The second regular meeting of the 2021-2022 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 2:10 pm via WebEx.

AGENDA

*Revised

WebEx meeting link

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

September 14, 2021

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

B. Announcements

C. Philip Rogers, Chancellor

D. Virginia Hardy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
   LaKesha Alston Forbes, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity and Title IX Coordinator

E. Jon Gilbert, University Athletics Director*
   Fiscal Sustainability Highlights

F. Cal Christian, NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative*
   Report on University Athletic Committee’s Academic Integrity Subcommittee

G. Chandler Ward, Student Government Association President

H. Purificación Martínez, Chair of the Faculty

I. Approval of Fall 2021 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates

J. Question Period

IV. Unfinished Business
V. Report of Graduate Council

The Graduate Council has no actions to report from the September 20, 2021 Graduate Council meeting.

VI. Report of Committees

A. Appellate Committee, Jeni Parker

Overview of 2020-2021 Faculty Grievance Committee Activities (attachment 1)

B. Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee, Melinda Doty

Report on findings from Distance Education and Online Instructional Support Feedback and Needs survey from Spring 2021 (attachment 2)

C. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, George Bailey

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded during the September 20, 2021 meeting including:

- removal of General Education Fine Arts (GE:FA) credit from ARTH 3975 African American Art;
- retention of Domestic Diversity (DD) credit for renumbered course MGMT 3362 Organizational Behavior (formerly MGMT 4242);
- special case course approval of Global Diversity (GD) credit for PSYC 2250 Selected Topics, Global Understanding: Psychological Perspectives taken in Spring 2009;
- retention of credit after removal of prerequisites for ANTH 2015 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3003 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3004 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3005 (DD and GE:SO), ANTH 3016 (DD and GE:SO), ANTH 3017 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3018 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3115 (GE:SO), ANTH 3252 (GD and GE:SO), ANTH 3300 (GD and GE:SO);
- the following transfer credit approvals for Global Diversity (GD) credit:
  - PLS 230 Introduction to Comparative Government and Politics from UNC Wilmington,
  - FINA H100 Art Appreciation from Indiana University South Bend,
  - ANT 160 Cultural Diversity in the Modern World from University of Kentucky,
  - HUM 180 International Cultural Exploration from Nash Community College,
- REL 205 World Religions from University of Tampa,
- GEOG 101 World Geography from Northampton Community College,
- SOCI 215 Cultural Anthropology from Randolph-Macon College,
- HIST 1311 History of World Civilizations to 1500 from University of Mary Hardin-Baylor,
- GPS 120 Global Perspectives in World Cultures from Wingate University;
- The following transfer credit approvals for Domestic Diversity (DD) credit:
  - HIST 0829 The History and Significance of Race in America from Temple University,
  - SOCS-2161 Principles of Sociology from Indiana University South Bend,
  - HIST 1311 History of the United States to 1865 from the University of Texas at Tyler,
  - SOCI 131 Intro to Sociology, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor,
  - SOC 101 Introduction to Sociology from York Technical College,
  - HIST 131 United States History I from Colorado Mesa University;
- and the following transfer credit approvals for General Education Humanities (GE:HU) credit:
  - CTXT 121 Visual Culture in Context: Pre-Modern Global Perspectives from Savannah College of Art and Design,
  - IDS 201 Environmental Ethics from NC State.

VII. New Business
APPELLATE COMMITTEE
Overview of 2020-2021 Faculty Grievance Committee Activities

In previous years, the Faculty Grievance Committee presented a report about their activities at the second meeting of the academic year, as was required by procedures that were outlined in the Faculty Manual. The new appellate process outlined in Part XII of the Faculty Manual has changed that reporting requirement, as follows in Part XII.I.III:

"III. Annual Reports
Annually, the Appellate Committee will write a report specifying the number of each type of appeal, the outcomes, and the duration of the process, as well as any other concerns that occur to the committee. The report will be submitted to the Faculty Governance Committee for review."

As a result of that change, this Faculty Grievance Overview report will be the last one presented to Faculty Senate.

Faculty Grievances from August 31, 2020 – September 1, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievance</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Status</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Respondent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition for Redress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievant chose Mediation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievant chose Chancellor Review</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing was held</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel Report in favor of Grievant</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s adjustments in favor of Grievant</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealed to Chancellor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Decision in favor of Grievant</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealed to the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees Decision in favor of the Grievant</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days from after Step 1 until Chancellor’s decision*</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This item is usually the number of days from after Step 1 until last completed step, which would be the Board of Trustees decision. Documentation of that date has not been forwarded to the Faculty Senate office, so we are providing the number of days from after Step 1 until the last action with a known date.
DISTANCE EDUCATION AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT
Report on findings from Distance Education and Online Instructional Support Feedback and Needs survey from Spring 2021

Executive Summary
Distance Education and Online Instructional Support Feedback & Needs
Spring 2021

The 2020-2021 Academic Year brought numerous challenges to both students and faculty as instruction moved into the online environment in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In early April, the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee (DELTC) offered a voluntary survey to East Carolina University faculty in order to provide them with more effective support for online, hybrid, and face-to-face instruction. The results are summarized here.

Response Rate
The survey garnered 210 responses. Of these, 203 identified themselves as faculty, with four department chairs and three "other." The largest number of respondents came from the Harriot College of Arts and Sciences (57), followed by the College of Education (27). The remaining colleges and academic units all had participants, with most between 10 and 20. Seventeen faculty responded without identifying their college.

Tools and Technologies
Faculty reported Canvas and Webex as their most commonly used tools; Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and MediaSite also received numerous mentions. Sixty-three faculty reported using additional tools; over 30 applications that fulfilled specific niche requirements were listed. In addition, faculty reported taking advantage of "publisher tools" such as those offered by Cengage, Pearson, Elsevier, and others.

Tools and Technologies Not Offered by ECU but Needed for Teachers/Learners
Feedback included specific applications that met departmental needs (such as Bandlab and Acapella for Music). Respondents also addressed pedagogical issues, such as being able to provide document annotations in classrooms, needing better support for academic integrity issues (solutions for proctoring/plagiarism), requesting technology upgrades for live streaming, and a host of others. In support of student needs, respondents identified numerous applications or technologies including eBooks, better strategies for office hours, and many others. Respondents recognized that many students lack robust broadband access.

Academic Integrity/Proctoring
Twenty percent of 182 respondents reported using some type of proctoring service for their online offerings, while the remaining 79.7% did not. Respondus Monitor was the most commonly reported proctoring tool, with 30 users; another 15 chose Examity. Proctorio was the third most frequently used option (5 users), while 6 users chose other tools.
Of those faculty who used a proctoring tool, 78% plan to continue using one. A number of faculty adapted to online pedagogy by modifying their assessments. Strategies included giving timed exams, allowing access to resources, and using alternate assessment strategies such as essays and other written assignments, oral/video recording exams, assessments requiring data interpretation, and hands-on activities.

**Future Needs - Computer Labs**
When asked to predict the future need for computer labs, 45 of 136 respondents did not anticipate a change to their current levels of usage. 28 respondents do not currently use the labs. 78 predicted that computer lab usage will likely decrease, and 8 underscored the need for students to have adequate devices and software to support academic requirements.

**Future Needs - Classrooms**
Survey responses underscored the need for classroom technology to evolve. Examples included being able to "drive" from a personal laptop rather than a fixed classroom computer, or to perform classroom-based livestreaming for students who are remote. Some respondents recognized their own need to learn how to use the available tools most effectively. Some responses accentuated the need for face-to-face (F2F) instruction for selected types of content (nursing, laboratory courses) and for some types of students (particularly first- and second-year students). Many expressed a desire to use more flipped classroom/hybrid strategies that allow self-paced learning outside the traditional classroom, while leveraging in-class time for group work, problem-solving, discussion, and other types of collaboration.

**Online Teaching and Faculty Curriculum Perception**
When queried on how online teaching affected faculty's perception of their own curriculum, 30 respondents noted no change in how they perceived their course. Eleven stated that their courses were not appropriate for the online environment, while 27 were positively disposed toward online offerings. Forty-six respondents discussed the importance of proper course design in the online environment so that students could be successful.

**Confidence in/Expectations for Online Course Delivery**
Many faculty reported confidence that they can successfully deliver their courses online. Ninety three of 132 respondents (70.5%) responded affirmatively, while 29.5% did not believe their courses could be successfully moved to an online format. When asked specifically if they planned to move courses from F2F to online in the future, 59 of 131 respondents (45%) responded affirmatively.

**Successful Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning**
Three key takeaways were identified from this section. The first was that low-stakes, frequent, formative assessments worked extremely well. The second was the need for flexibility of instruction, including elements of student choice (optional synchronous sessions with recording that can be accessed later, student choices on projects) and faculty "office hours." Scheduled web conferences with individual students are perceived as much more effective. The third takeaway was that video interactions can be excellent instructional tools, and that student produced video can be effective.
Unsuccessful Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning

A common theme was that faculty did not have enough time to develop their courses for an online format, and that the demands of responding to online activities like discussion boards and giving other feedback were also extremely time-consuming. Courses with a hands-on component (labs, nursing, allied health) cannot be fully replicated online. With limited time for development, some faculty relied on synchronous video lecture sessions, but found them lacking. Many students struggled with technology, and others struggled to be fully "present" in lengthy synchronous sessions. Some students expressed their frustrations more emphatically in email than they might have in the F2F setting. Respondents noted that engagement was more challenging in the online world, and some students struggled with independent learning. Concerns with academic integrity were also noted; trying to make exams "cheat proof" took too much time. Online proctoring was problematic.

Class Size
Many faculty observed that their classes were larger than what they consider manageable. Seventy of 122 (57%) reported that their classes were too large for effective online instruction/learning, while 17% reported their classes were under capacity. The remaining 25% found no difference. The disparities were noted across colleges.

Student Expectations
Faculty who had not already been teaching online observed that student expectations differed from those in F2F course. 68% (n=119) reported this finding. However, faculty who were already teaching in distance education programs had a different observation, with 54% (n=82) reporting no difference in student expectations.

Student Requests/Concerns
Respondents reported that students tended to have more questions/queries, while less likely to engage or review posted content. Students also asked for live sessions with faculty (although many students opted not to participate when they were offered). Flexibility was a key concern for students, who requested extra time for assignments, flexibility with due dates, accommodations, asynchronous exams, and extra credit/grading on a curve. Many students requested/expected leniency, and some expected to be able to do the course at their own pace rather than at the schedule designed by the instructor. They were sometimes resistant to group work. Students often needed compassionate support from faculty, in the form of more examples, more reminders, and technical assistance with proctored exams and other course technology. Students often expected 24/7 availability and quick response times; there were more email questions; some students also struggled with organizational skills.

Faculty Professional Development Needs
Respondents recognized the need for more training, including online pedagogy/best practices and specific Canvas tools. Importantly, respondents recognized that there is carryover from online teaching to F2F/hybrid teaching, and mentioned the need for proficiency in strategies that support student engagement and creating community.

Additional Comments
Here are a few representative quotes from survey respondents:
“I hope that we really embrace online learning as a good way to learn and promote high quality education--to get rid of the stigma that it is not a good way to learn. Just last week I heard a parent complain that her college aged children had to "teach themselves." Maybe we really need to explore what teaching and learning are as I think that some folks still think that telling others stuff is teaching--as in---if you have a one-way class lecture that it is fine, but if students are expected to read and process materials themselves that the teacher plays no part in it. I think we still need to be sure to see beyond the "sage on the stage" idea of college/university teaching.”

“When online learning emerged a number of years ago I was opposed to it. I’ve gradually warmed to it and now I think it’s an essential component of any department.”

“I think hybrid particularly for undergraduate learners should be strongly considered as opposed to 100% online or 100% face to face.”

“I spent my entire 2020 summer and winter break preparing online materials which totals to hundreds of unpaid ECU work time. Sadly, I had to move so fast that online materials had bugs that students found with benefit of extra credit quiz points.”

“I hope I won't ever have to teach online again. It's a ton of extra work and pretty depressing. Thanks for asking, though.”

**Notes and Observations**

Online learning is not ideal for every student; online teaching is not ideal for every teacher. We have to get better at helping students identify if and how they are good online learners, and we have to do better helping faculty make smart choices about which courses go online, how many students are in each section, and whether faculty feel they can teach particular content online effectively. It is noteworthy that today's students are much more likely to be juggling jobs and families, unlike the "traditional" 18-to-24-year-old college student of a few decades ago. Many of the challenges these learners already faced were exacerbated by COVID-19, such as the need to assist children with their own virtual learning activities, or the need to participate in the "Gig economy" to maintain employment. The pedagogy of distance education, along with its tools and technologies, has tremendous potential to support and enhance learning for today's students.