the new procedures, and whether faculty was involved.

Associate Provost Zhou stated that the changes are meant to address problems in the assessment process. Academic programs have been required to assess the same five learning outcomes, including two mandated institutional outcomes, every year, all the time, and programs were having trouble collecting data and making improvements to student learning on five learning outcomes every year. The process we developed two or three years ago did not work very well for most programs, and it was too many learning outcomes for certificate programs and too few courses to assess. The changes are designed for flexibility to identify critical learning outcomes and having their own way and timeline to track when to assess students learning to have multiple year improvement plans. The workbook and other changes are meant to help faculty work together to identify the critical outcomes based on curriculum, not because of institutional mandate or from IPAR. Programs need to decide what is most important to do and what the time line should be to assess it. How many years does a unit want to follow one particular learning outcome and how many years and how long will it take to improve student learning in a particular area. We do not want to be scrambling at the last minute to report to SACS. When we go back to SACS in five years, we will have evidence of the learning outcomes.
Professor Montgomery (English) expressed her appreciation that Associate Provost Zhou was addressing some of these assessment concerns. Professor Montgomery asked about timeframes, recursiveness, and reporting requirements—whether we will have longer to compete assessment, or whether we will continue to have to report improvements yearly. Associate Provost Zhou noted that some of the mandates about the details of doing assessment were somewhat arbitrary and stated that a unit does not need to show improvement on every outcome every year, but rather that the faculty is in the process of implementing improvement plans. The goal is to make assessment meaningful, to improve outcomes so that the program is working well for student learning at which point different outcomes would be assessed. Faculty will still need to report on assessment results every year, but won’t need to show improvement every year as long as faculty make clear that they are in the process of implementing the improvement plan. Then, a few years down the road, faculty can close that outcome indicating that the improvement plan has been followed up and we have a result of improved student learning with which the faculty is comfortable. The faculty can then move on to another outcome.

Professor Kulesher (Allied Health Sciences) asked if the faculty equity study compared faculty salaries by disciplines against state, regional, or national norms or data. Associate Provost Zhou replied that for Academic Affairs, the regression analysis did not include any benchmark data. In the annual IPAR salary study, they do include those data. IPAR compares the average salary of ECU faculty to the average of AAUP and to cohorts by CIP code. For the Health Sciences, the consultant is still working on the methodology, and it is premature to discuss that report, which is different from Academic Affairs.

Professor Jason Lao (Engineering and Technology) asked about the dissemination of the report. Associate Provost Zhou noted that the report is available on the Salary Equity Study Website. Chair Stiller confirmed that e-mails have been sent to the faculty with the URL.

Professor Grodner (Economics) asked whether the salary report was reviewed by anyone else, and questioned the methodology related to variables used in regression analysis. One issue is a regression that has all the variables in one model (race, gender, and ethnicity) because variable have to be controlled for. The result could just indicate some interaction with the variable. In publication, peer review is used to avoid such issues. Did an independent body look at the data and methods? Associate Provost Zhou noted that these issues about methodology were raised several times with the taskforce and the consultant. Associate Provost Zhou indicated that the consultant is a J.D. as well as a statistician and has legal knowledge about what kind of evidence has been supported and what kind rejected in court rulings. For example, according to his legal knowledge, the correct analysis is to compare Asian to non-Asian, African American to Non-African American, etc. Consequently, the analysis done for the report is different from other types of empirical studies.

Professor Kain (English/Secretary of the Faculty) asked about what faculty involvement there will be in decisions about assessment, and how we determine improvement in what faculty do since students change every year. Associate Provost Zhou replied faculty are involved through the Institutional Assessment Committee, which meets every month to discuss learning outcomes, number and quality of reports submitted, best practices, changes, and procedures. Decisions are not made by IPAR alone. They also collect information from peer institutions, and from SACS staff about assessment requirements. We are trying to address mandates in ways that work the best for ECU.
Professor Fletcher (Medicine) asked Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott about research information and a recent incident in which a co–investigator withheld shared data. Is there a way to put in safeguards in place to protect faculty? Professor Fletcher noted that the research was grant funded and the assumption was that the data would be shared. Vice Chancellor Van Scott reiterated that the situation included two researchers at two institutions and that the collaborator did not share data. He’s not sure how to regulate that except to lodge a complaint after the fact, and ECU followed up on the situation. One result was that when the other institution approached ECU about subsequent collaborations, ECU indicated that the situation needed to be resolved before we moved forward with additional collaborations. We can’t put regulations in place here that are going to impact what our colleagues at other institutions do.

Professor Kain (English) asked whether boilerplate wording could be put in agreements about how data would be used or shared. Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott replied that yes, and most people with contracts of subcontracts will include that if data sharing is expected. Professor Fletcher pointed out that the research was funded by NIH and data sharing was certainly expected.

Professor Lao (Engineering and Technology) asked about the decision to move the Graduate School of Research and Graduate Studies. Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott replied that the move was made to protect graduate assistantships when there are budget cuts because in the past we saved assistantships to the detriment of other areas within the division. As for engagement, moving Professor Sharon Paynter’s area, Public Service and Community Relations, into the same division that has economic development and outreach associated with it made sense. Research, engagement, and public service as a group serves as an interface with the public.

**Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**
There was no unfinished business to come before the body.

**Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council**
Professor Denise Donica, Chair of the Graduate Council presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the December 7, 2015 Graduate Council meeting minutes, including the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 18, 2015 which included Programmatic, Policy and Curriculum actions (GC 15-24) Request for Authorization to plan a New Program - MA in Hispanic Studies, request for Authorization to plan a New Program - Joint Ph.D. in Integrative Coastal and Marine Science (ICMS) with the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) and East Carolina University (ECU); changes to the grading scale for graduate students, including elimination of “R/Q” grades and replacement with “S/U” grades; and the College of Nursing: Proposal of New Courses: NURS 8205, NURS 8206, NURS 8236, NURS 8242, NURS 8250, NURS 8262; Revision of Existing Courses: NURS 8200, NURS 8220, NURS 8225, NURS 8226, NURS 8227, NURS 8235, NURS 8240, NURS 8241, NURS 8260.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council’s meeting minutes of December 7, 2015 were reviewed and approved with no changes as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #16-01**

**Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**
A. Research/Creative Activities Committee
Professor Richard McCabe (Dental Medicine), Chair of the Committee presented formal faculty advice on the proposed Regulation on the Use of Humans in Research, noting that there were no
changes from the committee being recommended. He stated that the committee was meeting in the first week of February to finalize the sub-committee recommendations. The Committee is reporting on a policy review on the use of humans in research. The committee met on this in October and conferred with Dr. Sanders of the Office of Integrity. There were no issues with current policy, which is consistent with international professional standards.

There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice on the proposed Regulation on the Use of Humans in Research was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #16-02**

B. Committee on Committees
Professor Crystal Chambers (Education), Chair of the Committee presented first nominees for the election of one delegate and two alternates to the UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation representing ECU. There were no nominations from the floor.

Following elections, Professor Anne Ticknor (Education) was elected as the 2019 Faculty Assembly Delegate and Professors Chris Duffrin (Medicine) and Ralph Scott (Academic Library Services) were elected as 2019 Faculty Assembly Alternates. The full roster is available [here](#).

Professor Chambers then presented Professor Tony Polito (Business) as the nominee to fill the open 2017 alternate term on the Appellate Faculty Grievance Committee. There were no other nominees from the floor and Professor Tony Polito was elected by acclamation. The full roster is available [here](#).

Professor Chambers then presented Professor Kim Larson (Nursing) as the nominee to fill the open 2017 alternate term on the Appellate Grievance Board. There were no other nominees from the floor and Professor Kim Larson was elected by acclamation. The full roster is available [here](#).

Professor Chambers then presented the first reading of proposed revision to University Curriculum Committee charge, which is to change the name of the committee from University Curriculum Committee to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. There was no discussion. Final action on the proposed revision will take place during the February 23, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.

C. University Curriculum Committee
Professor Jean-Luc Scemama (Biology), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the **November 12, 2015** meeting minutes including curricular actions within the Department of Geological Sciences, School of Art and Design, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Department of Health Education and Promotion and Department of Criminal Justice. Professor Scemama noted that the agendas for the remaining meetings this year are full, and that with meetings that have been added to the schedule, the committee has met fifteen times in seven months.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) noted, in reference to the committee’s report on two program discontinuations, that he was present earlier in the day when the UNC Board of Governors discontinued the BA in Art History and Appreciation in the School of Art and Design within the College of Fine Arts and Communication and discontinuation of the BS in School Health Education in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance. He wanted to know how the BoG could have been addressing these issues when the Faculty Senate had not voted on the requests to discontinue. He thought the order of the actions was not consistent with procedure and asked how that happened. Professor Scemama said he would
check on the actions. Professor Robinson commented that students at the BoG meeting didn’t have any knowledge of why the programs were discontinued. He noted that it is disturbing in the age of cuts to see programs like these discontinued without clarity about why. Are there programs replacing those? Professor Scemama replied that he did not believe that these programs were being replaced, but he noted that these programs did not have any students reported in the teach-out plans and they were being discontinued for low enrollment. No students had been enrolled for several years.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) expressed his concerns about the discontinuation of the BA in Art History and asked if there had been any comparisons with other institutions and whether they have similar programs. Professor Scemama said that comparisons were not done, but that when a request for discontinuation comes to the UCC, the departments have already made the decision and sometimes they are being required to discontinue. However, this arrangement was different than having an actual BA in Art History and Appreciation.

Professor Derek Maher (Religious Studies/Multidisciplinary Studies Programs) stated that the Multidisciplinary Program Committee approved a concentration in art history, and through an agreement between the two colleges, there will be curriculum approved and students interested will migrate to the new program.

Chair Stiller clarified that both discontinuation actions were presented to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee during their November 2015 meeting and that they had reported these items to the Faculty Senate and action had taken place during their December 2015 meeting. So, the timing was appropriate for the Board of Governors action.

Professor Marianne Montgomery (English) noted that the original material provided to the Faculty Senate included that “Deletion of the BA in Art History and Appreciation does not eliminate any courses in Art History.”

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) raised concerns about the differences between a BA in Art History and a concentration. Professors Scemama and Maher reiterated that the reason the Art History program was discontinued was low enrollment. Professor Maher stressed that the move to the concentration was to retain and strengthen a program in art history.

Following discussion, the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of November 12, 2015 were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-03

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Professor Don Chaney (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, confirmed that the discontinuations of the BA in Art History and Appreciation in the School of Art and Design within the College of Fine Arts and Communication and discontinuation of the BS in School Health Education in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance were approved by EPPC and the Faculty Senate in November, 2015. He then presented first curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the December 11, 2015 meeting minutes including request to approve the establishment of the Miller School of Entrepreneurship within the College of Business; request to approve the movement of MS in Sustainable Tourism from the Graduate School to the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Business; request to approve the authorization to plan a new Joint (ECU/UNCW) Ph.D.
program in Integrative Coastal Marine Science (ICMS); request to approve the revision of Existing Degree: Industrial and Organizational Concentration of the MA in General-Theoretic Psychology (change requirement) and new graduate certificate in Quantitative Methods for the Social and Behavioral Sciences within the Department of Psychology; request to approve the revision of the PhD in Bioenergetics and Proposal of four New Concentrations: Biomechanics and Motor Control, Cellular and Molecular Bioenergetics, Nutritional Exercise Physiology, Exercise Physiology and Behavioral Science in the Department of Kinesiology within the College of Health and Human Performance; request to approve a New Concentration within the BA in Foreign Languages and Literatures: Global Studies within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; Request to approve the discontinuation of existing certification: Driver and Safety Education Add On Certification in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; and the Program Review response for the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational and Policies Committee’s meeting minutes of December 11, 2015 were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-04

Professor Chaney then presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the January 15, 2016 meeting minutes including a request to discontinue the Alternate Entry (AE) MSN Option, RN/MSN Option, Existing concentrations within the MSN: Family Nurse Practitioner, Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, and Existing certificates: Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, Family Nurse Practitioner within the College of Nursing and a request to approve the authorization to plan a new degree program: MA in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; and receipt of the Annual Audit of the University Studies Program.

There was no discussion and curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s meeting minutes of January 15, 2016 were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-05

E. Admission and Retention Policies Committee
Professor Katie Flanagan (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, After Schedule Change Period, and that the changes are meant to align ECU policies with UNCGA guidelines. During the course adjustment period, students are allowed to make changes (add/drop) to any number of their courses within the first five days. After that, students have a course withdrawal allotment and that period of up to sixteen credits. In the past, students were allotted four courses—a one-credit lab would count the same as a three credit course. The requested change is to replace four courses with sixteen credits. After the allotment period ends, the policy has a mechanism for term withdrawal.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, After Schedule Change Period were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #16-06

Agenda Item VII. New Business
There was no new business to come before the Senate at this time.
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Kain
Secretary of the Faculty

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

Department of English

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 26, 2016, MEETING

Resolution #16-01
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Accepted by the Chancellor: pending

Formal faculty advice with no changes to the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council’s meeting minutes of December 7, 2015, including the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 18, 2015 which included Programmatic, Policy and Curriculum actions (GC 15-24) Request for Authorization to plan a New Program - MA in Hispanic Studies, request for Authorization to plan a New Program - Joint Ph.D. in Integrative Coastal and Marine Science (ICMS) with the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) and East Carolina University (ECU); changes to the grading scale for graduate students, including elimination of “R/Q” grades and replacement with “S/U” grades; and the College of Nursing: Proposal of New Courses: NURS 8205, NURS 8206, NURS 8236, NURS 8242, NURS 8250, NURS 8262; Revision of Existing Courses: NURS 8200, NURS 8220, NURS 8225, NURS 8226, NURS 8227, NURS 8235, NURS 8240, NURS 8241, NURS 8260.

Resolution #16-02
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Accepted by the Chancellor: pending

Formal faculty advice on proposed Regulation on the Use of Humans in Research, with no additional changes being recommended.

1.0 DEFINITIONS:
1.1 Human: a living individual about whom an investigator conducting research obtains data as part of a research project
1.1.1 Through intervention or interaction with the individual;
1.1.1.1 Intervention: includes both physical procedures by which data are gathered and manipulations of the participant or the participant’s environment that are performed for research purposes
1.1.1.2 Interaction: includes communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and participant
1.1.2 That is identifiable, private information about a human. {Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §45, Part 46.102(f)(1)(2)}
1.2 Investigator: either a professional or student, responsible for the conduct of research investigation
1.3 Research: Systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. {§45 CFR Part 46.102(e)}
1.4 Federal wide Assurance: Written assurance provided by the Institution to the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Health and Human Services (HHS) that the Institution will comply with the requirements set forth in the federal regulations for the protection of humans in research. This assurance must be approved by the OHRP, HHS for federal wide use by that office. {§45 CFR Part 46.103(a)}
1.5 Human Research Protection Program (HRPP): a comprehensive program at ECU that involves all units, departments, and individuals who are dedicated to the protection of human research and contribute to areas of compliance that impact those protections. (Ex. Sponsored Programs, Clinical Trials, Radiation Safety, Biosafety, etc.)

2.0 SCOPE: This regulation establishes the principles and organizational structure governing the use of humans in research activities and reflects the University’s commitment to the protection of those humans who volunteer;

2.1 The HRPP includes the ECU University & Medical Center Institutional Review Boards (UMCIRB) as set forth in the ECU Federal wide Assurance, which is required in order for ECU to receive federal funds;

2.2 All activities that meet the definition of human research must receive UMCIRB review and approval prior to initiation

2.3 All research that meets the definition of human research activities must be conducted in accordance with the regulations, rules and standard operating practices of ECU, the HHS and the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) Code of Federal Regulations governing the use of humans in research (if the research falls within the purview of the FDA), and the applicable regulations set forth by the International Council on Harmonization (ICH);

3.0 REGULATION: East Carolina University requires all faculty, staff, students, or any agents of the University who conduct research involving humans or private, identifiable information about humans to do so responsibly, abiding by all applicable regulations, rules, and standard operating practices to ensure the ethical conduct of research. The University has a systematic and comprehensive Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) that is designed to protect the rights, dignity, and welfare of humans who participate in the research programs of the University and its affiliated institutions. The program is based on the ethical principles outlined in the Nuremberg Code and the Belmont Report.

4.0 DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY: By applying for and receiving a Federal wide Assurance, HHS delegates authority for ECU to receive federal funds for the conduct of human research.

4.1 The Chancellor has delegated authority and responsibility of the HRPP to the Chief Research Officer (CRO). The CRO serves as the Institutional Official for ECU’s Federal wide Assurance and is responsible for the oversight and compliant operation of the HRPP to include the following as defined in the ECU FWA:

4.1.1 ECU Biomedical University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) (IRB #1); and
4.1.2 ECU Behavioral & Social Sciences University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) (IRB #2).

4.2 The UMCIRBs are granted authority through federal regulations to review human research proposals and take any of the following actions:
4.2.1 Approve;
4.2.2 Require modifications to secure approval;
4.2.3 Disapprove;
4.2.4 Suspend or terminate approval of on-going studies;
4.2.5 Suspend or terminate the ability of research personnel to conduct human research at or on behalf of ECU;
4.2.6 Observe or have a third party observe consent processes or the conduct of research; and
4.2.7 Conduct Quality Improvement and Quality Assessment evaluations; and
4.2.8 Conduct for-cause investigations of alleged or reported noncompliance of on-going and closed research studies.

4.3 No official of ECU or its Affiliates can:
4.3.1 Support the conduct of human research activities that do not have approval from the UMCIRBs; or
4.3.2 Overturn a decision of disapproval issued by the UMCIRBs.

4.4 The HRPP includes:
4.4.2 The ECU Biomedical and Behavioral and Social Sciences UMCIRBs, as defined in the ECU Federal wide Assurance;
4.4.3 Other units, divisions, or administrative bodies that interact or can impact the conduct of human research and can be called upon to enhance the protections for humans participating in research (ex. Institutional Biosafety Committee, Radiation Safety Committee, Risk Management, University Audit, etc.)

4.5 Related rules and standard operating practices are available on the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance (ORIC) website: www.ecu.edu/irb.

5.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 The Chief Research Officer (CRO):
5.1.1 Serves as the Institutional Official and has the authority to speak for the institution in matters regarding human research. The CRO is ultimately responsible for the oversight and compliant operations of the HRPP;
5.1.2 Maintains open and direct channels of communication with UMCIRB members and staff, investigators and research personnel, and administrators to address questions, concerns, or suggestions regarding the HRPP;
5.1.3 Ensures the UMCIRBs have sufficient meeting space, staff, and budgetary resources to support review and record keeping responsibilities;
5.1.4 Reviews an annual report drafted by the Director of the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance (ORIC) to identify and ensure adequate resources are available to support required activities;
5.1.5 Notifies the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) as appropriate and any relevant agencies of incidents of serious or continuing noncompliance with
UMCIRB procedures, federal regulations, or state laws as well as any suspensions of terminations of UMCIRB approval;

5.1.6 Protects UMCIRBs from undue influence or threat of retaliatory actions so that UMCIRBs can function independently, basing decisions on ethical principles, regulations, and institutional policies;

5.1.7 Approve recommendations and appoints IRB members, including alternates, ex-officio’s and continuing consultants; and

5.1.8 Receives annual evaluations and recommendations from the Director, ORIC, of:

5.1.8.1 UMCIRB Members, staff, board composition and number of protocols reviewed; and

5.1.8.2 Adequacy of resources, program continuity, scientific and professional expertise of members as relevant to the business conducted.

5.1.9 Delegates to the UMCIRBs the sole authority to make determinations of exempt status.

5.2 The ECU Director, ORIC:

5.2.1 Serves as the overall administrator for the HRPP;

5.2.2 Is responsible for ensuring that the UMCIRBs function and operate in compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations that govern the protection of humans involved in research activities;

5.2.3 Provides notification to the CRO and, as applicable, other administrative and affiliated officials, of any injury, breach of trust, unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others, serious or continuing noncompliance, and suspension or termination of UMCIRB approval;

5.2.4 Investigates all issues of undue influence or threats of retaliation directed to the UMCIRB members or staff and provides recommendations for resolution to the Vice Chancellor;

5.2.5 Presents an Annual Report to the Vice Chancellor regarding the status of the HRPP program that includes review of resources, continuity of operations, and adequacy of scientific and professional expertise available to carry out requirement of the HRPP; and

5.2.6 Ensures the standard operating practices of ORIC and the HRPP adhere to University Rules and Regulations, state laws, and federally mandated regulations, including Conflict of Interest, Whistleblower, and Export Control rules.

6.0 RELATED POLICIES, REGULATIONS, RULES, and STANDARD OPERATING PRACTICES

6.1 Related rules and standard operating practices are available on the Office for Research Integrity and Compliance (ORIC) website: www.ecu.edu/irb

7.0 HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision #</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reference Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/13/2014</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>New format and language</td>
<td>All Sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution #16-03
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Approved by the Chancellor: pending

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the University Curriculum Committee’s meeting minutes of November 12, 2015, including curricular actions within the Department of Geological Sciences, School of Art and Design, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Department of Health Education and Promotion and Department of Criminal Justice.

Resolution #16-04
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Approved by the Chancellor: pending

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational and Policies Committee’s meeting minutes of December 11, 2015 including a request to approve the establishment of the Miller School of Entrepreneurship within the College of Business; request to approve the movement of MS in Sustainable Tourism from the Graduate School to the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Business; request to approve the authorization to plan a new Joint (ECU/UNCW) Ph.D. program in Integrative Coastal Marine Science (ICMS); request to approve the revision of Existing Degree: Industrial and Organizational Concentration of the MA in General-Theoretic Psychology (change requirement) and new graduate certificate in Quantitative Methods for the Social and Behavioral Sciences within the Department of Psychology; request to approve the revision of the PhD in Bioenergetics and Proposal of four New Concentrations: Biomechanics and Motor Control, Cellular and Molecular Bioenergetics, Nutritional Exercise Physiology, Exercise Physiology and Behavioral Science in the Department of Kinesiology within the College of Health and Human Performance; request to approve a New Concentration within the BA in Foreign Languages and Literatures: Global Studies within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; Request to approve the discontinuation of existing certification: Driver and Safety Education Add On Certification in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; and the Program Review response for the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies.

Resolution #16-05
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Approved by the Chancellor: pending

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee’s meeting minutes of January 15, 2016 including a request to discontinue the Alternate Entry (AE) MSN Option, RN/MSN Option, Existing concentrations within the MSN: Family Nurse Practitioner, Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, and Existing certificates: Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner, Family Nurse Practitioner within the College of Nursing and a request to approve the authorization to plan a new degree program: MA in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures; and receipt of the Annual Audit of the University Studies Program.
Resolution #16-06
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 26, 2016
Approved by the Chancellor: pending

Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, After Schedule Change Period, as follows:

New text in catalog being added
“Course Withdrawal Allotment
Students may withdraw from up to 16 semester hours during their undergraduate career. Students may use these withdrawals between the end of the Course Adjustment Period and the deadline to withdraw from term-length courses without a grade, which is 60% of regularly scheduled class meetings, exclusive of final exams.

During Course Adjustment Period
The Course Adjustment Period is limited to the first five days of classes of the fall and spring semesters. During the summer, the Course Adjustment Period is limited to the first two days of classes each summer term. Students may refer to ECU’s academic calendar for specific dates (http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/senate/fscalend.cfm). During the Course Adjustment Period, a student may drop or add a course(s) to his/her schedule. Course drops during this period do not count against a student’s Course Withdrawal allotment of 16 semester hours.

After Course Adjustment Period
Students are expected to complete all the courses for which they are registered at the close of the Course Adjustment Period. The consequences of withdrawing from a course or term may affect a student’s progress in a major, tuition surcharge, and/or financial aid. The impact of a Course/Term Withdrawal is as follows:

Impact of Course or Term Withdrawals for Non-Extenuating and Extenuating Circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of Withdrawals on:</th>
<th>Non-Extenuating Circumstances</th>
<th>Extenuating Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Surcharge</td>
<td>Course(s) count in surcharge calculation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>Withdrawal (W) noted on Transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average (GPA)</td>
<td>None (for withdrawals within 60% of academic term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Hours</td>
<td>Courses(s) count as attempted hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Course(s) subject to financial aid and Satisfactory Academic Progress rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Withdrawal
During the first 60 percent of the regularly scheduled class meetings (exclusive of final exams), a student may withdraw from the course after consultation with his/her advisor. There are two options for requesting the withdrawal. The preferred option is that the student’s advisor email the Office of the Registrar (copying the student) at regis@ecu.edu. The second option is that the student email the Office of the Registrar at regis@ecu.edu. If the student initiates the request, the Office of the
Registrar will contact the student’s advisor for approval prior to granting the request. For either option, the request to the Office of the Registrar should include the student’s name, Banner ID, and course prefix and number of the withdrawn course(s). Please refer to Course or Term Withdrawal Refund Rule below.

The same 60 percent withdrawal period rule also applies to block courses of other lengths. It is the student’s responsibility to consult the official ECU academic calendar to determine the appropriate withdrawal period for such block courses. ([http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/senate/fscalend.cfm](http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/senate/fscalend.cfm)) Extenuating circumstances, however, can warrant consideration for withdrawal by exception. Students may petition the Dean of Students for Course Withdrawals by exception. ([http://www.ecu.edu/deanofstudents/](http://www.ecu.edu/deanofstudents/)) Petitions for withdrawal after the 60 percent withdrawal period deadline will typically be granted only for unforeseen and uncontrollable medical, psychological, or personal reasons directly affecting the course(s). The following are not considered a sufficient basis for exception: poor performance in course work, missed deadlines, change of major, a course grade’s adverse effect on the student’s grade point average, probationary standing, or other eligibility. The Dean of Students cannot accept requests after the last regularly scheduled class meeting prior to the final examination for the course(s) in question. Students whose request is received after the last class meeting or whose request is denied by the Dean of Students may appeal to the Student Academic Appellate Committee (SAAC). The decision of the Student Academic Appellate Committee is final. ([http://www.ecu.edu/deanofstudents/faqs.cfm](http://www.ecu.edu/deanofstudents/faqs.cfm)).

Term Withdrawal
Students desiring to withdraw from an academic term should meet with an academic advisor to review consequences and policies. The student must then obtain an official withdrawal form located on the website of the Office of the Registrar ([www.ecu.edu/registrar](http://www.ecu.edu/registrar)). After the student has obtained the signatures of the various officials designated on the form, the student must submit the form to the Office of the Registrar for final approval by email: regis@ecu.edu. The Office of the Registrar will accept a completed form that is scanned and sent via the student’s ECU email address.

Withdrawal Requests Made Within 60% of the Academic Term: During the first 60 percent of regularly scheduled class meetings (exclusive of final exams), a student may withdraw from the university without receiving grades for courses in which he/she is enrolled.

Withdrawal Requests Made Beyond 60% of the Academic Term: After 60 percent of regularly scheduled class meetings (exclusive of final exams), a student withdrawing from the university shall receive no credit for the courses in which he/she is passing at the time of withdrawal. A student will receive a grade of F for all courses in which he/she is failing at the time of withdrawal.

Please Note: A term withdrawal is not charged to a student’s Course Withdrawal allotment of 16 semester hours.

Course or Term Withdrawal Refund Rule
It is to the financial advantage of students withdrawing, dropping to part-time status, or dropping to a lower block of credit hours to do so as early as possible in the term. Refunds for tuition and fees (excluding room and board charges that are determined by contractual agreement) will be considered during the twenty (20) class day refund period in fall and spring and the five (5) day refund period during summer. No refunds will be considered after the published "last day for partial refund"."


Current text in catalog being deleted

“After Schedule-Change Period
During the first 60 percent of the regularly scheduled class meetings of a course (including the meeting for the final examination), a student may withdraw the course. After consultation with his or her advisor, the student secures the signature of the advisor on the schedule change form and takes it to the Office of the Registrar for processing or the request to withdraw the course may be emailed to regis@ecu.edu. Students enrolled in a distance education course must email DEDrops@ecu.edu from their ECU email account to request a course withdraw or drop. The same 60 percent withdraw-period rule applies to block courses of other lengths as well. Ordinarily, a student may withdraw up to four courses or a smaller prorated number in pursuit of a university degree. (See Course Withdraw Allocations, below.) It is the student's responsibility to consult official documents and/or the university calendar to determine the appropriate withdraw period for such block courses. Extenuating circumstances, however, can warrant consideration for withdraw by exception, as explained below.

Petitions for withdraws after the deadline for course withdraws will typically be granted only for unforeseen and uncontrollable medical, psychological, or personal problems directly affecting the course(s) to be withdrawn. Students may petition the Student Academic Appellate Committee through the Office of the Registrar for withdraws by exception (withdraws after the 60 percent withdraw period, withdraws beyond student's allotted number, and withdraws not counted against the allotted number). Poor performance in course work; missed deadlines; change of major; or a course grade's adverse effect on the student's grade point average, probationary standing, or other eligibility is not in itself a sufficient basis for exception. The decision of the Student Academic Appellate Committee is final.

Course withdraws for medical problems will be heard by Student Health Services and course withdraw for psychological problems will be heard by the Center for Counseling and Student Development. The written appeal must contain the rationale for the appeal and documentation of personal, family, or medical problems and how these problems affected the course(s) to be withdrawn. Student Health Services and the Center for Counseling and Student Development will not accept requests after the last regularly scheduled class meeting prior to the final examination for the course(s) in question except where earlier requests could not have been foreseen.

Students whose petitions for withdraws are denied by Student Health Services or the Center for Counseling and Student Development may appeal the decision to the Student Academic Appellate Committee. The decision of the Student Academic Appellate Committee is final.”