FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF 6 OCTOBER 1998

The second regular meeting of the 1998-99 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, 6 October 1998, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of 8 September 1998, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Singhas (Biology), Schneider (Business), Gabbard (Education), Gares (Geography), Boswell (Health and Human Performance), Kennedy (Industry and Technology), Dudek (Medicine), and Uffers (Music).

Alternates present were: Professors Greene for Duke (Communication), Dossor for Shea (Human Environmental Sciences), Eudey (Math), Jendraslak for Fiordalisi (Medicine), Tafra for Lannin (Medicine) and Shinpaugh for Joyce (Physics).

Announcements
1. Chancellor Eakin has approved the following resolution from the 8 September 1998, Faculty Senate meeting:
   98-24 Recommendations concerning cross-listed courses.
2. The Academic Calendar Committee has accepted a request by the Department of Physics to no longer offer a common examination time for PHYS 1251 and 1261, effective immediately. The examination will be given on the last regular meeting of the laboratory (as for other one credit hour courses).
3. The next Faculty Assembly meeting is scheduled for Friday, 6 November 1998, at 9:00 a.m. in Chapel Hill. Faculty, with issues they feel need to be addressed by this body, should contact one of the five Faculty Assembly Delegates listed:
   * Lou Everett  * Henry Ferrell  * Rita Reaves  * Allan Rosenberg  * Brenda Killingsworth.

C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
Richard Eakin, Chancellor, stated that the General Assembly is hard at work and should be finished within the next week or two. We hold high hopes the several items in that budget for ECU will persist and if they do, this budget will be very beneficial for East Carolina. We are also preparing the salary increment forms which should allow us to have the pay increases by the end of October. Over the course of the last several weeks now I have been in conversations with the vice chancellors and others with the Board of Trustees. These conversations have been very fruitful, very positive and very helpful to East Carolina. They will culminate over the next few days in a Trustees' retreat to determine their interests and planning for ECU's long-term growth and see if we can agree on some common goals not only for the next year or two but for the longer term. I will be reporting the results back to the campus community. Q.
Professor Jones (Social Work and Criminal Justice Studies):
Will the 1% one time increase be handled separately? A. I believe it will be handled at the same time. It is my understanding that the 3% pool is part of the ongoing and continuing basis for salaries while the 1% is strictly a bonus, a one time payment. It is my understanding that all the payments will be made at the same time. If what I said today is incorrect about the end of the month then I will be sure to communicate with the chair.

D. Vice Chancellor's Report
Richard Ringelsen, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that the chair asked him to talk about distance education. The UNC system is very involved with, concerned with and working toward statewide statements of policy, etc. on distance education. The University of North Carolina will provide distance education as an integral part of its overall strategy for making higher education accessible to all citizens of North Carolina. Our distance education audience is a different audience than it was a few years ago. The audience is now primarily adult learners among our citizens. The University of North Carolina will likely make two goals for distance education: 1) We will not compete with community colleges. If we offer bachelor's degrees at all, it will be degree completion programs. That has to do with funding for continuing education. 2) The other major emphasis in the UNC system will be post-baccalaureate programs of some sort, maybe full graduate programs but also lateral entry programs. Here at ECU we are very involved in the lateral entry program for teachers for certification. We are encouraging that group to work toward an online type of service for those teachers and work individually with them online to define the courses and then give the courses online.

We are also looking at the possibility of an information science or information technology package of courses because there is such an incredible need for such people. The key element in terms of ECU's involvement in distance education has to do with continuing education funding in the budget bill which is at the state house. The money can be used for anything that enhances our ability to deliver off-campus courses and programs. That funding is very likely to have a profound effect on our ability to teach these courses over time. It is very important as we add distance education efforts that faculty have time to teach the course and to develop the course. This generates student credit hours just like our on-campus courses and this produces dollars and those dollars can be used for faculty training, faculty teaching. Chair Killingsworth sent a memo to 13 faculty senate committee chairs asking them to think about distance education and the implications for their committee's charge.

Real education is a service provider. They come in and consult with faculty members to put their course(s) on the web. It always remains the faculty member's course. At the end of the contract the content remains ours. What we are doing is using their template to develop the course, their servers and expertise to put the course online. In the contract as written they agree to help us get 20 courses up and running, the first group of which would be available this January. So they will be coming in a couple of weeks to work with our faculty. The first thing they do for you is to develop your online virtual university. They set everything up through their servers. Then they help develop the courses. Then they run all the technology for the three-year contract period. When that contract expires, the course content reverts to us. They have no right at all to those
courses. While maintaining the right to use their template, we still own the course and the course content. At the end of the contract, we can renew the contract, or end the contract and offer the courses ourselves. Out of 60 requests, we chose 5-6 for spring. Faculty developing these courses will be given release time, credit for load or some other further credit.

Q. Professor Anderson (Foreign Languages and Literatures): What about intellectual property rights? A. This is under very careful discussion all over this university. Last week Counselor Ben Irons presented to the faculty officers the latest version of copyright guidelines. The basic idea is to have property rights be what they have always been. I am anxious to have this be discussed and for there to be a resolution. Q. Professor Simon (Political Science): What has the UNC system proposed to do about duplication of courses on various campuses? A. The task force of academic officers has not addressed this question as yet. In the document that exists it says that where a need exists, there will be coordinated competition. We are likely to be offering courses at different institutions online. The idea is that it is impossible to have a course on the Internet and not have people in other locations taking the course. So there is a lot of language in the document about trying to cooperate. Another issue is joint campus degree courses. Who owns it, who gives the degree? The recommendation is going to be that a student affiliate with an institution and that institution award the degree. We are trying to solicit community college support by letting them know that we will not be competing with their courses. Chancellor Eaklin: In the past we have divided the state up geographically partly based on commuting time. Clearly that definition is gone. It is my understanding that we are presently offering a degree via the Internet in which we have students in South Korea and Australia. Turf is no longer an issue which can be nullified and we need to stand up for ourselves. Q. Professor Wilson (Sociology): How do we assure the quality of our students? A. Vice Chancellor Ringelsien: It is interesting that Professor Jack Brinn, School of Medicine, developed cell biology technology-based instruction for distance learners. The distance learners actually come to campus for their last experience and were found to do better than the on-campus learners. What we really need to do is engage your colleagues and ask how they feel on these issues. The important thing is that the course we are offering from our end is the same as the one that has that number here on campus. Q. Professor Parrlor (Human Environmental Sciences): Will real education recoup some of its costs by charging students? How will that work? A. Yes, this is just for our off-campus courses. What they do is charge per credit hour, a one or two credit hour course is $80 per student, a three credit hour course is $120 per student. If we get full funding for credit courses, then North Carolina students who by law will only pay in-state tuition, we will pick up the costs with the money that has been allocated. If we don't get that funding, it will be tacked on as a fee. Here's another question, can our on-campus students sign up for online courses? We can't stop them but for a real education course we can't use any of those dollars to enhance anything on campus. They would have to pay the $80 or the $120. We could not subsidize them with the continuing education money. Q. Professor Friend (Industry and Technology): Are formula funds for distance education only? A. Yes, they can be used for developing the technology necessary to reassign faculty, to hire faculty, to hire technologists as long as the funds are used for distance education. Q. Professor Miller (Philosophy): Distance
education will cost a lot of money. It will not be cost-effective. It will also take a lot of faculty time to communicate with each student by e-mail each day. It also is not cheap to install all the hardware and software and maintain it. Why is upper level administration so enthusiastic to do this if it is so costly? A. First, there are no data relevant to the cost. Second, we have a "mission to serve" obligation. Third, the cost for information technology is applicable to what we are doing every day. There is no turning back the clock in terms of information technology. Professor Sexauer (Art): In the year 2005 the state of North Carolina will have an additional 40,000+ students and no physical facilities to handle this large number of students, so what we are really doing is gearing up now. Q. Professor Green (Communication): Is there a way to create funding to have access to Power Point and other software, some parity here? A. We can't use the distance education funds that are being put in this year's budget, but we can use technology enhancement funds and other funds as well. Q. Professor Ferrell (History): Are you going to have more faculty positions or are you going to add to the duties of the existing faculty? I don't think that the latter will work. Are you going to add 50 more positions? A. An important thing about the continuing education credit funding is that we can buy your time. If faculty don't have time, it won't work. It is important that as we get these funds, the budget include time. We can actually take some of these funds and create faculty positions, if so desire. The difficulty is that no single department may be offering enough courses to have a whole position. Q. Professor Jones (Social Work and Criminal Justice Studies): What about more part-time instruction? A. It is possible that because we can't define a full position, it would be tenure track if it were a full position, but as we begin we'll make sure you have time to develop these courses. Also for a department that is heavily invested in that procedure, there is a possibility of getting a tenure track position. Q. Professor Simon (Political Science): Is there some systematic effort in the UNC system and at this institution to put together information on what successes and problems exist? What is going on to deal with trying to get some compilation of successes and failures? A. Actually I would encourage everyone to go to our technology fair on the 13th of October where a number of our faculty will demonstrate the ways they are using information technology in their classrooms. Another interesting point is that should the budget pass, there will be $100,000 for each campus to enhance faculty development centers, particularly to do things to help faculty who are engaged in technology.

E. Faculty Assembly Report

Henry Ferrell (History) reported that the Faculty Assembly on November 5, 1998, will sponsor a copyright colloquium on issues concerning ownership and use of copyrighted materials. As a prelude to developing a system-wide task force this colloquium is designed to educate faculty.

President Broad will be there and the Assembly delegates and alternates will be invited. President Broad spoke to the delegates: The annual budget is being passed piece by piece. Salaries have been approved with a 3% merit increase more or less plus a bonus of up to 2%. The raise will appear in the October check retroactive to July 1, 1998. The General Assembly has undertaken a salary study. What they have discovered is that Chapel Hill has the highest average salary in the system, $69,000 per professor across all ranks. The state is below that with $65,000. The president expressed concern that UNC Greensboro is so low. UNC at Greensboro averages $50,000 per professor.
and this is below the Doctoral I average in the US. ECU's average is $48,000 per professor. A study was done on faculty profiles in the UNC system over a 10-year span. In 1997 ECU had 47% tenured faculty, 20% on tenure track and 33% not on tenure track, 87% full-time faculty and 13% part-time faculty. Other institutions included in the survey with higher percentages of tenured faculty included: FSU 52%, NCSU 50% and UNC-CH 52%. Some of the other topics discussed were: new teaching models with distance learning, enrollment surge, and review of post tenure review. Regarding post tenure review, there are a lot of differences in each of the institutions in the system and there are beginning to be legal questions about whether or not there should be a common process for reviewing, particularly for permanent tenure. Also discussed: What is the role and function of free classes to retired people? Should they be available online too? This is a serious issue because once you are over 65, tuition is free. These are the kinds of things we talked about. Regarding distance learning, Vice President Judith Pulley, VP for Planning, was asked about duplication. If several institutions in the system have similar courses online, is that duplication? She said they will make sure there is no duplication.

Additional remarks: Professor Rosenberg (Medicine): At the Assembly meeting they gave a report regarding the professional development advisory committee. This committee was convened to look at professional development initiatives statewide. We have met several times. What we have done is look at the charges given us last year which included: teaching effectiveness, assessment of learning, instruction technology and shared development, all issues that are paramount here at ECU. Regarding each of the charges, not only did we visit each campus, but several members of the committee participated with a national organization to look at other universities as to what they are doing in instructional technology in distance education. One member visited Central Florida which has a very large initiative in distance education and technology. He reported to the committee last week. Some of the issues that came up were the cost of those particular educational experiences and the assessment of student learning. We are now in the process of creating a final draft to the Board of Governors. The draft will include a proposed professional development group or consortium statewide to share expertise of the various campuses. Funding will be requested in the amount of about $450,000. Following approval there will be a grouping together from a central person, a director for professional development at the university level, and each campus will individually and independently not only have teaching and learning centers but will have the ability to be funded to provide workshops for faculty in the areas of expertise pertaining to the charge.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business
A. Students in Academic Difficulty
A report was distributed from Dorothy Muller, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, on Students in Academic Difficulty for the Senators Information. This report was requested at the 8 September 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting.

B. Department of Athletics Position Paper on ECU
Academic Retention Standards
Chair Killingsworth stated that the Credits Committee would consider the issues involved related to retention standards and will report to the Faculty Senate in either November or December. Chancellor Eakin: A little history may help in understanding how this document arose. The problem was
that I thought we had a representative from the Athletics Department on the original committee to look at retention standards who I thought would involve the Athletics Department in such a way so as to ensure full conversation among them. It turns out that conversation did not occur. It is my understanding that their representative did not take the information back to the Athletics Department and operated as a committee of one within the Athletics Department. This gave rise to the Athletics Department's concern as brought forth in this document. Q. It is my understanding that this report got to the Board of Trustees because the Board of Trustees asked about the position of the Athletics Department on this issue.

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees
A. Faculty Welfare Committee
Kathryn Greene (Communication), Chair of the Committee, stated that the Faculty Welfare Committee requested from the Chancellor that he withhold approval of what was passed last time until we were able to deal with a particular problem. The Faculty Welfare Committee Report (Attachment 2) has a slight change having to do with the electronic mail address. That is the first issue that we have. The Faculty Welfare Committee asked to revisit this issue because of two particular concerns. The first concern is, as was mentioned to us, Microsoft is not a vendor at the School of Medicine and the Health Sciences Library. The second concern has to do with making changes in the faculty manual every time we change vendors. So in Attachment 2 what you see in 2.a.1) is "electronic mail account". Second issue: In 2.a.8) "Free campus parking decal, valid in all locations, with the exception of private parking lots" we propose the following amendment: add after "valid in all" the phrase "staff and university registered". The amended 2.a.8) now reads "Free campus parking decal, valid in all staff and university registered locations, with the exception of private parking lots." Amendment passed. Resolution #98-25 (Please refer to the list of resolutions at the end of this report for the full revision to the ECU Faculty Manual.)

B. Faculty Grievance Committee
Gene Hughes (Business), Chair of the Committee, stated that in reference to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix Y, Section IV, the Faculty Grievance Committee submits their annual report for the 1997-98 academic year. Of the grievances initiated during the past academic year, 6 proceeded to STEP TWO; 5 proceeded to STEP THREE; 2 proceeded to STEP FOUR; 2 proceeded to STEP FIVE; and 2 proceeded to STEP SIX. Of this number, 2 reports were subsequently submitted by the committee to the Chancellor. Of grievances initiated prior to the last academic year, 1 is still in process; none proceeded to STEP SIX; and none were submitted to the Chancellor. The number of grievances by category include: 1-evaluation; 1-age discrimination; 1-denial of promotion; 2-salary, violations of personnel file; and 1-disability discrimination. Of these grievances, 6 have submitted Petition for Redress and 2 requested a hearing and the hearing was granted. Regarding the 2 hearings, 1 report was submitted to the Chancellor and 1 report was submitted to a unit head. Of the grievances initiated during the last academic year, none were appealed to the Chancellor; none were appealed to the Board of Trustees or beyond, and 1 appeal is still in progress. Of grievances initiated prior to the last academic year, no decisions were appealed. There were no questions.

Agenda Item VI. New Business
There being no further business to come before the Faculty
Senate at this time, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.