The fifth regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, January 28, 2003, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order
Bob Morrison, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of December 3, 2002, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Conner-Kerr and Painter (Allied Health Sciences), Gares (Geography), Willson (Medicine), Uffers (Music), Engelke and Williams (Nursing), Mooney (Sociology), Chancellor Muse, Administrative Council Representative Varner and Parliamentarian Anderson (Education).

Alternates present were: Professors House for Twarog (Art), Schmidt for Kalmus (Biology), Chandler for Markowski (Human Environmental Sciences), and Drees for Tranbarger (Nursing).

B. Announcements
- Weekly reports on undergraduate admissions are available on the Admission and Retention Policies Committee website at http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/ad/reports.htm.
- Activities of the Commission on Scholarship are available on the Faculty Senate website at http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/CommissiononScholarship/Commission.htm.
- The Faculty Senate office and both the Joyner Library and Health Sciences Library have the current 2002-2003 Academic Salary Listing on file for interested faculty.
- Listings of the 2003-2004 Research/Creative Activity Grants and Teaching Grants awarded for this academic year were distributed to each Senator.
- In order to have curriculum changes included in the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalog, the Committee Chair (cucsubmissions@mail.ecu.edu) should receive any curriculum information no later than February 13, 2003. Final curriculum matters for inclusion in the catalog will be considered at the February 27, 2003, University Curriculum Committee meeting.
- Letters concerning unit elections for the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators by January 31. In accordance with the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.
- The Committee on Committees has been charged to seek volunteers to serve on the various academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. The deadline for submission of a committee volunteer preference form is February 15, 2003. This year, faculty members have two ways to volunteer for service on the various standing University committees.
  - At One Stop, a faculty member signs in using his or her user name and password and after submitting that information, he or she clicks on Faculty Committee Volunteer Form under “Employee” section and completes the committee volunteer preference form. This information is then submitted directly to the Committee on Committees.
  - Or a faculty member may complete the volunteer preference form via the Faculty Senate website and forward the completed form to the Faculty Senate office at facultysenate@mail.ecu.edu.
- The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the December 3, 2002, Faculty Senate meeting:
  - 02-40 New paragraph added to the ECU Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, Subsection: General Requirements for Graduation.
- The Chancellor has denied the following resolution since this position has been eliminated:
  - 02-42 Revised University Athletics Committee charge to include the addition of the “Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs” as an ex-officio member without vote, but with all other parliamentary privileges.
- The Chancellor has approved the following resolution with modifications as noted below:
  - 02-43 Proposed Parking Plan Resolution - “The proposal to provide all retired faculty with a free Zone A permit may not be consistent with maintaining an oversell ration of 1.1 in that lot. A final determination at whether retired faculty permits will be Zone A or B will be made before the plan is implemented. Additionally, it is not clear that a public transportation system that merges the Student Transit System with the City of Greenville is in the best interest of the campus community.”
interest of our students or the University; further analysis and consideration will be needed before a final decision is made.”

- Thanks was extended to Professors Nancy House (Art) and Joe Ciechalski (Education), both Faculty Senate Alternates, for serving as Tellers during the meeting.

C. William Muse, Chancellor
Chancellor Muse was unable to attend the meeting. Kris Smith, Director of Institutional Research and Testing provided the group with a report on the Faculty Employment Categories as of Fall 2002.

Wolfe (Anthropology) indicated that the Department of Anthropology had eight permanently tenured faculty members, not four. Faculty Senators were asked to forward any discrepancies in the report to the Faculty Senate office for further research and clarification.

Ferrell (History) expressed concern that the data indicated a tendency for the University to be increasingly dependent on fixed term faculty, and wondered if that policy was consistent with the goal of striving for academic excellence. Dr. Swart indicated that this issue was under consideration in the Faculty Welfare Committee, and although we are currently underfunded by a substantial number of faculty positions, that he supported hiring more tenure-track faculty.

D. Vice Chancellor’s Report
William Swart, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, expressed his appreciation for participation in the Provost’s Convocation and indicated that it would become a reoccurring event. He also reminded the faculty of the upcoming Town Meetings (and the associated URL) that could be used as a forum to provide faculty input. He indicated that he is looking for inputs into most of the things that were talked about in the convocation, especially regarding the definition of what a “College” and a “School” might be in terms of their implementation at ECU. As to the proposed reorganization, he noted that Social Work and Criminal Justice have already become involved in discussions with the School of Human Environmental Sciences as to how they might become integrated into a new College. Dr. Swart attended some of the discussions in the department of Computer Science as to how they might potentially go to the School of Industry and Technology. This school might also include Engineering, resulting in a School of Technology, Engineering and Computer Science (TECS). We have identified a potential new College that might include the Department of Communications: the College of Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts. Dr. Swart will be meeting with the combined School of Music, the School of Art, the Department of Theater and Dance, and the Department of Communications on the 3rd of February. He indicated that all of these changes are ongoing, have not been finalized, and that more discussion will be forthcoming. Further, based on a memo from UNC Vice President Gretchen Bataille, we have not yet run these proposed plans through the process involving the Board of Governors.

In regards to the reorganization of administrative functions (that have not been announced), Dr. Swart indicated that he wanted to lessen the need for students going back and forth with questions from one department or another by combining all activities that relate to recruitment and retention under “one roof”, so that students will have “one-stop-shopping”. What this means is that the concept of an undergraduate college becomes unnecessary and the recruiting, retention, and orientation functions have been placed under Dr. Henry Peele.

Dorothy Muller (Dean, Undergraduate Studies) will become an assistant to Dr. Swart to essentially be a project manager working with new initiatives such as the three-year bachelors program beginning this summer. We do not have much time to do this, in that it will require effort and coordination from academic departments. Housing, Financial Aid, Dinning Services, and etc. must all be involved.

Concerning the fact that we have similar undergraduate services relating to students seeking part-time employment in Co-Op Education, Career Management (in the Counseling Center) and Internships (spread over many departments), Dr Swart has suggested the creation of a new division: Student Professional Development. The goal of this division is to support students in becoming the employees of choice by complimenting their four years of classroom activities with four years of concurrent hands-on experience. We face the responsibility of looking at how we must implement this concept of “Community-based Learning” in order to focus the resources of our students and faculty on community problems. We will be going outside to find a person to lead this division with strong skills in community-based learning.

Dr Swart announced the three remaining Provost Lectures, beginning with Dr. McCauley-Bell on February 5th. Dr. Swart concluded by reviewing some of the details of a very productive lunch yesterday with the minority faculty in order to instigate a dialogue on campus diversity.

Taggart (Music) expressed his deep appreciative for Dr. Swart’s participation in the last music scholarship gala. Yet, given the fact that Dr. Taggart has been reduced to begging for basic resources such as chalk, he was concerned that the extensive reorganization, coupled with the poor health of the State economy, would continue to produce dire economic consequences and a lack of resources. Dr Swart indicated that by reducing administrative costs and other measures that resources would be available. Dr. Swart took this time to address questions raised during earlier senate sessions concerning hiring a new dean in music. The reorganization should lead to the reduction of two current Dean positions and the acquisition of a new Dean for Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts. Assuming that the reorganization is ...

https://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fs Online/senate minutes/fsr1_03.cfm
acceptable, the plan would be to immediately staff the leadership roles (Directors) in Art and Music so that they could participate in the search for the Dean of the entire College. The Dean would then assume a role in marketing, raising funds, and other more global outside matters, rather than being involved in running the Schools.

Sugar (Education) noted that one of the issues mentioned in the convocation involved five-year plans and departmental goals. He asked what role or influence would academic units have in the formation and evaluation of those goals? He noted that Dr. Swart also mentioned that funding would be connected to the achievement of those goals. Dr Sugar asked if there was an initial formula or idea as to how that would be connected? Dr. Swart indicated that his initiatives always start with an end in sight and that he does have a vision as to what that would be like. We will be working closely with you to develop these goals. Yet, these discussions have not started and would take a long time today to talk about. He asked if this question could be re-presented a couple of months from now?

Martinez (Foreign Languages) expressed concern about a recent directive given to the Deans of Schools and Colleges concerning the need to increase diversity among the faculty. Dr. Martinez stated that the way that this was being actually implemented was confusing, and wondered if Dr Swart could offer comments. Dr. Swart replied that he felt that it is important for students to experience diverse perspectives as part of any well-rounded education. This University has about 120-150 minority faculty members, a very small percentage and far too few to offer students different points of view. He said that he told the deans that we need to increase diversity, and that they were free to pursue this goal in ways best suited to their own situation, but that if we did not see results then stronger measures would be taken next time. There are exceptional minority and women candidates in the marketplace and we should actively pursue these individuals.

E. Bob Morrison, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Morrison stated that at their December 13, 2002 meeting, the Board of Trustees passed the new parking plan. The plan was that presented to the Faculty Senate except retired faculty would get free Zone B parking. The Senate had passed an amended resolution to allow retired faculty to have free Zone A parking. Chair Morrison stated that he had spoken in favor of the Zone A amendment, and Board members had several questions about the effect this would have on the 1.1 sell ratio. At the Trustees’ meeting, Richard Brown indicated the parking plan was still being studied, and that some minor adjustments may be made to it as they collect and analyze more data. Chair Morrison stated that the only action item from the Academic Affairs Committee was the authorization of the conferral of degrees that was approved at the December 14, 2002 Faculty Senate meeting. He stated that the Finance and Facilities Committee discussed projects under design, such as the West End Dining Hall ($15,856,812), renovations to the Flanagan Building ($13,884,226), Family Practice Center ($23,500,000), Schools of Allied Health, Nursing and Health Sciences Library ($57,935,955) and the Harrington Field Baseball Stadium expansion ($7,500,000). He stated that they had also discussed projects under construction such as the Science and Industrial Technology Building ($65,795,399), renovations to the Leo Jenkins Cancer Center ($647,400) and the addition to the Rivers Building ($11,997,300). Chair Morrison stated that Vice Chancellor Richard Brown discussed an All-Funds Expenditure Budget Presentation for FY 2002-2003 that he had made out for the University Budget Committee so they could understand where all the money goes. State appropriations account for only 37% of the university’s budget.

The Commission on Scholarship has been meeting regularly every two weeks. They met last week, January 24 to discuss a draft report. That report among other things will define alternative definitions of scholarship, in addition to our traditional form of research and creative activity. The Commission will be making a report to the Faculty Senate in the near future, and will be making a recommendation to the Faculty Governance Committee on some additions to Appendix C on Personnel Policies and Procedures. Chair Morrison then stated that, as we know, the Provost has proposed a number of organizational changes. The process for making these changes are outlined in Appendix L, and require proposals with vestigial codes for moving, or dividing, or dissolving, or merging, or renaming departments or schools. The faculty of the affected units must vote on the proposals. Then the proposals will be submitted to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee where they will be reviewed. Recommendations from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee will then come to the Faculty Senate for approval. The Faculty Senate and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee have a lot of work to do over the next few months, or weeks, when these proposals start coming in to the committee.

F. Bertus Ferreira, Interim Director of International Programs
Professor Ferreira discussed the need to increase the number of international students coming to ECU and students here that choose to study abroad. Currently we have 187 students from overseas at ECU, which is less than 1% of our student population. This compares to a State average of 2% and a National average of 4%. We have 25 students studying abroad. That number needs to increase dramatically so that we can expose our students to the rest of the world. Dr. Ferreira asked the faculty with overseas connections to help in recruiting more [international] students to come to ECU and asked all faculty to become more involved with these students. He also discussed the need for financial assistance in terms of scholarship money. There are many very good students abroad that could come here from poor countries if they had financial assistance. Dr. Ferreira indicated that he would be forming a task force to begin planning for a minor in Arabian studies and will be looking at ways to revive the Language Institute for English. He also asked the faculty for support with the reinstatement of faculty study groups, which would allow those with international backgrounds and others to share diverse points of view in an organized setting.
Wilentz (English) noted that one of the obstacles with getting international students concerns the lack of tuition remissions at the graduate and undergraduate level. Dr. Ferreira agreed and again noted that funding related issues were of a vital concern.

Gepperline (Chemistry) commented that one way faculty could stimulate increases in international students at ECU and in ECU students abroad was through grant writing. A number of agencies will provide funds to send domestic students to international labs. This is a major recruiting tool for talented students and a good way to build international collaboration.

G Question Period
Faculty are encouraged to participate in the Question Period of the Faculty Senate meeting. This period allows faculty an opportunity to ask questions of administrators and others present relating to activities of the administration or Faculty Senate committees.

Wall (Philosophy) asked the Provost to expand and provide more details concerning his vision of four years in the classroom complemented by four years of hands on training? Dr Swart noted that that we are facing growth at this University and that we are running out of space so our major issue is how we are going to accommodate this growth. One way to do this is by increasing our capacity by 25%. If we get students through here in three years instead of four years we have increased our capacity without changing resources. This will use these resources much more effectively in the summer. Secondly, our students, after four years, have an average debt of $13,000. This is a tough load for a new graduate. What we want to do is to trade four calendar years for three years when they can go year round. If you go on to get a Master’s in four or five years then we have something to offer that very few Universities have available. The benefit to the student is the expected lifetime earnings of someone with a Master’s degree are from $500,000 to $1,000,000.

Scott (Academic Library Services) asked if the Chancellor’s report on Faculty Employment Categories could be provided electronically? The Faculty Senate Office will make this provision.

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. University Curriculum Committee
Dale Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the January 9, 2003, Committee meeting. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-01**

B. Academic Standards Committee
John Tilley (History), Chair of the Committee, first presented a progress report on the Review of the University’s General Education Course Goals and Objectives. The academic Standards committee is a relatively new committee, created last year. During the course of business last year we became aware that there was a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with the general education system and with the procedures by which courses carrying general education credit are identified. Hence, a broad-scale review and evaluation of these goals and objectives (as currently contained in **RESOLUTION #94-11**) was commissioned last April by the Chair of the Faculty. Dr. Tilley noted that his report would be divided into sections on what the committee is attempting to do and on what it has done so far. As to what the committee is trying to do:

1. The committee first attempted to get a handle on what the University wanted the general education program to look like in the future. Input from as many sources as possible was solicited as to what (if anything) was wrong and what (if anything) should be done about the problem.
2. The committee is conducting research about the current thinking on the subject of general education through out the profession, including the UNC system and other institutions.
3. The committee also attempted to determine what impact the SACS mandated assessment process would have on the project.
4. The committee decided to establish and document a basic philosophy of what general education is about at ECU. This would be archived in a manner that everyone (including students) could have access to the materials.
5. The committee realized that it would need to establish a new set of general education requirements (i.e., how many courses, in what areas, a person has to take to meet the general education requirement).
6. The establishment of a specific set of goals and objectives that a course has to meet in order to carry general education credit was also examined.
7. The final goal was to establish a new set of guidelines and procedures for identifying the courses that will carry general education credit.

Dr. Tilley indicated that last October the committee drafted an e-mail message that was sent out to all members of the faculty and administration soliciting their input on specific questions that pertained to general education. As of today, he has had 35 of these returned. All of the input in the responses has been passed to the committee for review. The Provost
attended one of the committee meetings last year and passed on some of his ideas. The committee has also received a package of materials from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. All of this will be taken into consideration. At the moment the committee is getting ready to solicit information from students. The committee has arranged for the East Carolinaian to give some coverage for this endeavor, and several members of the committee will be attending a meeting of the SGA Senate. The committee will set up a series of forums or hearings where faculty and the campus community will be invited to give further input. Dr. Tilley noted that the committee has compiled a file on how other UNC system Universities handle general education. One of the resources the committee found particularly useful was a book titled “Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College” (http://www.greaterexpectations.org/) (2002), Association of American Colleges and Universities (http://www.aacu-edu.org/). We looked at several other programs at other institutions that were brought to our attention, such as Old Dominion, William and Mary, and Miami of Ohio. The committee also met with Dr. Poteat who is in charge of assessment, to establish a relationship between the assessment process and what the committee is doing. We were told that we should come up with the best system possible and that his team would then figure out how to assess the various programs. Dr. Tilley indicated that a draft of the philosophy of the general education plan is included as Attachment 1.

Wall (Philosophy) asked about the 2nd paragraph [Attachment 1]: "The Foundations Curriculum complements specialized studies in the major and provides a broad context for exploring both personal and career choices." Dr. Wall asked if the use of the word “complements,” meant that the Foundations Curriculum is going to be tailored to specialized studies? Dr. Tilley responded that the committee has been thinking about the question of where upper and lower level courses should fit in this picture. There are two potential problems: one deals with assessment (which has been addressed), and one deals with the articulation agreement between the UNC system and the Community College system, which says that students who come in with a two-year associate degree will have the general education requirement met. Anytime we designate something as general education we immediately excuse a considerable number of students. That is the reason we adopted the term "Foundations Curriculum"; so that it can include upper level courses. We can develop language that will avoid exempting people who come in from the Community Colleges from those upper level requirements. Dr. Tilley indicated that the committee’s concept of the Foundation Curriculum is that it will not just be a gathering of courses that it would be nice for all to take. There will be some connection between the courses in the majors and the courses to satisfy the foundations requirement. The committee is exploring the idea of “clusters” and the concept that these courses must somehow be related to each other so that there is a coherent pattern.

Gemperline (Chemistry) also asked about the wording of the second paragraph, indicating that it seemed somewhat vague. Do we really mean to say that “…the foundation curriculum complements…” or do we mean that the “…foundation curriculum underpins…”? He noted that Dr Tilley had mentioned in his talk that upper level courses would also be counted in the foundation curriculum. If that is the case, are they really foundation courses? Dr. Tilley indicated that this document [Attachment 1] was just a draft and could be changed. He noted, as an example of what could be meant by the term “upper level”, that one of the suggestions being examined is that every student be required to take a course that involves some form of community service. In many units there are [upper level] courses (such as internships) that entail community service, which could then be conceivably used to satisfy requirements for the foundation curriculum. Also in terms of answering questions relating to a diversity requirement, an upper level course might be more useful.

Ries (Mathematics) asked why mathematics was listed under “Skills” [Attachment 1] rather than under “Knowledge”? Dr. Tilley responded that what was intended was to give examples of the sorts of skills people should have when they have completed this program. Dr. Rigsby (Geology) also responded that the terms are just suggestions and examples.

Ferrell (History) asked, if under “Skills”, the term communication referred to language? Dr. Tilley indicated that it could mean language or some kind of computer skills. Dr. Ferrell also asked if the committee might be requesting a new curriculum? Dr. Tilley indicated that the suggestion has come up in some of the input received by the committee that some new courses are needed. The interrelationship between this committee and the academic units has to be crucial to this process. He indicated that he did not think the committee has the prerogative of ordering units to do anything. It would be in order to work with units as to the feedback received by the committee relating to certain academic needs etc.

Professor Tilley then presented proposed revisions to the University Policy for Distance Education Class Evaluations.

Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked if, given that it seems impractical to approach distance education in the same semester method as other courses, there has been discussion regarding not locking us into the last week of classes that puts us into the standard way of doing things? Dr. Tilley replied that the concern was the timing of the four relevant final exam days. In regular semester courses on-campus students have to fill out their evaluation forms before final exams. The factor that brought this to the committee was that until the faculty senate approved this language the distance learning students were handing in their forms well after their final exam and it was perceived that this was inconsistent.

Pravica (Mathematics) asked who was in charge of sending out these forms. Dr. Tilley replied that it was up to the faculty member.

Following this discussion, the proposed revisions to the University Policy for Distance Education Class Evaluations were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #03-02 (Please refer to the list of resolutions at the end of this report for the
C. Committee on Committees
Henry Ferrell (History), Chair of the Committee, first presented the second reading of the revised Faculty Information Technology Committee charge.

Following discussion, the revised Faculty Information Technology Review Committee charge was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #03-03

Professor Ferrell then presented the nominees for three delegates and one alternate to the UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation. James Holloway (Business) was nominated as an alternate from the floor. The following (noted in bold print) were elected to serve as the University’s Delegation with terms expiring in 2006.

Ralph Scott
Academic Library Services

Purificacion Martinez
Foreign Languages and Literatures

Bob Morrison
Chemistry

Jacinta McElligott
Medicine

James Holloway
Business

Due to a miscalculation pertaining to illegal votes, the election for a Faculty Assembly alternate was ruled void by the Chair of the Faculty. Therefore, the election of a Faculty Assembly alternate will be held at the February 28, 2003, Faculty Senate meeting.

D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Bob Morrison (Chemistry), member of the Committee, presented a Request for Authorization to Plan a DPT- Doctor of Physical Therapy, stating that the Committee had forwarded their recommendation to the Chancellor. This report was presented for information only and did not require action by the Faculty Senate. (A copy of this request is available in the office of the Division of Academic Affairs.)

E. Faculty Governance Committee
Dee Dee Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed Policy on the Custody, Retention, Transfer and Access to Research Data and Records. This new policy would be included in the ECU Faculty Manual, Part VII. Research Information. There was no discussion and the proposed Policy on the Custody, Retention, Transfer and Access to Research Data and Records was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #03-04

Professor Glascoff then presented a proposed revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L., Section F. Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation.

Following discussion, the proposed revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L., Section F. Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation was approved as amended. RESOLUTION #03-05 (Please refer to the list of resolutions at the end of this report for the revised text.)

Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, Part V. Subsection I.M. Orientation of Courses. Dr. Glascoff stated that this document provided a list items that should be included for the initial class meeting. The first meeting should consume the full time allotted by schedule and all faculty members should have a syllabus for each course taught, which is on file with the appropriate administrator.

Pravica (Mathematics) asked why this should be available the first day of class rather than during first week? Dr. Glascoff indicated the intent was to provide information in a timely manner.

Niswander (Business) noted that we are only considering the bold text, and that information about the timing of the syllabus is already required.

Professor Glascoff reminded the faculty that there should be no posting of grades by social security number.

Wolfe (Anthropology) asked if a final was required for all courses, and should that be included? Dr. Glascoff stated that she believed that there was such a requirement.

Ferreira (Social Work) noticed that many times people alphabetize the lists of students such that ones identity is revealed regardless of what numbers are used.

Taggart (music) noted that a lot of what is listed in this document is actually required by law.
Schmidt (Biology) noted that in large classes where different numbers are made up and memorized by the students, significant amounts of time can be consumed by trying to figure out lost numbers. She wondered if it would be easier for the Registrar to assign a number for a student’s entire career.

Dr. Glascoff noted that the one-stop system would help with some of these problems.

Robbins (Biology) noted that there is an existing system already that comes from one-stop that gives you an e-mail listing based on your birthday (arranged in order) and is not personally verifiable. With a little editing it can be used for large classes.

Tovey (English) asked if we were only talking about the posting of grades during the end of the semester? Do we need something about the rest of the grades?

Hall (Psychology) understood that we are required to include more and more to put certain information on a syllabus, but noted that we are professionals and don’t need to be told how to do certain things. She asked if it would be possible for ITCS to randomly assign identification numbers on a semester-by-semester basis?

Finley (Human Environmental Sciences) noted that Blackboard was a very easy way to post grades that addresses the previous problems.

Niswander (Business) noted that the University is in the process (during the next two years) of switching over all student records to get away from using social security numbers.

Wall (Philosophy) asked if some of this information (such as weather) is given to us by other means [such as the alert system]?

Following discussion, a vote on the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Subsection I.M. Orientation of Courses was postponed until the February 25, 2003, Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Cope
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Psychology

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate office

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 28, 2003, MEETING**

03-01 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the January 9, 2003, Committee meeting.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

03-02 Revised University Policy for Distance Education Class Evaluations to read as follows:

“All student evaluations of instructors in distance education classes are to be submitted by the Monday following the last full week of classes in a given semester (i.e. no extension of deadlines following the completion of courses). To increase student response rates, all students enrolled in distance education courses will receive a reminder email prior to the deadline.”

**Disposition:** Chancellor

03-03 Revised *Faculty Information Technology Review Committee* charge.

**Disposition:** Faculty Senate

03-04 *Policy on the Custody, Retention, Transfer and Access to Research Data and Records*

**Disposition:** Chancellor

03-05 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L., Section F. Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation to read as follows:

1. The voting faculty of each unit shall vote on the effectiveness of the unit administrator. During March of the unit administrator’s fourth year of appointment and every fourth year thereafter, the voting faculty shall discuss and vote by secret ballot on the effectiveness of the unit administrator. Please refer to the ECU Policy on Review of Administrative Officers, dated 3-18-02.

2. Each unit will elect a Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation. For units with only one Personnel Committee, the elected chair of the Personnel Committee will serve as the Faculty Leader for the
Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation. For units with more than one Personnel Committee, the unit administrator will call a meeting of the chairs of the Personnel Committees during the fall semester preceding the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation. At that meeting, a voting faculty member of the unit will be nominated and elected by the chairs of the Personnel Committees within the unit to serve as the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Evaluation.

3. The Faculty Leader of the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation will call a meeting of the voting faculty during March of the following academic year. At that meeting, with the unit administrator absent, the faculty will discuss and vote by secret ballot on the effectiveness of the unit administrator. Absentee ballots must be made available for voting faculty members in advance of this meeting; ballots must be deposited with the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation prior to the meeting so that those ballots may be intermingled with and then counted along with ballots of faculty members present for the meeting. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation to ensure that absentee ballots and all other ballots are kept secret and confidential.

4. The balloting will be conducted by the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation, assisted by members of the Personnel Committee(s) from the unit. They shall distribute, collect, and count the ballots after adding any absentee ballots cast prior to the meeting. The unit administrator shall not vote in this procedure.

5. Before adjourning the meeting, the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation shall announce the results of the balloting to the voting faculty members. Immediately following the meeting, the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation shall convey to the unit administrator the results of the balloting. A copy of this correspondence shall also be submitted to the next higher administrative official by the Faculty Leader for the Quadrennial Unit Administrator Evaluation.

6. A negative vote by a majority of the voting faculty, excluding the unit administrator, shall constitute a recommendation that the unit administrator be removed. A decision to terminate an administrative officer's appointment shall be made by the Chancellor."

Disposition: Chancellor