COMMITTEE: Academic Standards Committee
MEETING DATE: November 21, 2005
PERSON PRESIDING: George Bailey
REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Bailey, Bauer, Bass, Decker, Richardson
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Brown, Griffin, Weismiller, Robinson,
OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: see below
CALLED TO ORDER: 2:06 PM

__________________________

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Minutes of Sept. 26th and September 12th
Action Taken: Approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: HIST 3460, Presented by Dr. Gross
Discussion: meets requirements
Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: HIST 3461: Presented by Dr. Gross
Discussion: meets requirements
Action Taken: approved
Assigned additional duties to:
Agenda Item: HIST 3461:
Discussion: meets requirements
Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: ANTH 1050: Presented by Dr. Leibowitz and Dr. Wolfe
Discussion: meets requirements
Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: EXXS 1001:
Discussion: meets requirements

Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: PHIL 1690: Presented by Dr. Bailey

Discussion: meets requirements

Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: RELI 3930: Presented by Dr. Garrison

Discussion: meets requirements

Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: HIST 3625: Presented by Dr. Tucker.

Discussion: meets requirements

Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Agenda Item: HIST 3626: Presented by Dr. Tucker.

Discussion: meets requirements

Action Taken: approved

__________________________

Discussion of the Form used to request Foundations Credit

The following will be added to the form:

“The course syllabus and sample texts should address directly the foundation goals for the area. If this is a course already on the books, you will need to do a new sample syllabus that addresses the new foundations goals.”

“D: Bring samples of course materials (textbooks, etc.) that will be used in the course to the AS meeting that hears the request for foundations credit for the course. The materials are expected to explicitly address all of the foundation goals for the course’s area.

E. If the course is an upper-division course (3xx or 4xx), explain why students should get foundations credit for taking the course.”

__________________________

Agenda Item: Dr. Mike Poteat on assessment:
Discussion: Dr. Poteat reviewed the role of institutional Effectiveness under Dr. Snyder until last year. This committee stopped meeting when Dr. Poteat started collecting assessment outcomes reports, which he and members of an administrative committee reviewed. At that time the General education Committee was dealing with assessment of GE following the structure set up after the last SACS visit. GE assessment was on a rotational basis. For 2004-2005 the humanities were assessed, for 2003-2004 the social sciences and for 2002-2003 the sciences. This has stopped. Dr. Poteat said that we need a plan for the future. Looking at one or two GE goals on a rotational basis is not sufficient. We need embedded assessment, which could be on a two-year cycle. After compliance reports, need enhancement plan. Dr. Bailey noted that the committee could develop a structure, schedule and criteria, but receiving, reviewing responding and summarizing for the University and SACS unit assessment reports requires a committee dedicated to doing that only. Whether such a committee should be an administrative or a Faculty Senate committee was discussed.

Moved: Recommend to the Provost and the Faculty Chair that they initiate creating either an administrative or a Faculty Senate outcomes assessment review committee. The committee’s suggested role is to receive, review, respond to, summarize and report on unit/program outcomes assessment and compliance actions. The committee’s reports would form the basis for the SACS next report in this area. (Dr. Brown)

Discussion: None

Action Taken: approved.

Assigned additional duties to: Faculty Chair and Provost J

Agenda Item: Moving the SOIS to the web – Dr. Poteat

Discussion: Moving the SOIS to the web would save a lot of money. The response rate could be lower. Paper SOIS gets a 70% response rate. Web based courses get a 65% response rate. The time period it is up would have to be worked out. It could be done earlier in the term. Blackboard might be used. If this was decided in Spring 2006 it could be implemented in Fall 2006. The committee might want to modify the instrument.

Action Taken: Discuss further at next meeting

Assigned additional duties to: none

Agenda Item: Review of Peer Review Procedure Concerns (Memo from Dr. Rigsby, October 5, 2005)

Discussion: Dr. Bailey will write an time-by-time response to the request for a review of peer review procedures (see below).
ADJOURNED: 3:45 pm

NEXT MEETING: To be determined

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: To be determined

Report on issues Raised in Regard to Peer Review Procedures

Responses to questions on the document entitled “Implementing Features which need to be established for the Faculty Senate Peer Classroom Observations Procedures.”

General observation: The committee does not find inconsistencies in ECU peer review procedures or supporting documents. The committee believes in a need for flexibility at the unit level in the implementation of ECU’s general personnel procedures, including procedures for peer review. Here are the committee’s responses to the questions on the document entitled “Implementing Features which need to be established for the Faculty Senate Peer Classroom Observations Procedures.” These questions address decisions that must be made within units. In most cases, the committee recommends that each unit decide for itself who to make these decisions.

1. (a) Who selects one of the two observers?

   The existing peer review policy and the vice-chancellor’s document allow flexibility so that each unit can address this question as best fits the character and needs of the unit. A unit can adopt a more restrictive formal procedure than found in ECU’s peer review policy and place this procedure in their unit code or a unit can follow an informal procedure agreed upon by a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty in the unit.

1. (b) If the personnel committee chooses, how is this done (by what majority vote)?

   Personnel Committees are governed by Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

1. (c) If a consultative process, how is a difference regarding the choice of observer to be handled?

   See 1.a

1. (d) Who informs the faculty member of his or her choice as an observer, and for whom?

   See 1.a

1. (e) Who informs the faculty member being observed of this choice?

   See 1.a

1. (f) Whom does the faculty member being observed notify regarding his or her choice of observer?

   See 1.a
2. (a) What is the nature of the self-evaluation form?

The existing policy allows flexibility so that each unit can address this question as best fits the character and needs of the unit. Each unit can adopt a form that best fits the unit’s mission. As to who makes up the form and who approves it, it is up to the unit to decide, formally or informally, who creates the form. If the decision is formal, voting members of the unit, as defined by the unit’s code, determine who approves a motion on this issue. Voting members of the unit, as defined by the unit’s code, determine who approves the form.

2. (b) Where does the observer obtain the form?

See 1.a.

2. (c) Does the faculty member being observed turn-in the self-evaluation form and if so, to whom?

See 1.a

3. (a) Does the faculty member being observed see the observer’s completed form prior to the post-conference (if so, does the observer send a copy? Do observers send each other copies of their observations?)?

See 1.a

4. Who is responsible for scheduling the pre- and post-conferences?

See 1.a

5. (a) What is the nature of the Faculty Development Plan?

The existing policy allows flexibility so that each unit can address this question as best fits the character and needs of the unit. Each unit can formally adopt a single format for all development plans or can let this be addressed on a case-by-case basis, as best fits the unit’s mission. As to who makes up a formal format and who approves it, it is up to the unit to decide, formally or informally, who creates the format. If the decision is to have a formal format, voting members of the unit, as defined by the unit’s code, determine who approves a motion on this issue. As to who approves a development plan, it is whomever the unit decides to have do so (see 1.a).

5. (b) Who is responsible for writing the development plan? How is the plan developed?

See 1.a

6. (a) Who is responsible for placing the results of the observation in the PAD?

The unit administrator and the faculty member being observed are jointly responsible. (See Appendix D.)

6. (b) Which items are placed in the PAD?
Anything that is used to evaluate a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure must be placed in the PAD (consistent with the limitations stated in the Faculty Manual).

6. (c) A time limit needs to be set for submitting materials for the PAD.

   It is the unit administrator’s responsibility to see that necessary materials are placed in the PAD prior to the initiation of a personnel action.

6. (d) If the chair and observed faculty member are to discuss and write a development plan, when does that occur.

   See 1.a, though if it turns out the chair is in charge of this in a given unit, then at the chair’s discretion.