The seventh regular meeting of the 1996/1997 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, 18 March 1997, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

18 February 1997

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call
B. Announcements
C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
D. Vice Chancellor's Report
E. Approval of Spring Graduation Roster
F. Dawn Clark, Faculty Assembly Delegate
   UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting of
   21 February 1997

IV. Unfinished Business

V. Report of Committees

A. Committee on Committees, Bob Woodside
   Second reading of proposed revisions to the following Committee charges (attachment 1):
   1. Admissions and Recruitment Committee
   2. Calendar Committee
   3. General Education Committee
   4. University Curriculum Committee

B. Calendar Committee, Nancy Moss
   1. Revisions to the following University Calendars:
   2. Proposed New University Calendars:
      Summer 1999, Fall 1999, Spring 2000
      (A copy of each proposed calendar may be obtained from the Faculty Senate office by calling ext. 6537.)

C. Credits Committee, Bob Woodside
   Proposed revision to the University Undergraduate Catalog,
   Section 5. Academic Regulations
   (attachment 4).

D. Educational Policies and Planning, David Lawrence
   1. Request for Authorization to Plan a PhD Program in Technology Studies
   2. Request for Authorization to Establish a BS Degree in Construction Management
      (Copies of both requests are available for review in the Faculty Senate office.)
      (For information only, no action required by the Faculty Senate)

E. Faculty Governance Committee, Jeff Jarvis
   Second reading of proposed revisions to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix A
F. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Janna Brendell
1. Recommendations concerning the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (attachment 6).
2. Proposed revisions to the Alumni Teaching Awards procedures (attachment 7).

G. Unit Code Screening Committee, Bill Grossnickle
Revisions to the following Unit Code of Operations:
1. Department of Sociology
2. Department of Geology
3. Department of Communication
(Copies are available for review in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex.)

H. University Curriculum Committee, Jim Smith
Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the 13 February 1997, and 27 February 1997, Committee Meeting. (Copies of these minutes have been distributed to all units and are available on the Faculty Senate web page.)

VI. New Business

Attachment 1.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

SECOND READING OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE CHARGES:

Admissions and Recruitment Committee
Delete under Section 4.a. Committee Responsibilities:
"Emergency appeals for admission through the University College which cannot be heard at a scheduled meeting of the committee will be settled by the office of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with, and with the approval of, the chair of the committee. The effect from such decisions will be restricted to one semester."

Calendar Committee
Add to 2. Membership:
ex-officio member (without vote but with all other parliamentary privileges) a representative from the Weekend University program

General Education Committee
Add to 2. Membership:
ex-officio member (with vote) the chair, or appointed representative, of the University Curriculum Committee
Add to 2. Membership:

ex-officio member (with vote) the chair, or appointed representative, of the General Education Committee

Attachments 2 and 3 may be obtained from the Faculty Senate office by calling ext. 6537.

Attachment 4.

CREDITS COMMITTEE REPORT

PROPOSED REVISION TO UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG,

Section 5: Academic Regulations, Appeals of Suspension (page 50)

Replace the following text in the second paragraph:

"...no later than four working days prior to registration day for the next term of enrollment and contain the following:..."

with:

"...by 5:00 p.m. according to the following schedule:
Appeals for Fall Semester:
   Examination day of the second summer term

Appeals for Spring Semester:
   Last day for examinations for Fall Semester

The appeal should contain the following:"

Replace the following text in the third paragraph:

"This letter must be received in the Office of the Registrar no later than four working days prior to registration day of the next term of enrollment."

with:

"This letter must be received according to the schedule noted above."

(Upon approval by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor, this deadline will be reflected in all University Calendars.)

Attachment 5.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Second Reading of Proposed Revisions to ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix A
Add to Appendix A, Faculty Constitution of East Carolina University, Section VIII, Duties of the Officers of the Faculty Senate, at the end of the third paragraph, (page A-5) the following:

"For the length of his/her term as Chair, the Chair of the Faculty serves as a Delegate to the Faculty Assembly (but not exceeding six consecutive years), with duties as a delegate described in the Bylaws of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina, Part X of the ECU Faculty Manual, Section II.A., Members of the Assembly."

(Following approval by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor, the General Faculty will be asked to approve this revision at the Fall Faculty Convocation, scheduled 18 August 1997.)

Add to Appendix A, By-Laws of the Faculty Constitution of East Carolina University, Section VI, Faculty Assembly Delegates and Alternates, Number 2, (page A-9) the following sentence as a new third sentence:

"One Faculty Assembly Delegate will be the Chair of the Faculty, holding a term for each year he/she is elected to serve as Chair of the Faculty (but not exceeding six consecutive years)."

(Following approval by the Chancellor, copies of the revised section will be incorporated into the next revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, that will be distributed to all faculty in August 1997.)

Attachment  6.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION SURVEY

In April 1995, the Faculty Senate charged the Teaching Effectiveness Committee with using the revised Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS) for one year (1996-1997) and reporting to the Faculty Senate on the results of the trial basis. During the one-year trial basis, a sample was to be given of both instruments, the comparability examined, and the results included in the report to the Faculty Senate.

Recommendations presented in this report are based on the following:

1. Results of statistical comparison of the two SOIS instruments,
2. Summary of Teaching Effectiveness Committee Survey of Faculty and Chairs survey data, and
3. Comments and feedback generated from campus-wide SOIS training sessions (public meetings).

Process
In Fall semester 1996, East Carolina University classes
were evaluated with both the old and the revised forms of the SOIS instruments to determine the relative utility of the two forms.

Statistical Comparison of SOIS Forms
The information content of the two SOIS instruments was compared by multivariate analyses of the structures of the two response sets to document any important difference/s between instruments in their objective assessment of student opinion of instruction.

Results of Statistical Comparisons
The primary conclusion from the analysis is that the two SOIS instruments are measuring the same thing. In general terms, the two instruments even with the difference in question wording are assessing comparable student perceptions. This point deals only with those questions included in the statistical analysis. It does not include the written comments by the students.

Faculty and Chair Surveys
The office of Planning and Institutional Research (PIR) and the Teaching Effectiveness Committee designed two survey forms to assess the opinions of faculty and chairs regarding the revised SOIS form. (A summary of survey results is available from the Faculty Senate office by calling ext. 6537.)

Faculty and Chair Survey Responses
In general terms, several important conclusions can be derived from these data:

1. Overall, faculty prefer the new SOIS instrument to the old one by a substantial margin.
2. There is some degree of confusion concerning how one should interpret the results of the new instrument by both faculty and chairs.
3. Faculty are evenly divided concerning the utility of a summary question such as #9 on the old instrument.
4. Chairs tend to prefer the old SOIS instrument.
5. Chairs believe a summary question like #9 to be important.

Training Seminars
As per the guidelines listed under Item VI. of Faculty Senate Resolution #95-25, PIR, Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the Center for Faculty Development worked together in planning and presenting training seminars for unit heads and other interested faculty.

Three training sessions were held:
4 February 1997 in Mendenhall attendance - 9
5 February 1997 in Mendenhall attendance - 10
7 February 1997 in Belk attendance - 0

Bob Thompson started each session with a statement of the purpose for holding these sessions. Those attending the session were asked what questions they had regarding either the new or the old version of the survey. A log was kept of these questions as well as of statements supporting
Thompson presented a brief background of the creation of the new survey. In his comments he summarized the results of a statistical analysis, performed for the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, that compared the results of the old and new versions. Next he presented a comparison of the major differences between the old and new versions of the student opinion of instruction surveys. The highlights of the comparison were summarized in a chart. He also presented a summary of the faculty's and chairs' responses to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee's survey evaluating the two SOIS forms and the kinds of generalizations that can be made based on the SOIS information. Thompson distributed a list of guidelines to use when generalizing from SOIS results.

Report on Training Seminars
Attendance at these meetings was very poor; comments listed below should not be viewed as representative. Even with this caveat, several points were raised during these discussions to which particular attention should be called.

1. The inclusion of the question on textbooks in the calculation of summed scores is probably inappropriate as this is not an individual faculty decision for many courses and departments.

2. Individual faculty, personnel committee members, and chairs are likely to use the summed scores on the new SOIS instrument as a surrogate for the old #9 question. Thus, the question becomes one of directness. Under the old form, #9 was a direct assessment by the students of instructor effectiveness. Under the new form, the summed scores are indirect measures which will likely be used as assessments of effectiveness.

3. The comments also indicated that more information will need to be provided faculty and chairs concerning the meaning of the results provided.

Recommendations
Based on findings gleaned from the aforementioned data analyses and discussions the Teaching Effectiveness Committee makes the following recommendations regarding the SOIS instruments:


2. Recommend adoption of the new SOIS form with the following revisions:
   a. Add a summary question in the same wording as #9 (old SOIS form) as question #19 on the new SOIS form with the same scoring scale as items #1 through #13 and calculate unit and university norms for the responses to this question using course level only.
   b. Remove the textbook question from the summed scores.
   c. Calculate summed scores by adopted method #1: delete no response for individual items and method A: delete no response items for summed scores.

The following attachments may be obtained from the Faculty Senate
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR THE ALUMNI DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR FOR TEACHING AWARDS

In item one, replace the following sentence that reads:

"A call for nominees will be sent out to each academic unit from the Teaching Effectiveness Committee by October 1 of each year."

with

"A call for nominees will be sent out to each academic unit from the Teaching Effectiveness Committee by the end of Spring semester each year."

In item two, replace the following sentence that reads:

"The candidate is to turn in all evaluative materials to his or her unit administrator by November 15 each year. The unit administrator is to forward the candidate’s materials to the Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee by December 1."

with

"The unit administrator should send a nomination letter listing the names and departments and/or schools of all nominees to the chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Nominated faculty who wish to pursue the award should submit the portfolio of all evaluative materials to the chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Deadlines for the submission of these materials will be specified in the call letter for nominees each year."

In item three, replace the following sentence that reads:

"The candidate, once nominated by the unit, will prepare a two page cover letter describing his/her assignments, approaches, and efforts for effective teaching and learning, plus the following required materials for the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee:"

with

"The candidate, once nominated by the unit, will prepare a
two page cover letter describing his/her teaching philosophy, including efforts for effective teaching and learning, plus the following required materials for the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee:

In item three, D, delete the words "...to five...", leaving the request at "three letters of support".