1996-1997 Faculty Senate
Full Minutes of 18 March 1997

The seventh regular meeting of the 1996-97 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, 18 March 1997, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order
Chair Don Sexauer called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of 18 February 1997, was approved as written.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Parker (Economics), Dixon (Geography), McMillen (Medicine), Crouch (Human Environmental Sciences), and Davis (Administrative Council Representative).

Alternates present were: Professors Albright for Kane (Allied Health Sciences), Greene for Krcmar (Communication), Jones for McMillan (English), Ciesielski for Hankins (Industry and Technology),

B. Announcements
1. The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the 18 February 1997, Faculty Senate meeting:
   - Creation of a ECU Summer Scholars Institute.
   - Revised Unit Codes of Operation for the School of Medicine and Department of Anthropology.
   - Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of 23 January 1997.

2. Chairs of the 31 Standing Faculty Senate Committees are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office no later than Wednesday, 30 April 1997.

3. The Chancellor's reception in his home honoring the 1996-97 Faculty Senators is scheduled for Thursday, 24 April 1997, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Please make plans now to attend.

4. Plans are now being made for the first annual Teaching Awards Ceremony to honor upcoming recipients of the three teaching awards, i.e. Alumni Teaching Excellence, Board of Governors Award for Excellence, and Board of Governors Distinguished Professor. This ceremony will replace the recognition shown each year for award winners at the Fall Faculty Convocation. The ceremony will be begin at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendrix Theatre on Wednesday, 30 April 1997 (Reading Day). A reception, hosted by Chancellor Eakin, will follow in the Mendenhall Multi-Purpose room. Please make plans now to attend.

C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
Chancellor Eakin reported on the Board of Governor's approval of a phased retirement plan; completion of the NCAA accreditation visit; Spangler Foundation matching gifts to UNC campuses in support of a distinguished professor program; legislative priorities of the Board of Governors including proposed salary increases of 6% with an additional 1% to award teaching excellence; and
appointments have been made to the Board of Trustees.

Jones (Social Work) asked about a proposed increase in the academic calendar to 160 days. Chancellor Eakin responded that 150 days is a national standard and to add additional days would cause a burden in terms of logistics, would have a negative impact on summer programs and any increased costs would be passed on to the students. Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages) asked about early retirement and the fact that the only privilege to be surrendered was tenure. Chancellor Eakin responded that it was not an early retirement plan but a "phased retirement plan". All of the details are not known at this time. Ferrell (History) asked about the potential location of the new science and technology building. Chancellor Eakin responded that the planning process was in the very early stages and no decisions regarding the placement of the building had been made as of now.

D. Thomas Feldbush, Vice Chancellor for Research
Vice Chancellor Feldbush reported on the distribution of graduate assistantships for the past two years and tuition waivers for this year. Prospects for more tuition waivers and assistantships were unknown. He stated that the change to Doctoral II status may bring an increase of funds for this purpose. Vice Chancellor Feldbush responded to a rumor that graduate deans were writing review reports in response to the recent program review listing. He stated that this was inaccurate. He explained that departments prepare reports and submit them to the deans office for editorial input and are passed on to the chancellor. This process is the same as that at UNC-CH, NCSU, UNC-G and UNC-C. In reference to Professor Taggart's question at the last meeting relative to a research/creative activity submission form, the form in question is out-of-date and no longer used. Vice Chancellor Feldbush stated that most of the data for the report will now be submitted online by the faculty member.

E. Approval of Spring Graduation Roster
Chamberlain (Art) moved approval of the Spring 1997 Graduation Roster, subject to completion of degree requirements. RESOLUTION #97-8

F. Faculty Assembly Delegate Report
Professor Dawn Clark (Theatre and Dance) presented a brief report on the UNC Faculty Assembly meeting of 21 February 1997. (A copy of the full report may be obtained in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex.)

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time.

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees
A. Committee on Committees
Bob Woodside (Math), Chair of the Committee, presented the second readings of proposed revisions to the following Committee charges: Admissions and Recruitment, Calendar, General Education, and University Curriculum. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-9 (Copies of the revised committee charges may be obtained from the Faculty Senate web page (http://www.ecu.edu/ fs online) or by calling the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537.)
B. Calendar Committee
Nancy Moss (Nursing), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented first the revisions to the Fall 1997, Spring 1998, Summer 1998, Fall 1998, and Spring 1999 University Calendars. These revisions were made to comply with the recently mandated 150 class days. Wilson (Sociology) asked if the amount someone was paid for summer school was affected by the length of term? Professor Moss indicated that her committee did not deal with such matters. Hebert (Business) asked if the spring semester could be moved up to take advantage of "dead time" in January. Professor Moss responded that the calendar was dictated in large part by the guidelines established by the Faculty Senate and the proposed calendars impact the least number of students. There being no further discussion, the revised University Calendars were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-10

Professor Moss then presented the proposed Summer 1999, Fall 1999, and Spring 2000 University Calendars. There was no discussion and the proposed calendars were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-11 (Copies of all University Calendars may be obtained from the Faculty Senate web page (http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline) or by calling the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537.)

C. Credits Committee
Bob Woodside (Math), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed revision to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5. Academic Regulations, in relation to appeals of suspension. Joyce (Physics) asked if faculty committees served as appeal committees across the nation? Professor Woodside responded that he had no information on that point. Farr (English) asked if the appeals process impacted the development of the calendar? Professor Woodside answered that it plays some part in the process. Ferrell (History) asked if there was a requirement for some type of appeals process at the end of fall semester and could the students be evaluated after a year rather than a semester. Woodside responded that the Committee had discussed this briefly and that, at the present, could not offer any solutions. Ferrell stated that he intended to offer a motion in light of this discussion later in the meeting.

Following discussion, the proposed revision to the University Undergraduate Catalog was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-12 (Upon approval by the Chancellor, this deadline will be placed in all University Calendars and included in the next printing of the University Undergraduate Catalog.)

D. Educational Policies and Planning
David Lawrence (Geology), Chair of the Committee, presented, for information only, the Committee's approval on the request for authorization to plan a PhD program in Technology Studies and a request for authorization to establish a BS degree in Construction Management. In the future, notice of the Committee's actions will be presented in memorandum format only.

E. Faculty Governance Committee
Sexauer, Chair of the Faculty and member of the Committee, presented the second readings for proposed revisions to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix A, Faculty
Constitution and By-Laws to include the Chair of the Faculty as a standing member of the UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to Appendix A, Faculty Constitution were approved. RESOLUTION #97-13 (Following approval by the Faculty Senate, the General Faculty will be asked to approve this revision at the Fall Faculty Convocation scheduled for 18 August 1997, then the Chancellor will be asked to act upon the revision. Following all approvals, the revised section will be incorporated into the ECU Faculty Manual, and copies distributed to all faculty.)

Chair Sexauer then presented the proposed revision to the Faculty Constitution's By-Laws to include the Chair of the Faculty as a standing member of the UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation. Ferrell (History) moved an amendment changing the wording to read: "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. No Chair of the Faculty may serve as a Faculty Assembly Delegate for more than six consecutive years." Following discussion, the proposed revision to the Faculty Constitution's By-Laws was approved as amended.

RESOLUTION #97-14 (Following the Chancellor's approval of the revision to the Constitution's By-Laws, copies of the revised section will be incorporated into the ECU Faculty Manual, and will be distributed to all faculty in August 1997.)

F. Teaching Effectiveness Committee
Janna Brendell (Music), Chair of the Committee, presented first the recommendations concerning the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey which were:

1. discontinue the trial of the new SOIS instrument for Spring semester, 1997;
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.

Jones (Social Work) expressed concerns about the potential for unsubstantiated student comments being returned to administrators and not only to the instructor. Bob Thompson (Planning and Institutional Research) indicated that there was only one copy and it would be disbursed to the instructor. Taggart (Music) indicated that some classes have only empty forms returned without comment. Greene (Communication) asked about the addition of the summary question, should the summary question be placed on the front of the form? Thompson indicated that the summary question should come at the end after the other questions have been answered. Allred (Psychology) asked about the calculation of the summed scores. Thompson explained the calculation. Wilson (Sociology) suggested an editorial change to the form to read: "recommend the adoption of the new SOIS form to be used according to the Revised Principles to Guide the Use of the Student Opinion Data (FS Resolution #95-24)" The editorial change was accepted.
Satterfield (Art) asked about the principles by which the SOIS instrument was generated. Chair Sexauer indicated that the instrument was under discussion and not the principles. Hough (Faculty Assembly Delegate) asked about the merit of including a summary question and its sole use in evaluation. Thompson indicated that the summary question was the best indicator and that it should not be used solely for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Ferrell (History) asked if we need only a one question survey form. Ferrell stated that if the survey was used as an evaluative instrument for teaching would it not be a grievable process. Thompson indicated that any administrator who uses only one SOIS question for evaluation of teaching effectiveness was, in his opinion, doing a poor job and that might be grievable. If the summary question was taken out of context it would not be a good indicator. Professor Ferrell asked if Planning and Institutional Research could provide an average grade point for courses and indicated that an average may be a good indicator. He also asked if required courses could be separated from elective courses? Professor Thompson indicated that could be done.

Worthington (Medicine) asked who gets the data? Was that not a part of the pad? Simon (Political Science) suggested that chairs do take into consideration the kinds of courses the instructor teaches. Ulffers (Music) asked if there could be an instructor summary form as in the old form. Miller (Philosophy) pointed out that improved teaching effectiveness results in students learning more and not an increase in popularity. Woodside (Math) suggested that the form be handed out in subsequent classes. Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) asked whether the questions have been validated? Would the best assessment of teaching effectiveness be with students after graduation and entry into the job market?

Following discussion, the recommendations concerning the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey were approved as editorially amended. RESOLUTION #97-15 (Copies of the new SOIS form may be obtained from the office of Planning and Institutional Research, Spillman Building, ext. 6288.)

Professor Brendell then presented the proposed revisions to the Alumni Teaching Awards procedures. Anderson (Education) asked when these changes would go into effect? Professor Brendell indicated next year. Following discussion, the proposed revisions were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-16 (Copies of the revised procedures are available in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex.)

G. Unit Code Screening Committee
Bill Grossnickle (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented the revised Unit Codes of Operation for the Departments of Sociology, Geology, and Communication. There was no discussion and the revised Unit Codes of Operation were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-17 (Copies of the revised codes, as well as codes from any other academic unit on campus, may be viewed in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex.)

H. University Curriculum Committee
Jim Smith (Business), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the 13
February 1997, Committee meeting. The minutes of 27
February 1997, will be acted upon at the April meeting.
There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were
approved as presented. RESOLUTION #97-18 (Copies of
these minutes have been distributed to all units and are
available on the Faculty Senate web page.)

Agenda Item VI. New Business

Ferrell (History) offered the following motion: "Resolved that
the Readmission Appeals Committee consider the viability of
adjusting the University schedule to allow for appeals for
readmissions to occur at the conclusion of the second
semester of the academic year. To accomplish this goal, the
determination of readmittance for each student would occur
at that time." The motion was accepted and the Chair of the
Faculty will forward this on to the Readmission Appeals
Committee for their consideration. A report will be
presented to the Faculty Senate next Fall. RESOLUTION
#97-19

Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) moved that a study be
done to validate the data generated by the SOIS instrument.
Thompson (Planning and Institutional Research) stated that it was
an opinion survey and not a measure of teaching effectiveness.
Even so, it is an important source of data for instructors and
administrators. The question should be directed more to the
principles rather than the instrument. Singhas (Biology)
asked about the timing of administering the survey
instrument. Miller (Philosophy) restated that the SOIS was
an opinion survey but the use was the primary method of
assessing teaching effectiveness. There was no correlation.
Farr (English) asked about whether this was a purchased
form with validated questions. Thompson indicated that part
of the new form was derived from a purchased form but had
not been validated like the purchased form. Simon (Political
Science) indicated that the University does use more than
one form for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
Everett (Nursing) spoke against the motion stating that there
were other issues that needed to be looked at rather than
SOIS. Vice Chancellor Ringeisen announced that he was
planning to develop workshops for unit administrators
concerning evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
Anderson (Education) referred to the Seven Characteristics
of Effective Teaching (Resolution #91-29) that was
formulated by the Faculty Senate in 1991, and that these
characteristics should be disseminated and discussed.
Sexauer (Chair of the Faculty) responded that those
characteristics would be disseminated in some manner to
faculty.

Following the discussion Ciesielski (Industry and
Technology) asked to withdraw the motion at this time. He
stated that he would review the issue in light of the
discussion and consider a motion at a later date. The
motion was withdrawn.

There being no further business to come before the Faculty
Senate at this time, the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.