

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2011-2012 FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the 2011/2012 Faculty Senate will be held
on **Tuesday, February 21, 2012**, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

REVISED 2/16/12
AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

[January 24, 2012](#)

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

B. Announcements

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

F. Election of Five Members to the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee
(*ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, [Section VIII](#))

G. Question Period

IV. Unfinished Business

V. Report of Graduate Council and Committees

A. Graduate Council, Terry West

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 18, 2012](#) and [February 1, 2012](#), which include curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Human Ecology, Department of Physics, College of Education, and College of Allied Health Sciences.

B. University Curriculum Committee, Donna Kain

Curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of [January 12, 2012](#) and [January 26, 2012](#) which include curricular actions within College of Fine Arts and Communication, Honors College, Department of Anthropology, Department of English, College of Health and Human Performance, College of Technology and Computer Science, and Office of Undergraduate Studies.

C. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Joseph Thomas

Proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students (attachment 1).

- D. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, Linda Wolfe
1. Approval of [SOCI 1010](#) Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Social Sciences.
 2. Recommendation revising ECU's current Cultural Diversity course credit undergraduate graduation requirement (attachment 2).
 3. Recommendations establishing a six-hour Global Credit graduation requirement (attachment 3).
 4. Recommendations for revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (attachment 4).
- E. Committee on Committees, Catherine Rigsby
1. Election of a member to the Appellate Hearing Committee (attachment 5).
 2. Third reading of proposed revisions to Faculty Governance Committee charge (attachment 6).
- F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Scott Gordon
Curriculum and Academic Program matters included in the [February 10, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including the following:
1. Request for Authorization to [Discontinue the Pre-school Add-on licensure](#) in the Birth through Kindergarten (BK) Teacher Education Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the College of Human Ecology.
 2. Request to add an [Infrastructure Concentration](#) in Construction Management Program in the Department of Construction Management within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
 3. Request to [discontinue the Occupational Safety and Health Minor](#) in Department of Technology Systems within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
 4. Request for Notification of Intent to Plan a [Bachelor of Science in University Studies](#) within the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
 5. Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of [Anatomy and Cell Biology](#) within the School of Medicine.
 6. Proposed [New UNC-GA Program Approval Timeline](#).
- G. Faculty Governance Committee, George Bailey **REVISED 2/16/12**
Formal Faculty Advice on Proposal to Move the Administrator Survey from Paper-based to Online Administration in Spring 2012 (attachment 7).
- H. Faculty Welfare Committee, Ken Ferguson
1. Role of Faculty in Classroom Safety (attachment 8).
 2. Formal Faculty Advice on the Proposed Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy (attachment 9).
- I. University Budget Committee, Todd Fraley
Report on University Budget.

VI. New Business

ADMISSION AND RETENTION POLICIES COMMITTEE

Proposed Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students

Revisions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in strikethrough.

Nontraditional Students

Individuals who are at least twenty-four years of age and do not qualify for admission as a freshman or transfer student may apply for admission as a nontraditional student. Applicants should complete an application, submit all academic transcripts, and explain the nature of their academic preparation. Students are reviewed holistically by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, and must demonstrate the potential for academic success at the university level. Applicants with limited or no college experience are encouraged to complete some classes at a community college to increase the competitiveness of their applications. Please note admission is not guaranteed. Admission to the university does not guarantee admission to individual programs. Please see individual program requirements for enrollment information. Students enrolling under this policy must

- 1. comply with all university policies regarding payment of tuition and fees.**
- 2. comply with NC state law concerning health and immunization.**
- 3. meet university retention requirements.**
- 4. follow all university academic regulations as shown in the undergraduate catalog published in the year during which the student enrolls.**

~~Individuals who are at least twenty-four years of age (nontraditional students) or individuals whose high school class graduated three or more years prior to the expected date of entry and who meet UNC minimum course requirements may be permitted to enroll in the university under a performance-based admission policy that specifies retention stipulations provided they meet one of the following conditions. (See General Transfer, Note, above.) The student must~~

- ~~• have had no previous college experience or~~
- ~~• have had previous college experience but have not been matriculated within the past one year and are eligible to return to the previous institution but do not meet all stated university admission requirements or~~
- ~~• have had previous college experience, are not eligible to return to the previous institution, and have not been matriculated at the collegiate level for at least three years prior to the expected date of entry.~~

~~Meeting one of the above conditions does not guarantee admission. Admission is not guaranteed and is granted on a capacity available basis as the University must adhere to its enrollment projections. Students are reviewed individually and must demonstrate the potential for academic success at the university level.~~

~~Individuals enrolled as degree-seeking students under the performance-based admission policy must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.2 and meet all retention stipulations by the end of the semester in which the twenty-eighth semester hour of degree creditable work is attempted. Failure either to meet the GPA requirement or to satisfy the retention stipulations will result in the student's being ineligible to continue enrollment at ECU. (See Section 5, Academic Regulations, Readmission.)~~

~~Students enrolling under this policy must comply with all university policies regarding the payment of tuition and fees and must comply with NC state law concerning health and immunization. An individual enrolled under the performance-based admission policy may not declare a major, compete in intercollegiate athletics, or participate in student exchange programs until all retention stipulations specified in his or her admission letter have been satisfied.~~

**Faculty Senate Agenda
February 21, 2012
Attachment 2.**

FOUNDATIONS CURRICULUM AND IINSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

Recommendation revising ECU's current Cultural Diversity
course credit undergraduate graduation requirement

Recommendation is noted in **bold** print.

The Chancellor's Diversity Leadership Cabinet was charged to create a recommendation that would give content to ECU's currently undefined cultural diversity courses requirement. The Cabinet used ECU's definition of "diversity" as the differences in "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective that individuals use to identify themselves and others as members of different groups. The Cabinet notes that "ECU desires a diverse academic community where teaching, learning, and living occurs in an atmosphere of mutual respect in the pursuit of excellence." The Cabinet recommended six diversity course goals as a basis for ECU's diversity course requirements.

Adopting ECU's definition of "diversity" and a revised statement of the Cabinet's goals that operationalizes (as learning outcomes) the Cabinet's original statement of these goals, **the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness committee recommends that the current cultural diversity course requirement be modified as follows:**

- 1) **Rename the current undergraduate cultural diversity requirement the "Diversity Credit Requirement" and call courses that receive this credit " Diversity Credit courses," not "cultural diversity courses." (This is done in order to communicate the difference between diversity goals and global goals. Diversity goals focus on group issues specific *primarily* to groups of people living in the United States of America and to a lesser extent North and Central America and elsewhere. Racism against African-Americans in the United States is an example of a diversity issue, as "diversity" is being used here. Global goals met by courses that receive global credit aim to ensure that ECU students are prepared to be successful members of the global community. These goals focus on issues specific to and arising from globalization. Understanding the impact of globalization on the economies of individual countries is an example of a global issue, as "global" is being used here.)**
- (2) **Increase the current one-course, three hour diversity credit graduation requirement to a minimum of six hours.**
- (3) **Require that courses that receive diversity credit address four of the following six diversity goals:**
 1. **Students can define and distinguish differences currently used in identifying groups, such as differences in "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability,**

religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective.

2. Each student understands his or her own identity, values, beliefs, behaviors, privileges, biases, and cultural perspectives as these pertain to his or her relation to groups distinguished according to their members' "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective.
 3. Students will recognize the effects of power inequalities between different groups that can result in in prejudice and discrimination, the historical and contemporary causes of these inequities, their consequences for individuals and communities and the impact of civil and human rights movements designed to address them.
 4. Students understand, in the context of the American experience, the similarities and differences of the characteristics and behaviors that define groups distinguished according to the "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective of their members.
 5. Students recognize the value of promoting diversity of "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective at all levels among individuals, groups, and organizations.
 6. Each student will demonstrate the skills necessary to work effectively with members of groups identified by "race," gender, age, ethnicity, culture, national origin, ability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, socio-economic status, intellectual position, and perspective.
- (4) Replace the current text on the diversity requirement in the ECU undergraduate catalog with the following:
"All undergraduates shall take a minimum of six hours of Diversity Credit courses."
- (5) Initiate the Diversity Credit graduation requirement with the freshman class of 2013/2014, such that students who entered as freshmen in the Fall of 2013 will have to meet the diversity requirement in order to graduate.
- (6) Require that for a course to receive Diversity Credit, it be recommended by the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness committee (FCIE) and the Faculty Senate and approved by the Chancellor.
- (7) Require that the FCIE provide a Diversity Credit course proposal form in its Faculty Senate committee website. Units seeking approval of courses for Diversity Credit will submit their requests to the FCIE using the proposal form available on the FCIE website.
- (8) A course can receive Diversity Credit, Foundations Credit and Writing Intensive Credit.
-

FOUNDATIONS CURRICULUM AND IINSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Recommendations establishing a six-hour Global Credit graduation requirement

Recommendations are noted in **bold** print.

Note: In conjunction with this recommendation, the FCIE committee also is **recommending that ECU rename the current undergraduate “cultural diversity requirement” the “Diversity Requirement.”** This is being suggested in order to help communicate the difference between diversity goals and global goals. Diversity goals focus on issues specific *primarily* to groups living in the United States of America and to a lesser extent North and Central America. Racism against African-Americans in the United States is an example of a diversity issue, as “diversity” is being used here.

Global goals met by courses that receive global credit aim to ensure that ECU students are prepared to be successful members of the global community. These goals focus on issues specific to and arising from globalization. Understanding the impact of globalization on the economies of individual countries is an example of a global issue, as “global” is being used here.

The five global goals recommended below were developed by an ECU committee in response to ECU’s Phase I and Phase II responses to the UNC General Administration’s UNC-Tomorrow report. The approach that is being recommended here to addressing the need for ECU undergraduates to receive an education that prepares them to be successful global citizens is the approach that ECU takes with its Writing Intensive graduation requirement, whereby existing courses are used to fulfill the 12 credit hour requirement.

The Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee recommends that:

- (1) East Carolina University establish as an undergraduate graduation requirement that students shall take a minimum of six hours of courses that carry Global Credit.**
- (2) The Global Credit graduation requirement shall be initiated with the freshman class of 2013/2014, such that students who entered as freshmen in the Fall of 2013 will have to meet the Global Credit requirement in order to graduate.**
- (3) Courses designated for Global Credit shall address at least three of the following five goals:**
 - 1. Students will recognize the global interdependence of societies, economies, and environmental systems and the implications of his or her actions on the wider global environment, including the natural earth environment.**
 - 2. Students will understands how cultural beliefs, values and sensibilities shape people’s perceptions and impact global decisions and actions.**
 - 3. Students can use disciplinary concepts to explain how global and local issues are interconnected.**
 - 4. Students possess the skills necessary to communicate, interact and work positively with individuals from other cultural groups.**
 - 5. Students can evaluate global issues and events from multiple perspectives and apply critical thinking skills to address global challenges.**

- (4) The ECU undergraduate catalog shall contain the following statement:
“All undergraduates shall take a minimum of six hours of courses that receive Global Credit.”
 - (5) In order for a course to receive Global Credit, it must be recommended by the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness committee (FCIE) and the Faculty Senate and approved by the Chancellor.
 - (6) The FCIE shall provide a Global Credit course proposal form on its Faculty Senate committee website. Units seeking approval of courses for Global Credit shall submit their requests to the FCIE using the proposal form available on the FCIE website.
 - (7) A course can count towards Global Credit, Foundations Credit and Writing Intensive Credit.
-

**Faculty Senate Agenda
February 21, 2012
Attachment 4.**

FOUNDATIONS CURRICULUM AND IINSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Recommendations for revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Recommendations are noted in **bold** print.

Executive Summary

In Spring of 2009 a six-member SOIS subcommittee was appointed by Associate Provost for Accreditation and Assessment Dr. David Weismiller to review the currently used Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS). There had been growing faculty concerns about how the SOIS was used in evaluation of faculty teaching as well as the response rate following the University’s switch from a paper-and-pencil survey to an online survey. This Committee (the “SOIS I Committee”) recommended that the University revise the current SOIS.

The present committee (the “SOIS II Committee”) was appointed following the report of the SOIS I Committee. The Committee’s charge was to develop a “home grown” student opinion of instruction survey to replace the SOIS instrument currently in use. This committee met 16 times over a period of two academic years. The Committee reviewed the SOIS I Report and the criticism of the currently used SOIS that has centered on the misuse of the survey in evaluation (e.g. using small and statistically insignificant differences in scores to make merit pay and other personnel decisions and overreliance on the use of a single item [item 19] in critical decisions). The Committee made a recommendation to Faculty Senate on the interim use of the current SOIS survey in October, 2009 which was adopted.

The Committee reviewed the literature on effective teaching and developed a series of potential questions to ask on a student opinion of instruction survey. After developing several drafts of potential questions the committee held two on-campus open discussions on student opinion of instruction and requested that a group of faculty and students provide feedback on the potential questions. There was significant agreement between student respondents and faculty respondents on the importance and relevance of the proposed questions. The committee reviewed each of the recommended items in light of the feedback received from the two open forums and the student and faculty surveys. Final adjustments were made in the wording of the items and the number of items

and the Committee recommended 22 items for the Student Perception of Teaching Survey. In addition to the 22 items the Student Perception of Teaching Survey will include space for students to make open-ended comments about the course. The Committee strongly believes in the value of providing the opportunity for students to make written comments as part of the process.

The Committee makes a number of recommendations that aim to improve the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. These recommendations include:

- 1. The use of the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (see Appendix E) to replace the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey currently in use;**
- 2. The university policies on faculty evaluation should emphasize the necessity of collecting a variety of data about teaching when unit administrators evaluate teaching (such as classroom visitation/observation, self-evaluation, and the review of teaching materials);**
- 3. Unit administrators and personnel committee members in units should have training on how to effectively evaluate teaching effectiveness, including the use of the results from the Student Perception of Teaching Survey;**
- 4. More attention to the use of information about teaching effectiveness in improving teaching (i.e. use of results for formative rather than only summative evaluation);**
- 5. Faculty members should affirm their responsibility to provide multiple sources of information about their teaching in their annual reviews and during promotion and tenure reviews and use feedback resulting from evaluations to improve instruction;**
- 6. Unit administrators and personnel committee members should affirm their obligation to utilize information in a fashion that provides useful feedback to instructors about their teaching;**
- 7. Faculty members should have access to colleagues (i.e. department colleagues, mentors, and/or programs through the Office of Faculty Excellence) to assist in interpreting and improving instruction as necessary;**
- 8. The university should ensure periodic review of the process of evaluation of teaching, including review and updating of instruments used in evaluation of teaching.**

The SOIS II Committee will continue to meet to make a recommendation for an opinion survey for use in laboratory and distance education courses. In addition, the committee will address student response rates to the online survey and issue a report with recommendations to improve student participation and response rates.

DRAFT Student Perception of Teaching Survey (face-to-face courses)

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. The instructor cancelled class fewer than 3 times. | Y/N/NA |
| 2. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time. | Y/N/NA |
| 3. The course was well organized. | Y/N/NA |
| 4. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the course content and student learning. | Y/N/NA |
| 5. Presentations and other activities were usually engaging. | Y/N/NA |
| 6. The instructor stimulated my interest in the course topics. | Y/N/NA |
| 7. Instructional technology used in this course contributed to my understanding of the course material. | Y/N/NA |
| 8. The instructor's speech was understandable. | Y/N/NA |
| 9. The pace of instruction allowed me time to take notes. | Y/N/NA |
| 10. The instructor encouraged questions during class sessions. | Y/N/NA |
| 11. The instructor was available to help if I asked for assistance. | Y/N/NA |
| 12. The instructor was encouraging about my ability to learn course material. | Y/N/NA |

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|---|---|----------------|--------|
| 13. The instructor treated students respectfully. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 14. The instructor made it clear what was expected on graded assignments. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 15. Tests and graded assignments were on material covered in the course. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 16. Tests and assignments were evaluated and returned in time to be useful to me for future assignments. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 17. The topics presented in course were covered as stated in the syllabus. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 18. The readings and assignments covered the course content. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 19. The instructor's explanation of course content was clear. | | | | | | Y/N/NA |
| 20. Compared to other courses I've taken at ECU the amount of work in this course was: | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | Not Demanding | | | | Very Demanding | |

What do you feel are the strengths of this course?

What would you change to improve the course?

Additional Comments.

DRAFT Student Perception of Teaching Survey (face-to-face courses)*
Item Correspondence to Peer Evaluation Categories

Organization

1. The instructor cancelled class fewer than 3 times.
2. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.
3. The course was well organized.

Presentation

4. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the course content and student learning.
5. Presentations and other activities were usually engaging.
6. The instructor stimulated my interest in the course topics.
7. Instructional technology used in this course contributed to my understanding of the course material.
8. The instructor's speech was understandable.
9. The pace of instruction allowed me time to take notes.

Respect/Rapport

10. The instructor encouraged questions during class sessions.
11. The instructor was available to help if I asked for assistance.
12. The instructor was encouraging about my ability to learn course material.
13. The instructor treated students respectfully.

Evaluation Methods

14. The instructor made it clear what was expected on graded assignments.
15. Tests and graded assignments were on material covered in the course.
16. Tests and assignments were evaluated and returned in time to be useful to me for future assignments.

Class Content

17. The topics presented in course were covered as stated in the syllabus
18. The readings and assignments covered the course content.
19. The instructor's explanation of course content was clear.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT
 Election of a member to the Appellate Hearing Committee

Nominee: Natalie Stewart, Theatre and Dance

2011/2012 HEARING COMMITTEE

Regular Members (with vote)	Academic Unit	Term	Office Location	Mail #	Office #
Ken Soderstrom	Medicine	2012	Brody 6S-34	633	
James Holloway	Business	2013	Slay 330	503	737-1042
James Wirth	Technology & Computer Science	2013	Science Complex C-107	520	328-9693
Puri Martinez	Foreign Languages	2014	Bate 3308	556	328-6522
Mamadi Cora	Sociology	2014	Brewster A-420	567	328-4836
Alternate Members (with vote)					
Linda Mooney	Sociology	2012	Brewster A-409	567	258-0286
Myra Brown	Allied Health Sciences	2012	Health Sciences 4340P	668	744-6172
Patricia Dragon	Academic Library Svcs	2013	Joyner 1204	516	328-0296
OPEN		2014			
Angela Thompson	History	2014	Brewster A-203	554	328-1035

Faculty Senate Agenda
February 21, 2012
Attachment 6.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Third Reading of Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Governance Committee Charge
(First reading February 2011; Second reading March 2011)

Additions are noted in **bold print** and deletions in ~~striketrough~~.

1. Name: Faculty Governance Committee
2. Membership:
8 elected tenured faculty members.

Ex-officio members (with vote): The Chancellor or an appointed representative, the Provost or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies or an appointed representative, the Chair of the Faculty, and one faculty senator selected by the Chair of the Faculty.

The chair of the committee may invite resource persons as necessary to realize the committee charge. The chair of the committee may appoint such subcommittees as he or she deems necessary.
3. Quorum: 4 elected members exclusive of ex-officio.
4. Committee Responsibilities:
 - A. The committee considers matters relating to Appendix A. Faculty Constitution and By-Laws, where there is no conflict with the functions of the Committee on Committees.
 - B. The committee considers matters relating to Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of ECU, Appendix L. ECU Code, and other governance documents not specified in other committee charges.
 - C. The committee considers policies and procedures related to initial faculty appointment, tenure, promotion in rank, merit, (see Appendix D. Tenure Policies and Regulations of ECU), and other such matters as may pertain to the general well-being of the faculty, e.g. sexual harassment policy.
 - D. The committee advises the Chair of the Faculty regarding the contents of the Faculty Manual.
 - E. ~~The committee considers matter relating to unit re-evaluations~~ **sets guidelines for, and considers matters relating to, unit organization and the development of unit codes.**
 - F. The committee shall review personnel policies and procedures (Appendices C and D). This process shall occur every five years.
5. To Whom The Committee Reports:
The committee recommends to the Faculty Senate revisions to Appendix A, Faculty Constitution and By-Laws, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of ECU, Appendix D. Tenure Policies and Regulations of ECU, and Appendix L. ECU Code. The committee makes recommendations concerning unit ~~re-evaluations~~ **organization** to the Faculty Senate. The committee makes its recommendations on policies concerning initial faculty appointment, tenure, promotion, and merit to the Faculty Senate.

6. How Often The Committee Reports:
The committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and at other times as necessary.
 7. Power Of The Committee To Act Without Faculty Senate Approval:
The committee is empowered to advise the Chair of the Faculty regarding the contents of the *Faculty Manual*.
 8. Standard Meeting Time:
The committee meeting time is scheduled for the 2nd Wednesday of each month.
-

Faculty Senate Agenda
February 21, 2012
Attachment 7.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Formal Faculty Advice on Proposal to Move the Administrator Survey from Paper-based to Online Administration in Spring 2012

Overview

The Administrator Survey has been done each spring since the mid-90's and has always been administered by Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research (IPAR), formerly known as IPRE, and PIR. This survey provides an important input to faculty in the process of evaluating the performance of their upper level administrators such as the Chancellor, academic Vice Chancellors, and Deans. The Administrator Survey utilizes scannable paper survey forms produced by IPAR using Scantron software and printed on a color printer. After the survey data is scanned from these forms, IPAR generate the survey reports.

A separate companion survey, The IDEA Chair Survey, is administered at the same time as the Administrator Survey but focuses on faculty evaluation of their chairs and school directors. The IDEA Chair Survey is administered online for ECU by the IDEA Center, a non-profit entity associated with Kansas State University. In that survey eligible faculty rate eligible department chairs and school directors. See discussion of eligibility criteria under "Notes" below.

The IDEA Chair Survey was originally administered using paper forms but was changed to online administration over ten years ago. The IDEA Chair Survey at ECU typically achieves an overall response rate in the mid-70 percent range. The charge for the IDEA Survey is about \$5000. The overall response rate for the paper-based Administrator Survey is about 31 percent.

Issues

1. The survey response rate should be improved, if possible. The overall response rate of the Administrator Survey has average only about 31% over the past five years. In Spring 2011 and 2010 the lowest rates of this period occurred: 22.1% and 27.2%, respectively. Low response rates may be related to faculty fear of that at least some of the administrators they evaluate will be able to identify faculty with their survey responses, since IPAR historically has reported to upper-level administrators who are evaluated in the survey. Such faculty fear may exist despite the professional standards kept by IPAR staff and the lack of evidence suggesting unprofessional conduct.
2. Material and time costs should be reduced wherever possible, especially because the University budget is currently strained. The time and material costs of the Administrator

Survey could be significantly reduced by moving it online.

3. The efficiency of the Administrator Survey should be increased to provide better and quicker survey results. Results of the Administrator Survey conducted each Spring term are an important component of personnel evaluations.

Proposed changes

Overall Proposal: In light of cost savings in time and materials, increased work efficiency, possible increase in the survey response rate, it is proposed that the Administrator Survey be moved online and be administered by a neutral third-party unit.

1. It is recommended that the Center for Survey Research, Division of Research and Graduate Studies, administer The Administrator Survey. This unit reports to Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor of the Division of Research and Graduate Studies. Dr. Mageean is not evaluated in the Administrator Survey. Mande Lancaster, Director of the Center for Survey Research at ECU, has agreed to administer the online Administrator Survey as a neutral third-party. IPAR has historically reported to the Chancellor or Provost who, when eligible, are evaluated in the survey. While IPAR has a long record of maintaining confidentiality of survey data, utilizing a third-party as survey administrator is likely to reassure faculty of data confidentiality and this should help increase the response rate. In effect, this is modeled after the way the IDEA Chair Survey is administered. Ms. Lancaster would charge \$300 to administer the survey and would agree to keep her part of the survey process totally confidential within her unit.
2. Other third-party survey options were explored but would cost much more than is typically spent for the Administrator Survey.
 - (a) The IDEA Chair Survey is well respected at ECU. The IDEA Center does also offer an Administrator Survey consisting of a number of preset questions and space for up to 20 additional items created by the institution. The estimated cost is about \$5000, which is close to the current cost of the IDEA Chair Survey. The Faculty Senate would also need to assess the test content as to its alignment with ECU performance standards for upper-level administrators.
 - (b) The Qualtrics Company was asked to estimate their charge for simply administering the online version created by IPAR, but their estimate approached that of the IDEA Chair Survey (and the IDEA Administrator Survey).
3. The Survey Research Center (or other third-party Unit) would agree to the following:
 - (a) IPAR would supply the faculty contact list and identities of upper-level administrators to the third party Unit. The third-party Unit would launch the survey and handle any technical problems encountered or reported by faculty. As a cost-cutting measure IPAR would create and provide the online survey form to the third party Unit; this would reduce cost and ensure use of survey content which is currently approved by the ECU Faculty Senate.
 - (b) In no case would the third-party Unit divulge the identities of respondents or their responses to anyone outside the Unit. Unit staff would inspect the response record of faculty only as necessary to ensure the quality of the survey process or to resolve technical problems reported by faculty.
 - (c) Qualtrics software keeps track of who has responded in order to email reminders to non-responders. Sending several reminders would help increase the response rate.
 - (d) Personally identifying information (e.g., email addresses) will not be included in the raw data which the Unit provides to IPAR in order to create the survey reports.

Benefits

1. Time costs. IPAR would save about 60 hours of student/staff time. About 1500 faculty participate in the survey, each faculty member rating from 1 to 3 upper-level administrators, depending which are eligible to be evaluated. An IPAR time study revealed that to label, rubber stamp, and stuff envelopes with survey materials for 1500 respondents would require about 40 hours. Most of this would be student work time. An additional 20 hours of staff would be necessary to prepare/create the materials for student workers and to supervise them, resulting in a total of about 60 hours of student/staff time spent on these phases of the project.
2. Material costs. If the Center for Survey Research were to take over the online administration of this survey, the material cost would be cut at least in half, that is, by at least \$300. The overall estimated cost to IPAR is about \$650 for the use of such materials as 3000 heavy-weight scannable Scantron survey forms (designed and printed by IPAR), outgoing and return manila envelopes (1500 of each sent to faculty), mailing labels, memos, rubber stamps and ink (for envelopes). The cost of the proposed third-party administration of the survey is \$300.
3. Response rate. The overall response rate and survey efficiency may increase significantly by implementing the proposed changes. The overall response rate for the Administrator Survey may increase significantly. By modeling this survey after the successful IDEA Chair Survey, administered by the third party IDEA Center which sends multiple email reminders and achieves response rates in the mid-70% range, the current 5-year overall average of the Administrator Survey may increase significantly beyond its current 31% . Even if the online rate remained about the same, there would be savings in material and time, greater efficiency, and quicker turnaround of results.

Notes

1. Eligibility criteria. Administrators are eligible to be evaluated if they have served full-time on a permanent basis for at least one year as of survey time. Faculty are eligible to participate if they have been working full-time, and have been permanent, with faculty title, and assigned for at least one year as of survey time. Each Spring IPAR staff identifies who is currently eligible to be evaluated and which faculty are eligible to evaluate them, as of survey time (usually in April).
2. Security. Survey responses will be safeguarded on all servers and networks involved in the survey process. Standard security measures such as data encryption, firewalls, password-protected files, and so on, will be employed as necessary. Any personally identifying information will not be associated in any reports of the survey results or any way that would breach confidentiality of the data. Any deliberate intention to do so would render that intender subject to criminal prosecution, punishment, and/or dismissal. The strongest human safeguards against breaches of confidentiality are the professionalism and expertise of the survey staff.

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT
Role of Faculty in Classroom Safety

When an emergency occurs in the classroom, students naturally look to the instructor for leadership, and your knowledge of the correct response is critical to a safe resolution of the emergency. The Faculty Welfare Committee, in cooperation with Tom Pohlman, Environmental Manager of the campus Environmental Health and Safety program, is providing this information in the first of a series of monthly correspondences to help you prepare for classroom emergencies.

What to do before the semester starts:

- Know how to report an emergency from your classroom or lab.
- Learn where at least two evacuation routes are from your classroom.
- Determine how you will secure the classroom in case of a lockdown.
- Decide how you can/will receive emergency alerts. Register at www.ecu.edu/alert.
- Know where your designated evacuations assembly point is or designate an evacuation assembly point for your class in case of evacuation. (At least 100 paces from the building.)
- Determine where you will take your class to shelter from severe weather. More information at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-admin/oehs/emergency/Tornado-Safe-Procedures.cfm>

Recommended items for instructors to take to class:

- A charged cell phone or similar communication device.
- List of important phone numbers (punch card from Student Safety [Lockdown] flier).
- Small flashlight
- Door stop if your classroom does not have an inside locking device.

During the first week of class, tell your students what you will expect in case of:

- Fire
- Severe Weather
- Lockdown (hostile intruder)
- Hazardous material spill (if in a lab setting)
- Consider including safety procedures in your syllabus.

As faculty, you should familiarize yourself with these procedures and do your part to help keep our campus safe. For more information, see the ECU Emergency Response and Preparedness Web site at <http://www.ecu.edu/police/erp>.

**Faculty Senate Agenda
February 21, 2012
Attachment 9.**

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT

Formal Faculty Advice on the proposed Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy

Proposed additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

Faculty Scholarly Reassignment

REG # (To be done by Legal)

PRR General Subject Matter (Leave blank. To be done by Legal)

Authority: Academic Council

History: First Issued: month, year

Related Policies: UNC Policy Manual, §300.2.6 [G]

Additional References: *ECU Faculty Manual*: Part VI, Sections I, D. "Leaves of Absence"; Appendix C, Part III "Evaluation"; and Appendix I, East Carolina University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment and External Activities of Faculty and Other Professional Staff

Contact for Info: Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs (328-1888); Assistant Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences Personnel (744-1910); Director of Benefits, Human Resources (328-9825)

1. Purpose

Faculty members are expected to remain highly competent in their disciplines and to maintain familiarity with recent scholarship. In pursuit of their scholarly interests, faculty often need sustained and dedicated periods devoted to a project involving research or creative activity. The purpose of this regulation is to provide for equity in submitting and consistency in approving requests for reassignment of faculty time for scholarly activities.

2. Definition

2.1. Faculty Scholarly Reassignment – an approved reassignment for a defined period of time in order for a faculty member to pursue full-time a project involving research or creative activity **of truly exceptional merit**.

3. Eligibility

3.1. Full-time tenured faculty members are eligible to apply for a faculty scholarly reassignment.

3.2. Full-time tenured faculty holding an administrative appointment as a director or department chair, with the support of the dean, are eligible to apply for a scholarly reassignment. If awarded, the faculty member's administrative duties will be reassigned, along with other campus responsibilities, and the faculty member will forgo all administrative stipends for the period of the scholarly reassignment.

3.3. A probationary term (tenure-track) faculty member is normally ineligible to apply for these scholarly reassignments. ~~An exception may be made only if the proposed research or creative activity is of truly exceptional merit.~~ The faculty member must be in his/her last probationary year, and if awarded, the reassignment is contingent upon receiving tenure prior to beginning the scholarly reassignment.

3.4. Faculty will be expected to either maintain contact with graduate advisees or to make other arrangements to ensure that students' progress will not be disrupted. This expectation must be clearly stated in the reassignment agreement.

3.5. Faculty members selected for scholarly reassignments will undergo the annual evaluation process as prescribed by Appendix C, **Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty Part III** of the *ECU Faculty Manual*.

3.6. The reassignment period will count as time toward promotion and post-tenure review.

3.7. The faculty member will continue to have the general obligations of a University employee other than teaching and service during the reassignment period, including but not limited to remaining accessible through a reliable means of communication with supervisory personnel, complying with reasonable directives of supervisors and officers of the University, responding in a timely and cooperative manner to requests for information, and taking such actions as may be required to comply with any applicable law or University policy or process.

3.8. Faculty on a scholarly reassignment are eligible for consideration for merit salary increases, promotion, and one-time payments or any other salary adjustments approved by the General Assembly, the Board of Governors, or East Carolina University.

3.9. During the reassigned period, the faculty member is expected to devote full time to a project (**in addition to duties noted in 3.4 and 3.7 above**) that is expected to result in a tangible creative or scholarly product, e.g., the submission and/or publication of one or more peer reviewed articles, a book or book chapters, a patent, or other creative or scholarly product.

3.10. A faculty scholarly reassignment is not an entitlement nor is it based on length of service. Decisions will be based on the merits of the proposal, productivity appropriate for the discipline and the faculty member's stage of career development, and the availability of funds.

3.11. A recipient of a faculty scholarly reassignment pursuant to this regulation is not eligible to receive another scholarly reassignment during a period of seven years following the start of the initial reassignment.

4. Terms and Conditions

4.1. The terms and conditions of the scholarly reassignment will be documented in an appointment letter from the appropriate Vice Chancellor.

4.2. A faculty member on a 9-month contract may be awarded a scholarly reassignment for one semester (either fall semester or spring semester) at full salary or for one academic year (excluding any summer sessions) at half salary.

4.2.1. The faculty member agrees to return to full-time employment at East Carolina University for two semesters following the reassignment.

4.3. A faculty member on a 12-month contract may be awarded a scholarly reassignment for 6 months at full salary or 12 months at half salary.

4.3.1. The faculty member agrees to return to full-time employment at East Carolina University for 12 calendar months following the reassignment.

4.4. During the reassigned period, the faculty member's salary may not exceed his/her regular full-time salary. Funds obtained by the faculty member for travel, per diem, housing, and similar expenses are not considered salary. Exceptions to the cap on salary may be approved by the

appropriate Vice Chancellor in cases where a scholarship or fellowship program provides a salary exceeding the faculty member's regular full time salary.

4.5. A faculty member on a faculty scholarly reassignment who accepts a position at another post-secondary institution or any other paid employment that was not included in the proposal or approved through the East Carolina University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment and External Activities of Faculty and Other Professional Staff policy (see Appendix I of the *ECU Faculty Manual*) will be considered to have failed to comply with the conditions of this regulation and voluntarily resigned from his or her employment at East Carolina University.

4.6. The faculty member agrees to return to full-time employment at East Carolina University for the period specified in sections 4.2.1 and 4.3.1 above. Should the faculty member fail to do so, he or she must repay the salary received during the period of reassignment by a date specified by the University. Prior to the beginning of and as a condition for receipt of any reassignment, the faculty member must execute the University's contract acknowledging the obligations contained within this regulation including, but not limited to, returning to full-time employment or repaying the salary.

4.7. Within three months after the conclusion of the reassigned period, the faculty member will submit a report of accomplishments to the unit administrator and to the dean of their college or school.

4.8. Within a year after the conclusion of the reassigned period, the faculty member will be required to provide a formal presentation of the work accomplished during the reassignment to unit colleagues and/or the university community at large.

4.9. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions set forth in this regulation may affect, among others, future eligibility for future faculty scholarly reassignments, annual evaluations, and may subject the recipient to repayment of the salary received during the reassigned period.

4.10. If circumstances require that a substantial change be made in the project after it has been approved, the faculty member should obtain approval of the changes from the appropriate unit administrator and dean.

5. Continuation of Benefits

5.1. Continuation of Retirement Contributions

5.1.1. For faculty on a scholarly reassignment, the period is considered an approved leave of absence for educational purposes.

5.1.2. The maximum allowable credit for educational leave or interrupted service for education purposes is six years over the course of one's career within the UNC system.

5.1.3. NC Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System (TSERS) – Full Pay

5.1.3.1. The University will continue making the employer contribution to TSERS and the faculty member will continue making his or her pre-tax contribution through payroll deduction.

5.1.4. NC Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System (TSERS) – Partial Pay

5.1.4.1. If the faculty member wishes to continue making his/her contribution, the University will continue making the employer contribution. The contributions are based on the faculty member's base rate of pay in effect immediately preceding the reassignment. The faculty member's contribution shall be on an after-tax basis and must be submitted by the faculty member to the Benefits Unit of

Human Resources by the payroll deadline for transmission to the State Retirement System. In addition, unless the faculty member returns to service as a contributing member within 12 months after completion of his or her scholarly reassignment and contributes to the Retirement System for at least three more years (except in the event of death or disability), TSERS will cancel the service credits and refund contributions to the employee.

5.1.4.2. In advance of the reassigned period, and after determining whether or not the faculty member wishes to continue making his/her retirement contributions, a letter and other appropriate forms will be submitted by the appropriate Vice Chancellor to the NC Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System requesting permission for the faculty member to continue his/her retirement contributions.

5.1.5. UNC Optional Retirement Program –Full or Partial Pay

5.1.5.1. If a faculty member participates in the UNC Optional Retirement Program (ORP) the same procedures, except provision 5.1.4.2, as outlined above for TSERS members apply, including the six year maximum allowable credit limit.

5.1.5.2. Employer and employee contributions are payable to the appropriate ORP carrier.

5.2. Other Benefits

5.2.1. Coverage under the State's Disability Income Plan and the Death Benefit will continue for eligible members during the reassigned period.

5.2.1.1. TSERS participants are eligible for the Death Benefit and the Disability Income Plan.

5.2.1.2. ORP participants are only eligible for the Disability Income Plan.

5.2.2. A faculty member who is on reassigned time is eligible and should continue to receive the University's contribution for State Health Plan coverage, whether on full pay or partial pay. The employee's contributions for dependents' coverage will continue to be payroll deducted from the faculty member's paycheck on a before-tax basis.

5.2.3. Continuation or eligibility for all other benefit programs is subject to each plan's policies or provisions.

6. Application Process

6.1. The application process takes place in the academic year prior to the academic year of the reassigned period.

6.2. By September 15 the applicant must submit a completed application to the unit administrator.

6.3. The application must include the following:

6.3.1. An abstract of the proposed project (maximum 200 words) including expectations, if any, for supplemental funding for expenses and/or salary

6.3.2. A current curriculum vitae

6.3.3. A narrative (maximum 1500 words, excluding references), which shall include all of the following:

6.3.3.1. a detailed description of the research or creative project

6.3.3.2. potential enhancement of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, or service and the potential value to the teaching, scholarship or service program of the unit

6.3.3.3. contribution to knowledge in the field of study

6.3.3.4. expected outcomes (e.g., the submission and/or publication of one or more peer reviewed articles, a book or book chapters, a patent, or other creative or scholarly product)

6.3.4. Invitations to other institutions, award letters for fellowships, or other supporting documentation

6.4. The unit administrator will submit all applications to the appropriate departmental or school committee, consisting of no fewer than three persons, for review. The committee will submit a ranked order recommendation to the department chair or director.

6.5. By October 15, the department chair or director will forward to the dean the ranked order recommendation and will indicate how many reassignments can be supported with current resources, and if replacing the duties and responsibilities of any of the applicants presents an extraordinary challenge.

6.6. The dean will convene a college committee to review all the applications and the recommendations forwarded by the chair or director.

6.7. The college committee will submit a ranked order recommendation to the dean, who makes the final decision in consultation with the appropriate Vice Chancellor.

6.8. By November 15, the dean will announce the recipients, if any, for the following academic year.

6.9. Deans are responsible for providing the appropriate Vice Chancellor with a list of applicants and results of the process annually.

6.10. Decisions at the unit administrator level and above about granting scholarly reassignments must be made with a clear understanding of the source of funds to maintain the instructional expectations of the department.

6.11. A faculty member may appeal a denied request for a scholarly reassignment. The written appeal must be submitted to the appropriate Vice Chancellor within 14 calendar days of the announcement of the awards. The appeal must include a copy of the original application, a rationale for the appeal and any supporting documents. The Vice Chancellor's decision is final.
