ECU

2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2019
Video Live Stream

The fourth regular meeting of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate was held on **Tuesday, December 10, 2019,** at 2:10 pm in the East Carolina Heart Institute.

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
The November 11, 2019 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Su (Geography, Planning and Environment), Grodner (Economics), Sorensen (Criminal Justice), Allen (Chemistry), Stokes (Allied Health Sciences), Scott Mobley (Theatre and Dance), Vogelsong (Recreation Sciences), and Parker (Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Greer for Parker-Cote (Medicine), Poulin for Tuttle-Newhall (Medicine), Olson Lounsbery for Lockerbie (Political Science), and Martin for Roberson (Nursing).

B. Announcements
Full announcements are linked above and in the agenda.

Professor Popke reminded faculty that Professor Howard from the School of Communication has been appointed as University Ombuds. Faculty can consult with Dr. Howard during his office hours on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 9 am – 12 pm in the Belk Building, or by appointment (see full list of Announcements).

Professor Popke called attention to three Policies, Rules, and Regulations (PRRs) that had been reviewed by Faculty Officers. He reminded the Senators that when draft PRRs come across his desk that he consults with the officers to determine whether they should be sent for formal vetting to a committee. When a PRR does not get sent to a committee, it is reported in the Announcements. The PRRs in the Announcements are for International Travel By ECU Students, Student Health Services Eligibility for Care, and Minors on Campus. He explained that in their review, the Officers are concerned not to give busy work to committees if the issues are not related to faculty, but he encouraged faculty to get in the habit of reviewing the PRRs in the Announcements and bringing any concerns to his attention.

Professor Popke noted there are a number of items related to fixed-term faculty being discussed in the committees this academic year and the faculty officers have organized two open meetings to

discuss the concerns of fixed-term faculty. The dates are listed in the announcements: Wednesday, January 29 and Thursday, January 30.

Before moving on to the next item of business, Professor Popke asked all Chancellor Search Committee members to stand. He counted fourteen as present, and he asked four volunteers to leave. He explained that more than ten members of the search committee constituted a quorum and would be counted as an official, unpublicized meeting of the search committee. The requisite number of search committee members left.

C. Vern Davenport, Chair of the ECU Board of Trustees and Chancellor Search Committee
Mr. Davenport stated that the Chancellor Search Committee had their first meeting today. He apologized to committee members who had to leave to avoid quorum. He believes this search committee is diverse and represents a broad constituency of ECU, including students, faculty, staff, and local alumni. He wants the new chancellor to have the broadest range of support so that ECU does not experience the issues they had with previous chancellors (who had to step down or be replaced). The Chancellor Search Committee is planning to have 8-10 listening sessions in January so that faculty and other constituencies can provide input. They will also have an online survey available.

He said the feedback from the listening sessions and the online survey would be used to form a profile of desired characteristics and requirements for the next chancellor. He added that they would have an extraordinarily open and diverse candidate pool and process, and that he and other committee members had already received a great number of communications of interest from potential candidates. The Chancellor Search Committee outlined an "aggressive" time table at their meeting. They are hoping to have new chancellor by Fall 2020. *But* if they do not find the right person by the fall, they will take their time until the right candidate is identified. Mr. Davenport acknowledges that Pirate Nation is enthusiastic and that everyone understands ECU's importance to the region. The new chancellor must be comfortable with the region and participate in regional activities and customs. Mr. Davenport believes that the new chancellor needs to work with Vidant to continue to improve rural healthcare services. He believes ECU will find the perfect person for this position.

Mr. Davenport then asked the Senate about what they want in a new chancellor. What backgrounds, experiences, capabilities and strengths should the new chancellor possess? The following discussion ensued.

Professor Gruber (School of Music) presented a list of recommendations from School of Music. The School of Music faculty believe that ECU's new chancellor should meet the following criteria:

- has served a minimum of 10 years as teaching faculty at a university no smaller than ECU.
- has a minimum of 10 years of administration experience with budgetary responsibilities at a university no smaller than ECU.
- willing to submit a written essay that will be distributed to the entire ECU faculty, expressing personal qualifications for the job and why they are seeking the position.
- has a graduate degree and rank from established university so they can be tenured at ECU.
- has the ability to communicate clearly the needs of the faculty, students, university system, and community at large.
- has a commitment to the higher goals of ECU.

- is a leader in teaching and innovation.
- has a commitment to stand firm against economic pressures.
- will uphold our values of diversity, ethics, good will, transparency, and community engagement.
- needs to care about employment conditions for everyone.
- should consider a standard, university-wide meritorious multi-year contract policy for contingent laborers who have proved themselves with successful service. This is not only an ethical way to employ people, but eminently practical for our students and our institutions.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) noted that with interims filling many roles in upper administration, ECU is at a pivotal moment and this decision will resonate for years. He said he is deeply invested in this decision. Our new chancellor must be ethical, straight forward, committed to ECU's mission of serving Eastern North Carolina and the state, and be someone our students, faculty, staff, alumni, and external stakeholders can rally around. He said they must embrace Eastern NC and not see the position as a temporary placement while looking for something else. They need to have the background to understand the unique challenges of governing a large state-supported institution, ideally one with a medical school.

Professor Morehead said they must be familiar with shared governance, financial aid, granting agencies, economic development, and the challenges of dealing with multiple governing bodies. He said that eliminates people who have not spent significant time teaching, conducting research and engaging in creative activity, or supporting faculty. He said that he does not fundamentally believe that a nontraditional candidate is incapable of success, but there is a very steep learning curve in a culture that is not that of business or politics. With this new leader needing to replace capable academic leaders nearing their retirement, ECU cannot afford to have someone learning on the job and picking a leadership team without deep ties to the academic community.

Professor Morehead said that the new chancellor should not have any clear allegiances with local or statewide politicians or be plainly partisan. He granted that it is critical that they be capable politically, but they must build coalitions in a purple state likely to see shifts in the power structure with any election. Someone plainly partisan will have barriers to success within the university, the local community, and with the Board of Governors and the legislature. Not all share a common view of what ECU is and should be. We must clearly articulate our mission, values, and understanding of our place in the system to successfully build support for what we do, and that support cannot come from just fifty percent of the electorate. ECU has been in state and national news for the wrong reasons. A high-quality, experienced search firm is the only way we will get the right candidates when they have only seen our negative press. It is also important for the final candidates to come for a campus visit that includes as many stakeholders as possible. Professor Morehead objected to the idea that searches must be closed and that the candidate would not be open about being on job market. Do we want someone whose job is so precarious that applying for a new one would jeopardize it? Don't we want them to get to know the students, faculty, and other campus constituencies before they make such a momentous decision? Don't we want buy-in and support for an incoming chancellor?

Mr. Davenport spoke to these points. He said a campus search could be a dicey option relative to those who are currently holding a position. The search committee would look at the candidates and see how it goes relative to those candidates once they are in that process. He says it is paramount to protect confidentiality of the search, and the Chancellor Search Committee will not start with a search

firm. Instead they plan to entertain and solicit candidates in the next sixty days first to see what candidates are drawn in. He voiced belief that everyone would be unbelievably pleased and surprised by the candidates in the selection. If this approach does not yield a group of sufficiently quality candidates, the Chancellor Search Committee will employ a search firm or consultant. He noted that having Ron Mitchelson as Interim Chancellor gave them an opportunity to take more time, if needed. Mr. Davenport has firsthand experience with search firms. He explained that they have very strong staff support to vet candidates, and that he has spoken extensively with Dr. Roper about the strategy to begin without a search firm and engage one later, if necessary.

Professor Wolf (Physics) said faculty serve as institutional memory and know what works and what is a disaster. He noted that there have 6 Chancellor searches since 1977, and in the past these search committees had 3-5 faculty representatives. He asked for Mr. Davenport to comment on why there was a reduction in faculty on this Chancellor Search Committee.

Mr. Davenport answered that the next chancellor needs a diverse and wide committee. The candidate cannot have just faculty support, but needs widespread support from all of pirate nation. Mr. Davenport feels the candidate will be most successful if they appeal to this wide range of people. But he assured faculty that they are represented and that he will continue to solicit their feedback. The composition of the search committee was formed after getting feedback from new chancellors and existing chancellors, and the aim was to provide a broad subset of the ECU Pirate Nation ecosystem. He reassured faculty that they are represented and will continue to be involved in this process. He did not want the search committee overweighted one way or the other.

Chair Popke reminded the Senate of the questions being asked of faculty at this discussion with Mr. Davenport.

Professor Montgomery (English) thanked the Search Committee for attending this meeting. She said that ECU's mission is fundamentally academic in the broadest sense—to educate students to discover new knowledge and share that knowledge with our region and beyond. Given that is the mission and it is an academic mission at its core, the new chancellor must have qualifications to be a tenured professor here, have an administrative background with academic leadership experience, and have led an institution with a mission like ours. She said the size of the institution at which the candidate gained the leadership experience is not as important as having academic qualifications to be a faculty member and having academic leadership experience. She expressed her optimism about the path of the institution, the work that faculty, students, and staff do, and said she was looking forward to having a chancellor to lead them forward in their mission.

Professor Martinez (Parliamentarian, Foreign Languages and Literatures) thanked the Search Committee for attending the Senate meeting. She wanted the committee to visit more often to see the important work faculty do for shared governance. She said she wants a new chancellor who understands what it means when they hear that ECU has a strong system of shared governance. This means they understand it involves the three main legs of faculty, senior administration, and the Board of Trustees, and that they understand what the responsibilities are of each part. She noted that a search firm would actively seek candidates for the position, and she asked how the search committee or system staff will perform that role and contact ideal candidates? She added that the ideal candidate will have had a leadership role in their institution, preferably at an access institution. How will the search committee actively recruit a diverse pool and not just wait for someone to apply?

Mr. Davenport responded that we first need to establish what we want in a candidate and added that "we are engaging in shared governance right now." He said we have to define what we want in our next chancellor here and at the other listening sessions over the next 60 days and communicate that out into the marketplace. He added that faculty likely know someone they would like to talk to about being chancellor, and that he had people in his ecosystem and other members of the search committee did as well that could be approached. He said there had already been a lot of interest shown, and that the first priority was to get clear on what we want in the next chancellor. Mr. Davenport believes that people who want this job will actively seek it out. He reiterates that if it takes 2 years to find the right candidate, they will use that time. But they would like the process to be as expedient as possible.

Professor Altman (Kinesiology) said the position would be more enticing if the school adopted the "strong Provost" model. This promotes a clarity and cohesiveness.

Professor Justice (Business) spent 25 years in HR and served on many search committees. She asked the Chancellor Search Committee to pay attention to the culture and the values of ECU. What is their motivation to want to be at ECU? She cautioned the search committee about underestimating the significance of those who understand our culture. She said faculty need to be supportive of the search and trust the committee. Professor Justice noted that active candidates are not always the best candidates. She said usually the best candidates are those we tap on the shoulder, and that is hard work on the search committee. She is worried that active candidates who come to us without a search firm are "running" away from something rather than running to something. She said the search committee should be wary of influx of interest because if the homework is not done to properly vet those candidates, it can get us in trouble.

Professor Greer (School of Medicine) thanked her peers for their contribution to this discussion. She said she would like the chancellor to be a full professor, an administrator in academia, with at least 5 years of experience as senior executive officer. She asserted that when a leader is chosen from a non-academic domain, that person is being set up for failure. The candidate needs to be transformative leader who is team-orientated and values-directed, who has the capability to balance the demands of the complex political and economic atmosphere, and who is nationally recognized in academia. She added that Dr. Morehead had alluded to the politics and economics relative to our selection. She said there had been great interference that our search committees and our candidates have not had any control over, and that that she wanted the search committee to do their best to assure the faculty that those political and economic pressures are held at bay to ensure this search is ethical.

Professor Stiller (Biology) noted that he was part of the search committee for the last chancellor, and he sees the same dynamic at play as in previous years. Then, as now, faculty want someone with a strong academic background (i.e., what it takes to work in this environment) and academic administration experience. In the last search and in the appointment of the recent interim, although faculty raised those concerns, they were not taken seriously and faculty want a better outcome. He acknowledged that the new hire must be able to interact with all constituents and pointed out that there is only one place to get this experience: the academic environment, in university administration. He is not so interested in a complete change but rather stability. He used a baseball analogy to describe the current situation: we are standing at the plate with an 0-2 count, and under those circumstances, you do not make a wild swing for the bleachers. You use the safer strategy that will achieve the goal.

Professor Pearce (Sociology) thanked the search committee for this opportunity. She explained that ECU has been making strides toward promoting ethnic, racial, gender, sexuality religious, and national origin diversity. She noted that this includes students and faculty and that ECU has a lot more work to do with it. She requested that the search committee choose someone with a record of supporting and being committed to diversity of all types. She added that it was important that they did not just that they *say* they will be committed to diversity, but that they have a record of that commitment. She also said that she stood with Dr. Popke's request that 4 search committee members be faculty.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) noted that he teaches critical thinking and is sensitive to consistency, and when he thinks of the different qualifications someone needs to be a good chancellor at ECU, he finds it impossible to imagine anyone with all the primary characteristics. He explained that he has been here since 1980 and seen various chancellors interact with city of Greenville. He never thought we had someone who did a very good job in the downtown area and being able to work with the city in its long-term goals should be a high priority. That conflicts with being a senior academic administrator someplace else unless that person has had a good relationship with the city or town where they are. He pointed out that the university is becoming a larger part of the downtown even now, so he does think that is extremely important.

Professor Domire (Kinesiology) thanked Chair Davenport and the search committee members. He said it was important not just to get clear on the qualifications that the next chancellor should have, but that we talk about why we care about those qualifications. He acknowledged that we should think about the challenges ECU is facing and the difficulty of working with all those constituencies, but we should also think about the specific challenges we have, like growing student enrollment. That problem is one that is unique to academics. For those kinds of problems, you will not find the person who has the requisite qualifications and experience unless they are in an academic setting. He noted that this person is going to need to make a lot of senior administrative appointments and someone who does not have a network of people to draw on is really going to struggle. He encouraged the search committee to look at other people who have been successful and examine their qualifications, and added that the people that we reach out to and talk into applying are usually best candidates as well.

Professor Bauer (English) said she was pleased to hear Chair Davenport share the faith in the interim chancellor. She pointed out that the interim chancellor is a geographer who also understands the value of the arts. She voiced concern that the arts were not represented on the search committee, and said we need someone who recognized the value of our writers, musicians and artists. She noted that because we have an interim chancellor who does see the value in the arts, there was no need to hurry until we find a candidate for chancellor who will share that value.

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) said that a real challenge over all these years has been to have a chancellor who understands the Health Sciences, School of Medicine, and Academic Affairs equally well and can balance the demands. He encouraged the committee to look for someone who comes from a place with a medical school.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) said he was reminded of the first chancellor search he saw at East Carolina. He discussed the search committee that hired Thomas Brewer, and said there

was a very strong faculty component on the committee, with possibly even a majority of the committee made up of faculty. He went on to say that as soon as Thomas Brewer came to campus, he started dropping his resume in the mail looking for other jobs, so he was not sure that a large faculty component on the committee was necessarily a good idea. He acknowledged the importance of the work of the committee and wished them success.

Vice Chancellor of Health Sciences Mark Stacy said he was on the committee for two reasons. He explained that he does not suffer fools very well, and he wants to look for a great leader to work for and someone the faculty will want to work for as well. He said that another reason was that we have 27% white male students and 59% women, and we need to pay attention to that to reflect our future.

Professor Greer (Medicine) noted that we have an interim president of the UNC system and there should be an ongoing search for that as well. She said that the person selected for chancellor will report to someone who had no input in their selection and will serve as that individual's boss. Given the recent political unrest in the state, this is of concern. She asked how we address it and whether it could be controlled through timing. She asked if Interim Chancellor Mitchelson could stay in place for a while until it is not a problem any longer.

Mr. Davenport acknowledged that Professor Greer had asked an extremely perceptive question, and that it is driving the current timeline somewhat. He said Dr. Roper has been good to them and extremely supportive in the past year as the Board of Trustees has experienced so much turmoil. He said Dr. Roper is going to stay until June of next year, and that through everything so far he has been at his side, challenging him on the committee timing and process. If the search were to move into July, this could be a good thing or not a good thing. Right now the committee is on pace for Dr. Roper to make the recommendation to the Board of Governors, and he expressed confidence that we will be able to weather any outcome.

Professor Sprague (Physics) said that we have faculty members like Professor Scott who remember Chancellor Brewer, and that he began his time on Faculty Senate when Professor Muse came in and that did not go down very well. He explained that when faculty give the search committee recommendations that they are speaking from experience. He said they know what works and what does not work, and they have had experience working with all different types of chancellors hired under different sorts of circumstances. He urged the search committee to the reach out to faculty and heed their feedback.

Ümit Yalçın (Philosophy and Religious Studies) said he had suggestions about values, and that the search committee should look for someone who sees the academic mission of the university not as generating technically professional facilitators for other peoples' will, but as citizens. Connected to that we should look for someone who sees themselves not as a leader but as a public servant.

Mr. Davenport then gave some closing comments. He solicited faculty to ask around their networks to see who would like this job. He said faculty are an important constituency to this process. He urged the faculty to "get your licks in." He said the faculty would get an email address to which they could send names, or they could provide those names to Jeff Popke. He added that students and staff are also an important part of this process. He encouraged faculty to provide their feedback through that email address or to Jeff so that the information can be collected. He promised the process will be open and transparent, ethical and honest and expressed appreciation for the input.

D. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Chancellor

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson thanked everyone for their reception of the committee. He announced that our 5th year Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) report was accepted. He noted that it was a massive effort involving many faculty and that it was uncommon to get this kind of acceptance without any commentary or further review. He said it means two things: we are a great university and we document it pretty well. He said that he is concerned about the immediate past and the future that we face and that senate officers referred to the need for structural adjustments (not necessarily a strong provost model) and some things we might put in place in preparation for this new leader. He said he reflected on the engagement survey commissioned by the UNC system a couple years back from a firm called ModernThink. He said Chairman Popke did a great job of digging into that data and coming to this body with important information. He acknowledged that senior leadership got hammered. He explained that the figures cited were the percent of positive responses. For the item "Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future," our score was a 44, and the system average was a 55. For the item "I believe what I am told by senior leadership," we got a 42, and the system average was a 56. He noted that in general, we are 12 percentage points behind system average on everything associated with senior leadership. He pointed out that there have been a lot of changes to senior leadership and wondered if that would help this time, because the engagement survey is coming out again. He asked for faculty to score senior leadership better this time.

He said faculty felt pretty strongly that senior leadership was not doing its job, and they want to put some things in place that can be handed over to a new leader who will be pressured to adopt these institutional conventions. He said these will be done next semester, and they are varieties of ECU institutional face-to-face communications involving senior leaders. There will be a University Council, replacing what was previously convened under the Provost and called the Deans and Directors Monthly Meeting. The University Council will be broader based. Instead of just having 4 divisions represented, all divisions will be represented, including Athletics. It will convened by the Chancellor, and will be widely representative of the university, including Faculty Senate officers. It will involve the Chancellor with this group of 60 people in a room, hearing the message, and meeting on a monthly basis.

He said the Chancellor's Executive Council will continue, and a Chancellor's Cabinet will meet monthly. The Chancellor's Cabinet will be Vice Chancellors and Athletic Directors only. In those meetings, the Chancellor can say things that are deep and meaningful and pointed that probably could not be said in front of faculty.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson then discussed Collegiate Forums. For each college, the Chancellor, Academic Council, and dean of the college will convene with the faculty and staff of the college so there is an opportunity to interact with faculty/staff at the collegiate level. There will be about 10 meetings annually, and each college gets one. There will also be a Divisional Forum, especially for those divisions that don't have faculty (about 4 of them). It will be the same kind of meeting with those divisions.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that this spring, he will bring back the State of the University address (like State of the Union address). He noted that Chancellor Ballard had a State of the University Address in the spring every year, but it had not been done in many years. This address will

be for ECU faculty, staff, and students. It will happen annually on the first Wednesday in February. This spring, that falls on February 5th at 3:00 PM in Wright Auditorium.

He then turned to discussion of the budget piece. He explained that the budget appears very linear to him, in that it begins at the level of the unit and bubbles up to the top. He acknowledged that faculty have no exposure to the thinking, logic, and comparisons that take place at college and divisional levels and that they will be thinking about that and trying to get a design that is acceptable to everyone. He said that shared governance is tricky business, and ultimately budgets and budget setting is an administrative responsibility and they are not going to vote on it. He understands that faculty voices about budget matters are still important. He said he is aware of recent inadequacies in the style and level of communication that has taken place between senior administration and the campus at large, and what we face in a new leader. He expressed hope that faculty would provide some guidance for him.

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) asked if there was any chance that we will see some sort of minutes or proceedings from Executive Council. He said he understood that some discussions would be sensitive, but even seeing a list of the topics would be helpful.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said some of the topics were personnel topics, and those would not be posted. He said Executive Council has no minutes.

Professor Scott followed up by asking if, as a public body, perhaps Executive Council should have some minutes. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said yes, and that he would give it some thought.

Professor Stiller (Biology) noted that while he was Chair of the Faculty, he met repeatedly with the former chancellor and asked about the possibility of the Chair of the Faculty or a Senate representative serving on Academic Council so that when there is a Senate resolution or other matter that comes up, there would be someone there to talk about it. He said the former chancellor was very supportive of the idea, but it never materialized. He wondered whether it was something the Interim Chancellor would like to consider. Academic Council is a smaller body but having a faculty representative on Executive Council would be useful so that faculty representation is there for those issues, and it would help with the issue of needing minutes as well.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that most of the things that are of immediate concern to faculty do come through Academic Council. He said the Chancellor has always relied on the work of Academic Council and those three Vice-Chancellors (Academic Affairs, Research, Economic Development and Engagement, and Health Sciences) who meet twice a month and provide recommendations to the Chancellor. The current design would include the Chair of the Faculty in one of those meetings, which will be the meeting at which the Chancellor receives those recommendations. He said Professor Jeff Popke brought that up to him as well, and he thinks they are moving in the right direction for Academic Council.

Professor Altman (Kinesiology) noted that Research and Graduate Studies seems like it is split away from the other areas and that the Graduate School is not as well-represented on some of the higher-level committees. She said their involvement is important when it comes to recruiting graduate faculty hires, and their input would be helpful. She wondered whether it was a structural problem, after the Graduate School split from Research, Economic Development and Engagement.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson answered that Graduate School Dean Paul Gemperline has certainly engaged with the Provost and in the Deans and Directors meetings. He acknowledged that the split is part of the issue, but that it was done purposely in order to protect the budget associated with assistantships. He emphasized that they have never cut assistantships at ECU, and they had to move them out of that Division because they were still assigned that budget item. They had to get it into a Division that could absorb that protection. He assured the faculty that they make a good effort to engage Dean Gemperline across the two divisions, and that Dean Gemperline was also proactive about that engagement. He noted that Dean Gemperline's evaluation is by the three Vice Chancellors and clarified that the Provost executes it but takes input from the three Vice Chancellors. He admitted that it isn't perfect, and that if the faculty want a strong Provost model they can just keep raising the flag.

Paul Zigas (University Counsel) clarified that the Executive Council meetings are not technically subject to the open-meeting laws because they are actually meetings of professional staff, but the meetings could be treated as such if it was deemed appropriate. They are not currently recognized as public bodies.

E. Ralph Scott, Faculty Assembly Delegate
Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) provided a report on the [November 22, 2019](#) UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting and recounted Faculty Assembly proceedings.

Chair Green said the Board of Governors was upset about recent negativity toward board members (related to recent negotiations with the Sons of Confederate Veterans, which caused controversy). Chair Green said Board of Governors is interested in input from faculty about these issues.

Drew Moretz, Vice President for State Government Relations said the Board of Governors have approved limited line items, and some cuts were avoided from budget. But no budget has come out yet, no capital expansion budget, and no faculty salary increases. The legislature will return in January. We all need to contact our representatives and the Governor's office about the budget.

Kim Van Noort, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs said we need to change the current funding model in NC from one which is enrollment driven. There is no substitute yet but they are working on it. Teachers have large presence in lobbying efforts. Senior Vice President Van Noort is comfortable with how UNC president search is unfolding. The university library committee is working on an open source journal initiative. Senior Vice President Van Noort says provosts may distribute retention funds for keeping faculty who were planning to leave. Senior Vice President Van Noort says that faculty are seen "as a bunch of left wing commies" and we need to "work on this." Faculty Assembly representative Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) says this must mean "we need some right wing commies." We need to work on this perception that we are "radical"

President Roper was unable to attend due to a Board of Governor's meeting at Elizabeth City State University.

Siobhan Norris, U.S. Army Veteran, Program Manager for Military and Veteran Education discussed military and Veteran's programs. They want higher Education in North Carolina but they need to work out how they will get credit for military training and service.

Andrew Kelly, Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning discussed a long-range view of where students will be in the future (see power point).
Anthony Chow, Innovation and Technology Committee, illustrated WebEx and gave a demo of this new program, followed by group photographs.

Questions
There were no questions posed at this time.

F. Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Popke stated that as a holiday gift, he had no remarks to offer and was happy to answer any questions about updates on Senate initiatives during the question period.

Question
There were no questions posed at this time.

G. Question Period
There were no questions posed at this time.

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

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council
Professor Ron Preston (Education), Chair of the Graduate Council provided curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the November 25, 2019, Graduate Council meeting minutes, including and reported here for informational purposes, an amendment to the September 30, 2019 Graduate Council meeting minutes; level 1 action items from the November 20, 2019 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority; and the Department of English Graduate Faculty Appointments Criteria which was approved by the Graduate Council.

There was no discussion and the Faculty Senate approved, as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor, curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council's November 25, 2019 meeting minutes. **RESOLUTION #19-84**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Faculty Welfare Committee, Marlena Rose
Professor Rose (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on the revised Student Grievance Regulation. The Committee worked with University Counsel on this regulation.

There was no discussion and the Faculty Senate approved, as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor, the revised Student Grievance Regulation. **RESOLUTION #19-85**

Professor Rose then presented the Faculty Salary Compression Study Report. The final report and the executive summary of the compression study are posted on the Faculty Welfare Committee website: https://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/fw/facultywelfare.cfm. The study was based on faculty data as of Oct 31, 2018. The study identified a total of 230 "low-end outliers" whose actual salaries in

Fall 2018 were at least 0.75 standard deviation below predicted salary according to regression analyses. IPAR has prepared a report for each unit that includes actual salary, predicted salary, residual, standardized residual, and salary benchmark (when available) for each faculty member included in the analyses. The reports have been distributed to the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, Deans, and Directors of the Libraries. The Chancellor and the Chair of the Faculty hosted two forums for the Academic Affairs faculty on Dec. 3 and 5. Academic Affairs deans will continue to work with chairs and directors to provide salary adjustment recommendations for the faculty identified for review. The recommendations are due to the Provost by January 31, 2020. All AA faculty included in the analyses will receive a letter in the spring about whether they were identified for salary review and adjustment. The Faculty Senate will continue to work with IPAR on an analysis of fixed-term faculty salaries in Academic Affairs because those faculty are not included in the current study. The Health Science Division leadership is reviewing their results. IPAR will conduct additional analyses, if needed. Dates for HS open forums will be announced later. Faculty can provide comments or ask questions about the study by completing an online feedback form by March 1, 2020. The URL for the online feedback form is available in the posted report. Faculty feedback is confidential. The Faculty Welfare Committee will review all feedback, taking appropriate action when possible and forwarding questions and issues more appropriately addressed by others.

Professor McKinnon (History) asked if Faculty Senate could make a motion to have the committee work on another salary study for fixed term and adjunct faculty in Academic Affairs. Professor Popke confirmed that it could be done.

Professor McKinnon then made a motion to request that the Faculty Welfare Committee conduct another salary study of fixed term and adjunct (part-time) faculty in Academic Affairs. The motion was seconded.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson asked if this study would also be a salary compression study, and Professor Popke answered that the study would likely need to be somewhat different from the faculty salary compression study because it will not have the same type of key variables of rank, time in rank, and department. He explained that the advisory committee at first had envisioned both Academic Affairs and Health Sciences studies to include only tenure-track and tenured faculty because the determinants of their salary are quite distinctive. As those studies began to roll out, there was a separate Health Sciences advisory group. It was quickly realized that with the Health Sciences side, you cannot leave out fixed-term clinical faculty because they make up such a great number of that division. With parallel advisory committees modifying their respective studies, the result was that fixed-term faculty in Academic Affairs were the only group excluded from this process. It was not a decision at the outset for that to be the case. He agreed that it makes sense to conduct a study for fixed-term faculty in Academic Affairs as the next step, and that it would focus on compression or injustice in some fashion, but the determinants would be different. He said he had already heard from Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research that a study of fixed-term faculty in Academic Affairs would be challenging due to the distribution of fixed-term faculty that are clustered in some departments and not in others, but that they would do what they could to come up with a different kind of analysis appropriate for fixed-term faculty in Academic Affairs.

The motion to request that the Faculty Welfare Committee conduct another salary study of fixed-term and adjunct faculty (part-time) in Academic Affairs was voted on and approved. **RESOLUTION #19-86**

Professor Popke explained that timing for answering the comments submitted through the feedback form for the Faculty Salary Compression Study would be a little delayed.

B. Agenda Committee, Margaret Bauer
Professor Bauer (English), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed 2019-2020 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates.

There was no discussion and the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-87**

C. Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee, Timm Hackett
Professor Hackett (English), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies. He explained that the changes separate instructor preparation and professional development. The revisions required changing items 7 and 8 numerically, but there were no further revisions to those sections.

Professor Ticknor (Education) asked if he could define "faculty" as it was being used in section 6, and to define what the Cornerstone online training is and what it entails. Professor Hackett explained that the training portion and the faculty to which it applies has not changed, and the committee wanted to separate that training from the continuing education that Distance Education instructors need to maintain their eligibility to keep teaching Distance Education courses.

Professor Greer (Medicine) noted Health Sciences faculty may be less aware of those requirements and less likely to see trainings placed in Ccornerstone. She said that in the upcoming week, her department was receiving training from Information Technology and Computing Services (ITCS).

Professor Hackett said there will be a change so that in Faculty 180, chairs can track continuing education much more efficiently than in the past. He also said that if faculty attended an event that was not previously classified as a Distance Education workshop or conference and upon arriving there, faculty realize that it does cover enough Distance Education topics to count, they can come back and petition chair to recognize that as Distance Education training as well.

Following this discussion, the revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-88.**

The proposed Contingency Plan and Continuity of Instruction Best Practices will be presented in spring 2020.

D. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Jean-Luc Scemama
Professor Scemama (Biology), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 14, 2019 including curricular actions within the College of Business and Department of English. Professor Scemama also noted that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee voted to commend Lori Lee for her years of service.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of November 14, 2019 including curricular actions within the College of Business and Department of English, were approved. **RESOLUTION**

#19-89.

E. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Eli Hvastkovs
Professor Hvastkovs (Chemistry), Chair of the Committee will present the proposed addition to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Academic Regulations: Attendance and Participation relating to student visitors in class in spring 2020. The committee is awaiting information from University Counsel before finalizing their edits.

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Mark Bowler
Professor Bowler (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 8, 2019 including a request to establish a BSBA in Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, addition of a new concentration and removal of a concentration in the BSBA in Management within the College of Business; program discontinuation of MM in Music Education within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, request to establish a BA in Biology in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences, and a new minor Criminal Law and Legal Process in the Department of Criminal Justice within the College of Arts and Sciences.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of November 8, 2019 including a request to establish a BSBA in Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, addition of a new concentration and removal of a concentration in the BSBA in Management within the College of Business; program discontinuation of MM in Music Education within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, request to establish a BA in Biology in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences, and a new minor Criminal Law and Legal Process in the Department of Criminal Justice within the College of Arts and Sciences were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-90**

G. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, Lisa Ellison
Professor Ellison (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 11, 2019 including writing intensive course designation by section (WI*) for RCSC 4903.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of November 11, 2019 including writing intensive course designation by section (WI*) for RCSC 4903 were approved as presented.
RESOLUTION #19-91

H. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, Puri Martinez
Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 4, 2019 including Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for HIST 141: US History Since 1877 from Johnson County Community College in Kansas; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for PLS 141: World Politics from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, HUM 252: Humanities from Minot State University, and FAS 342: Modernism from South New Hampshire University; and meeting minutes of November 18, 2019 including General Education Natural Science Designation (GE:SC) for GEOL 1010: Geology

Goes to Hollywood: Natural Disasters, General Education Humanities Designation(GE:HU) for ENGL 1000: Exploring Literature and ENGL 3260: History of African American Literature, and Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for ENGL 3875: Introduction to Writing Studies.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of November 4, 2019 including Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for HIST 141: US History Since 1877 from Johnson County Community College in Kansas; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for PLS 141: World Politics from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, HUM 252: Humanities from Minot State University, and FAS 342: Modernism from South New Hampshire University; and meeting minutes of November 18, 2019 including General Education Natural Science Designation (GE:SC) for GEOL 1010: Geology Goes to Hollywood: Natural Disasters, General Education Humanities Designation(GE:HU) for ENGL 1000: Exploring Literature and ENGL 3260: History of African American Literature, and Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for ENGL 3875: Introduction to Writing Studies were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-92**

Professor Martinez then presented the report regarding the recommendation to Pilot Test Blue Text Analytics Software. Members of Faculty Governance and General Education and Instructional Effectiveness committee were tasked with evaluating the Blue Text Analytics Software. Ultimately the working group determined that it would be impossible to evaluate the reliability of the results (based on current research) and this software is not a marked improvement of our current practices to justify the costs.

They do not recommend Blue Text Analytics based on research conducted.

There was no discussion and the resolution regarding the recommendation to Pilot Test Blue Text Analytics Software was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-93**

I. Service-Learning Committee, Almitra Medina
Professor Medina (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 12, 2019 including removal of Service-Learning designation for RCLS 3004, Service-Learning designation (SL) designation for COMM 6216: Community Engagement and Health Communication, and designation by section (SL*) for COMM 3151: Family Communication.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of November 12, 2019 including removal of Service-Learning designation for RCLS 3004, Service-Learning designation (SL) designation for COMM 6216: Community Engagement and Health Communication, and designation by section (SL*) for COMM 3151: Family Communication were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-94**

J. Unit Code Screening Committee, Kenneth Ferguson
Professor Ferguson (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to Department of Psychology Unit Code of Operations and Departmental Guidelines.

There was no discussion and the revised unit code and guidelines were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-95**

K. Research/Creative Activities Committee, Zac Domire

Professor Domire (Kinesiology), Chair of the Committee, began presenting the proposed revisions to the 2020 Research/Creative Activities Grant Guidelines. Professor Popke stopped the report to note that the items from the Committee were being presented out of order, and a vote to change the order of the agenda was taken. Senators voted to allow the change in order of items, and Professor Domire proceeded with the report. He said that in the revisions to the Guidelines, the Committee looked to find ways to support fixed-term faculty. They voted to allow fixed-term faculty to be eligible if research is listed under their assigned duties/goals/weightings.

Professor Gustafson (Music) says the School of Music applauds the Research/Creative Activities Committee's motion to include Fixed-Term faculty eligibility for the Research/Creative Activity Awards, because they do not see an ethical justification for keeping the door closed to an entire class of faculty. She added that it is especially concerning that ECU's non-tenure track faculty members, who work hard to serve ECU and who teach a substantial proportion of our students with generally less institutional support, are disproportionately women. They do, however, question the RCA committee's conditions that limit eligibility to full time faculty, and the prerequisite of research being included in the goals/weightings/assigned duties.

Regarding the condition that faculty should be full-time, Professor Gustafson pointed out that the sole criterion in the Research/Creative Activities charge is the merit of the proposal. They do not see why part-time faculty with meritorious proposals should be disqualified as a group. Many part-time faculty have much to offer their disciplines and our ECU students through their research and creative activity endeavors. She added that, keeping in mind that the Research/Creative Activities grant application already requires a letter of recommendation by the unit head, any concerns about the applicant's level of commitment to ECU can be addressed at the unit level.

Regarding the Research/Creative Activities Committee's requirement that faculty should have research/creative activity as part of their goals/weightings/assigned duties, Professor Gustafson pointed out that this requirement would effectively eliminate the vast majority of teaching faculty because of their teaching-focused contracts. Again, the RCA application already requires a letter of recommendation by the unit head, so any concerns about the applicant's assignments and role at ECU can be addressed at the unit level.

She said that the School of Music therefore moved to change the wording of the first sentence under eligibility as follows: "Applicants must be ECU faculty members who do not serve on the RCA Committee at the time of their application."

Professor Domire acknowledges that this did come up in discussion in the committee and involved a lengthy debate. He says this limitation was intended to be protective for fixed-term faculty who do not get credit for research/creative activity as part of their job duties. Such people may be compelled to participate in something that they are not receiving credit for in their evaluation, and that is why that restriction was included.

Professor Nelson (Music) expressed appreciation for the Committee's attempts to prevent some of the bad situations that may arise for fixed-term faculty, but said she just cannot see justification to restrict an entire class of faculty. She noted that department chairs must approve Research/Creative Activity grant submissions coming from their faculty. Therefore, there should be no conflict between a fixed-term faculty's job expectations and their Research/Creative Activities grant application.

Professor Altman (Kinesiology) asked if goals can be adjusted if people want to apply but do not currently have that in their list of duties. Professor Domire said that is how the Committee had envisioned it would work and how it would probably be appropriately handled, that some of their activity would be reassigned to creative activity.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) suggested adding language that makes it clear that the fixed-term faculty applicant can request a statement from the department head or chair that research will be considered in their evaluation. Professor Domire said that from his understanding of the process, the fixed-term faculty members would have research in their goals and weightings, so the successful completion of the application would suffice.

Professor Greer (Medicine) agrees that the requirement is protective, not restrictive. She explained that it is important to protect fixed-term faculty from having to do more than the 100%. She can see how it would appear restrictive, but she can also see how if it is not included in a fixed-term faculty member's weights, it would not be appropriately acknowledged and valued. If it is put in your weights it is counted as work that you have been assigned.

Professor Nelson (Music) says that to compete for this award is voluntary, and any professional development is activity. This is especially important for fixed-term faculty when there is so little job security. She does not see this as protective because application is voluntary.

The vote was taken and the revisions to the 2020 Research/Creative Activities Grant Guidelines were approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #19-97**

Professor Domire then presented the resolution on increased funding of the 2020 Research/Creative Activities Grants. He encouraged faculty to read the resolution and noted that it was even more important to have increased funding for the grants now that eligibility for the grants had been expanded.

There was no discussion and the report on funding for the 2020 Research/Creative Activities Grants was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-96**

Agenda Item VII. New Business
Professor Bauer (English) presented a resolution about non-member of the university community groups access to campus, provided below. She referred faculty to the resolution, which was attached in the agenda. She indicated a willingness to answer questions but noted that the resolution was authored by Professor Donna Kain (English) and that she would be better able to answer questions. Following the summarization of resolution, the following discussion ensued:

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) expressed concern about the requirement to provide notice in a "timely manner" because that might vary between administrative offices. He suggested providing a range of time instead.

Professor Kain (English) said they chose "timely manner" because it is difficult to know how much time the people who will have to provide the notices will have. She said that in the specific case cited in the background information for the resolution, a notification email was sent on the Friday before the event to a set of people, but more faculty input might help negotiate what the timeframe would be.

Professor Bauer said the timeframe can be left unspecified, understanding that they will make a good-faith effort to notify. This is more to let administrators know there is a group they can call to let faculty know that this is happening. Currently, faculty do not know these things are happening until they see them when walking across campus. If there is a group prepared, then when the notification is given they can jump in.

Professor Greer (Medicine) concurred with Professor Scott and noted that matters of safety can arise. Safety officers need to be advised so they can have time to be in place. Giving 48 hours notice or something similar would allow for that. Professor Kain answered that in a lot of these instances the safety officers knew, but faculty did not know and the student body did not know. Campus police knew and were providing security for them. Professor Greer answered that there needs to be a communication from police to faculty.

Professor Johnson (Communication) asked how do you decide, from a freedom of speech perspective, which group is safe and which is not. Professor Kain clarified that the resolution is not asking to bar any groups, it is just asking for notification so faculty can prepare and be able to engage in a constructive dialog. Some of these events are not sponsored by any faculty or student campus organizations, and there are groups on campus making decisions about those requests and she was not sure that faculty were adequately represented on that. Faculty need more time to be able to address that. Faculty do have to know who is coming so they are prepared to help students understand these issues, and if the opportunity presents itself, faculty will be able to have constructive dialog. Professor Kain asserted that she is very sensitive to issues of freedom of speech so she feels like they have made a very narrow request here.

Professor Drake (Business) says it seems like some of the problem is with the Campus Reservation Office. Could they offer a public listing of all the events?

Professor Kain said she would like that, but she was told that they do not do that and it is not their responsibility. She clarified that she agreed that it was not their responsibility to advertise for the groups, but she thinks that if more faculty were involved in the group that approves the requests, it would help.

Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Virginia Hardy explained that information for speakers on campus, is fed to the university calendar. But if you have situations like when Brother Bob comes to campus, that is not posted right now for those types of things. She said her office is discussing with University Counsel the potential creation of a website about freedom of speech, which would include posting of certain events that are upcoming. She said things already in motion for notification.

Professor Kain agreed that is a good idea, but there are differences between speakers like Reverend Bob and the GAP group with its posters on display. Faculty just want enough time to prepare. Professor Hardy said it was rare that we have something that big, and that she would like to talk more about what this could look like, and how do we define which one of those things will raise the bar as well as potentially adding those events on the calendar.

Professor Chambers (Vice-Chair, Education) asked about possible trigger warnings for some of this content.

Professor Hardy said it is hard to know what will be a trigger for students and agreed that further conversations to figure some of these issues out would be helpful.

Professor Kain said that she does not think faculty were aware there were counseling services available. Her understanding was that groups like the one mentioned in the background of the resolution are approved by a body on campus, and that is different than Reverend Bob. When these events are approved, faculty should be told. If there are other services being provided, faculty should know. Faculty know that is just life that things will happen that will upset people too.

The vote on the motion was taken and the resolution was adopted as presented. **RESOLUTION #19-98**

Professor Scott (Academic Library Services) requested to add the Resolution on Service of Lori Lee to the agenda for consideration. Professor Popke reminded the Senate that adding this item of new business would require approval by 2/3rds of the Senate. The Senators voted to take up the item as new business.

Professor Popke said by their count, this is the 234th Faculty Senate meeting organized and attended by Lori Lee, and it is also her last as she embarks on her well-earned retirement after 30 years of exemplary service to the Faculty Senate. He said that in 1989, when Lori was hired as a Secretary Level IV, there were about 900 faculty at that time. She took it upon herself to start attending meetings of the Senate committees (something the previous secretary had not done) so she could be better informed about faculty governance. He said that began 30 years of taking the initiative, of going above and beyond the call of duty in service to shared governance. By their count, 30 years later she has worked with some 800 different committee chairs, attending something on the order of 4,800 different committee meetings, and has been there through all of that with answers, suggestions, motivation and encouragement, strategy, and steadfast advocacy in the interest of faculty. He went on to say that to express their gratitude, he has asked Professor Scott and Professor Stiller to read the resolution that has been placed at each Senator's seat.

Professor Scott recounted that when the committees on which he had served would draft a resolution and Lori would read it, she would often say that the committee should "think a little more" about that resolution by way of providing advice. He said they did not need to think anymore on this resolution because they were going to pass it. He read the following:

Whereas, Lori Lee has faithfully, steadfastly, and proactively served in the Faculty Senate Office for 30 years, redefining the role of office manager and fulfilling it with diligence, patience, and good cheer; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has acted as the institutional memory of the Faculty Senate and served as the face and voice of the Faculty Senate Office; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has passionately advocated for shared governance and consistently and effectively promoted the voice of the faculty in the affairs of East Carolina University; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has served 15 Chairs of the Faculty, providing critical support to maximize their success; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has deployed her incredible organization skills to support the operations of 22 Academic and five Appellate Committees, served as executive secretary to their chairs, and supported the participation of thousands of faculty committee members; and

Professor John Stiller read the remainder of the resolution:

Whereas, Lori Lee has been instrumental in organizing more than 200 meetings of the ECU Faculty Senate, and has managed and catalogued the passage of more than 1,800 Faculty Senate Resolutions; and

Whereas, Lori Lee was honored with the Chancellor's Award for Excellence, Devotion to Duty in 2000, the Women of Distinction Award by the Chancellor's Committee on the Status of Women in 2015, the Faculty Senate 50th Anniversary Medallion also in 2015, and the Centennial Award for Excellence, Spirit Award, in 2017 for her many contributions to the Faculty Senate, ECU, and the larger community; and

Whereas, Lori Lee is perpetually ready to play any role to advance our collective efforts; and

Whereas, Lori Lee moves through her work and her life animated by the sterling values of integrity, fairness, inclusion, and kindness towards others;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the East Carolina University Faculty Senate, representing all ECU faculty members, commends Lori Lee for her countless, selfless contributions to our community over three decades of outstanding service; and

Be it Further Resolved That, Lori Lee is recognized as a model exemplar of ECU's motto, To Serve.

The Faculty Senate and guests stood to deliver a standing ovation.

The Senate voted to approve the resolution. **RESOLUTION #19-99**.

Professor Popke announced that in commemoration of Lori Lee's contributions to Faculty Senate and shared governance, all the hours she has spent in Rawl Annex in steadfast support of the Faculty Senators and all ECU faculty, and following action by the ECU Board of Trustees, on November 22,

2019, Rawl Annex Room 142 has been officially named as the Lori Lee Faculty Senate Conference Room.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,
Amanda Ann Klein   Lori Lee and Rachel Baker
Secretary of the Faculty   Faculty Senate
Department of English

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 10, 2019 MEETING

Resolution #19-84

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the November 25, 2019, Graduate Council meeting minutes, including and reported here for informational purposes, an amendment to the September 30, 2019 Graduate Council meeting minutes; level 1 action items from the November 20, 2019 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority; and the Department of English Graduate Faculty Appointments Criteria which was approved by the Graduate Council.

_____

Resolution #19-85
Formal faculty advice on Student Grievance Regulation

The Committee originally provided formal faculty advice through Faculty Senate Resolution #19-36, which was rejected by the Chancellor and returned to the Committee for further review. The Committee worked with University Counsel to address the concerns. Detailed here are the changes between the two versions, with the clean copy provided below.

Authority: Chancellor
History: Approved March 26, 2018.
Related Policies:
ECU Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy
ECU Regulation on Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence
Undergraduate Grade Appeal Policy
Graduate Student Grade Appeals
Graduate School Appeals Procedures
Institutional Complaints SOP

Additional References:
ECU Office of Equity and Diversity
ECU Admissions Student Academic Appeals
North Carolina Post-Secondary Education Complaints, c/o Student Complaints, UNC System, 910 Raleigh Road, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-2688, Telephone (919) 962-4550
The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033, Telephone (404) 679-4500
List of State Agencies
North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority (NCSEAA), which serves as the portal for the National Council for State Reciprocity (SARA) P.O. Box 14103 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 T: 855-727-2162

Contact for Information: Associate Vice Chancellor /Dean of Students, 252-328-9397

1. Introduction

A grievance arises under this Regulation when a student believes, based on established administrative policies and procedures, that he or she has been treated in an arbitrary or capricious manner or been subjected to inappropriate behavior by a University office, department or other unit or division (herein referred to collectively as "unit") or a representative of the University (faculty or staff). By way of example, grievances concerning violations of the University's Freedom of Expression Regulation may be addressed under this Policy.

2. Grievances Not Covered by this Regulation

    2.1. The following grievances are not covered by this Regulation:

    2.1.1. A student grievance, complaint or appeal that is covered by any other University or UNC System policy, regulation or rule, including, but not limited to, the following:

        2.1.1.1. Grievances involving allegations of discrimination, harassment or retaliation based on membership in a protected class as set forth in the University's Notice of Nondiscrimination Policy. These grievances should be referred to the Associate Provost for Equity and Diversity (see link to policy above);
            2.1.1.1.1 This would include grievances involving allegations of Prohibited Conduct under the Regulation on Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence.
        2.1.2.2. Graduate and Undergraduate Grade appeals, which are handled pursuant to the applicable grade appeal policy (see link to policy above);
        2.1.2.3. Graduate student appeals of adverse academic actions and decisions (see link to policy above);
        2.1.1.4. Institutional Complaints, which are handled pursuant to the *Institutional Complaints Standard Operating Procedure,* (see link to SOP above);
        2.1.1.5 Grievances under the Student Complaint Process outlined in the Faculty Manual; and
        2.1.1.6 Grievances against a staff member to be submitted to the Human Resources Employee Relations Division.

3. Informal Resolution

    Prior to bringing a formal grievance against a University unit or representative, students are encouraged to attempt a good-faith resolution of the grievance directly with the party involved in the disputed matter and/or with the head of the unit in which the grievance arises. A student with a complaint who is willing to engage in informal resolution efforts should meet with a staff person in the Office of the Dean of Students, in person, within 30 calendar days of the incident in dispute to initiate the informal resolution process." The 30 days do not include any period of time when the University is officially closed.

4. Formal Grievance Resolution Process

    Should a situation arise in which a student is unwilling or unable to resolve his or her grievance informally, the formal grievance resolution process may be employed. This process, outlined

below, must be initiated within 30 calendar days of the failed informal resolution, if applicable. The 30 days do not include any period of time when the University is officially closed.

4.1 Step I: The student must present a formal grievance in writing to the Associate Vice Chancellor /Dean of Students (125 Umstead Hall). In the event that the student's grievance is against the Dean of Students, the student must present a formal grievance in writing to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. This written grievance must include the following:

    4.1.1. Name, address, email address and telephone number of the student bringing the grievance;

        4.1.1.2 The student must execute a Buckley waiver if they are willing to be identified fully. If not, the student's personally identifiable information will be kept confidential to the extent required by law and not shared with the unit/employee associated with the grievance (e.g., disclosure may be required in connection with a health and safety emergency or the due process rights of an employee potentially subject to serious sanctions).

    4.1.2. Identification of the office or individual against whom the grievance is brought;

    4.1.3. A detailed description of the specific University action or individual behavior resulting in this grievance;

    4.1.4. The date(s) or period of time during which the behavior occurred and the location of the incident(s); and

    4.1.5. A listing of all individuals who witnessed any part of the incident in dispute.

4.2. Step II: Upon receipt of the formal grievance covered by this Regulation, an investigator will be appointed within 7 calendar days by the Associate Vice Chancellor/ Dean of Students to investigate the allegations in the grievance.

    4.2.1. The investigator shall review the written grievance and gather the pertinent facts and information, which may include determining the involvement of pertinent supervisors, department chairs and deans in the investigation. Depending upon the grievance, pertinent data such as interviews and documents, may be gathered by the investigator or the University unit involved in the grievance. If the grievance involves a University unit or representative acting within the course and scope of their official duties, without allegations of personal misconduct, the facts, information, data and any findings or recommendations are then presented to the unit involved for final resolution of the grievance.

    4.2.2 If the grievance is based on allegations of personal misconduct by a faculty member or staff member, the investigator gathers pertinent information as described in the preceding section and presents it to either the department chair or unit administrator. In the event of an appeal, the pertinent information could be presented to the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences (faculty complaint) or the Director of Employee Relations (staff complaint) for final resolution of the grievance, if needed.

4.3 If a grievance cannot be resolved after exhausting East Carolina University's complaint procedure described above, or any other applicable campus procedures, the student may file a complaint with the following agencies:

    4.3.1. North Carolina Post-Secondary Education Complaints (see contact information above);

    4.3.2. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) (see contact information above);

    4.3.3. Any applicable state agency (see contact information above; or

      4.3.4. Complaints about East Carolina University may also be filed by students who do not reside in North Carolina by contacting the North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority (NCSEAA), which serves as the portal for the National Council for State Reciprocity (SARA) (see contact information above)

Resolution #19-86

In direct response to the [2018-2019 Faculty Salary Compression Study](#), and as a next step, the Faculty Welfare Committee is charged with initiating the study of fixed-term and adjunct (part-time) faculty salaries within the Division of Academic Affairs.

Resolution #19-87
Proposed 2020-2021 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee Meeting Dates

2020/2021 University Academic Calendar

Fall 2020		**Spring 2021**	
August 24	Classes Begin	January 11	Classes Begin
September 7	State Holiday	January 18	State Holiday
October 10-13	Fall Break	March 7-14	Spring Break
November 6	Registration	March 26	Registration
November 25-29	Thanksgiving Break	April 2-3	State Holiday
December 7	Classes End	April 27	Holiday Makeup Day
December 8	Reading Day	April 27	Classes End
December 9-16	Exams	April 28	Reading Day
		April 29-May 6	Exams

2020/2021 Agenda Committee and Faculty Senate Meeting Dates

Agenda Committee	Faculty Senate
September 1, 2020	September 15, 2020
September 22, 2020	October 6, 2020
October 20, 2020	November 3, 2020
November 17, 2020	December 8, 2020 *at Heart Institute*
January 12, 2021	January 26, 2021
February 9, 2021	February 23, 2021
March 16, 2021	March 30, 2021
April 13, 2021	April 27, 2021 *at Heart Institute*
	May 4, 2021 (2021/2022 organizational mtg.)

Resolution #19-88
Proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section III. Distance Education Policies

(Additions are in **red** and deletions are in ~~strikethrough~~.)

The committee proposes revisions to subsection V. Instructor Preparation and added revised text from Faculty Senate Resolution #11-86 as a new subsection, VI. Professional Development Activities for Online Instructors. The renumbered subsections VII. Standards for Online Learning and VIII. Evaluation of Distance Education were not revised.

CONTENTS
I.   Distance Education Courses and Programs
II.   Oversight of Distance Education
III.   Courses Delivered by Distance Education
IV.   Fostering Academic Integrity in Distance Education
V.   Instructor Preparation
VI.   Professional Development Activities for Online Instructors
VII. ~~VI.~~Standards for Online Learning
VIII.~~VI.~~Evaluation of Distance Education

. . . . .

V.   Instructor Preparation
All courses offered via distance education shall be taught by a qualified, credentialed instructor approved and assigned by the unit administrator. Instructors who teach distance education courses and programs shall have the same academic qualifications as instructors who teach face-to-face courses. Each instructor who teaches one or more distance education courses must complete a university training program. Academic units that wish to develop their own training program must use the university training program until their own training program is approved by the appropriate vice chancellor.

Unit administrators are responsible for ensuring that each instructor teaching distance education courses has the appropriate distance education training. All instructors teaching distance education courses will engage in at least one training activity each academic year that addresses advances in the methodologies and technologies used in distance education. Training is documented in the faculty annual report of each instructor teaching one or more distance education courses. ~~The unit administrator will provide a complete list of instructors teaching distance education courses and documentation that each instructor has met the training requirements annually to the Provost's office.~~

~~Instructors teaching a distance education course have access to consultation, implementation, and evaluation support from appropriate supporting units (i.e. Office of Faculty Excellence, IPAR, college Instructional Support Consultants, library services, Information Technology and Computing Services, Information Resources Coordinating Council, Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee, etc.). The University shall provide appropriate equipment, software, and communications access to instructors necessary to provide effective distance education. The University will ensure the availability of continuing instructor education and training to enhance proficiencies in the methodology~~

~~and the technologies used in distance education.~~

VI. Professional Development Activities for Online Instructors

Each faculty member who teaches one or more distance education courses must complete an initial university training program consisting of online instructional modules. Faculty continuing to teach distance education courses must engage in at least one professional development activity each academic year that addresses advances in the methodologies and technologies used in distance education.

The following all qualify as professional development activity:

- Instructional modules in Cornerstone related to distance education.

- Any of the following activities if it is related to online learning /teaching
    o Attending an external conference session or webinar (e.g. teaching of accounting online at a national accounting conference)
    o Presenting a research paper (e.g. comparison of learning outcomes for course taught face-to-face and online, etc.)
    o Presenting a seminar (in-house or external)
    o Publishing a paper or proceeding or other relevant professional publications
    o Attending a seminar presented by the Office for Faculty Excellence (OFE) or Academic Technologies-ITCS (see examples in attachment) or individual units. To register for OFE programs, go to http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/ or http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ofe/Spring11.cfm. To register for Academic Technologies programs, go to https://itcs.ecu.edu/departments/academic-technologies/.
    o Being a finalist for a distance education award (e.g. Max Ray Joyner)

Documentation of the above can include program listings, history of participation, tables of content from program, certificate of completion, etc.

- individual units will offer seminars and other programs related to online learning / teaching. As these are announced, they will be distributed via email, posted in cornerstone, and or other means of communication. Documentation will be provided by the presenter(s). Please add it to your records.

If there is a specific seminar or topic or activity that you think may qualify but you are not certain, or if you have questions or require further information, you can complete the below Petition for Alternative Activity to Meet the ECU Distance Education Professional Development Requirement and submit it to your unit administrator. This form will be placed online once it has been approved by the Chancellor.

**Petition for Alternative Activity to meet the
ECU Distance Education Professional Development Requirement**

Faculty can petition to have an activity other than those identified by the university meet the DE Professional Development requirement. To petition, complete this form, save it, and email it to your unit administrator.

Name _____ **email** _____

College _____ **Department** _____

Activity Title: _____

Date of Activity:
_____

Description of activity and time Invested in its completion:

~~VI.~~ **VII.**   Standards for Online Learning

. . .

~~VII.~~ **VIII.** Evaluation of Distance Education

. . .

Resolution #19-89
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of November 14, 2019 including curricular actions within the College of Business and Department of English.

Resolution #19-90
Curriculum and academic program matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of November 8, 2019 including a request to establish a BSBA in Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, addition of a new concentration and removal of a concentration in the BSBA in Management within the College of Business; program discontinuation of MM in Music Education within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, request to establish a BA in Biology in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences and a new minor Criminal Law and Legal Process in the Department of Criminal Justice within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Resolution #19-91
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of November 11, 2019 including writing intensive course designation by section (WI*) for RCSC 4903.

Resolution #19-92
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes of November 4, 2019 including Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for HIST 141: US History Since 1877 from Johnson County Community College in Kansas; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for PLS 141: World Politics from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, HUM 252: Humanities from Minot State University, and FAS 342: Modernism from South New Hampshire University; and meeting minutes of November 18, 2019 including General Education Natural Science Designation (GE:SC) for GEOL 1010: Geology Goes to Hollywood: Natural Disasters, General Education Humanities Designation(GE:HU) for ENGL 1000: Exploring Literature and ENGL 3260: History of African American Literature, and Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for ENGL 3875: Introduction to Writing Studies.

Resolution #19-93
Report regarding recommendation to Pilot Test Blue Text Analytics Software (BTA)

Over the summer 2019, Jeff Popke, Chair of Faculty formed a workgroup comprised of members from the Faculty Governance and GEIE committees to consider ECU policies and procedures related to student evaluation of teaching. This activity followed the Faculty Senate's approval of revisions to Part X, I.B. Cumulative Report for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure in the *ECU Faculty Manual* and the adoption of a Mandatory Statement about Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI). The workgroup forwarded a recommendation to Chair Popke formally supporting the pilot test of Blue Text Analytics software and a summarization of student comments from the SSOI and access of the results to department chairs and other evaluators.

In the recommendation, the workgroup took into consideration the following:
- According to the *Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section IV, III, *evaluations of an instructor's performance may include supervisors' opinions based on investigations prompted by student complaints*. The identity of the student(s) is known to the unit administrator, and before including it in the evaluation, the complaint must be thoroughly investigated by the unit administrator in a timely fashion (usually 5 days since receiving the complaint).
- According to the *Faculty Manual* policy, comments included in Survey of Student Opinion of Instructor (SSOI) are anonymous, so their use in evaluations of instructor's performance is inappropriate. Because of the nature of the SSOI, it will always be impossible for the administrator to know the identity of the student, to carry an appropriate investigation of the complaint or do it in a timely fashion, since results are not until the courses are finished.
- Research demonstrates that SSOI scores are a poor measure of teaching effectiveness. They are correlated with many variables unrelated to teaching effectiveness, including the student's grade expectation and enjoyment of the class; the instructor's gender, race, age, and physical attractiveness; and the weather the day the survey is completed.

- Research also shows that anonymity in student comments is necessary but may work against the gathering of reliable information by allowing students to make unfounded claims.
- Research shows that in order to make appropriate use of student comments, those comments need to be classified and analyzed. A holistic evaluation of the comments is inappropriate.
- Recommendations regarding best practices for evaluation of teaching shows that evaluators can gain perspective on instructor's performance by reviewing multiple courses taught by the instructor over multiple semesters, or by reviewing the performance of the students taught by the instructor in subsequent related courses.
- In the past, administrators at ECU have relied too heavily on SSOI scores to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
- In the past, administrators at ECU have inappropriately used anonymous comments from students to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
- Some administrators at ECU and the SGA believe that the inclusion of SSOI comments would be useful tools for administrators.

The workgroup recognized that ECU needs to engage in a discussion on the appropriate use of SSOI in the evaluation of teaching. A better understanding by all campus constituencies of the role of SSOI is necessary. The piloting of BTA for 1 year seemed an appropriate step toward what should be a multipronged approach.

In August 2019, Chair Popke forwarded the workgroup's recommendation to the GEIEC with a request to "consider this BTA recommendation, along with possible guidance to the campus for the use and interpretation of the information and provide a formal report to the Faculty Senate." In order to fulfill this task, the GEIEC consulted with IPAR regarding the BTA software.

The committee received the following feedback from IPAR:
- While reaching out to schools currently using BTA, they found out that:
  - Faculty didn't feel the Blue Text Analytics was helpful with sections with small enrollment (or small number of responses to open-ended questions);
  - Blue recommended using Text Analytics at the department level (more robust), rather than at course/section level; and
  - Blue Text Analytics would have the capacity to identify sensitive themes (e.g., violence, threats, self-harm, etc.) in the future.

IPAR indicated that they would support the pilot text of BTA software if ECU has an evaluation plan. They suggested that faculty/chair surveys or focus groups could be options for how to evaluate the effectiveness. However, in their opinion, testing the reliability of BTA results would prove to be very challenging, almost impossible.

Besides consultations with IPAR, the GEIEC researched the *Faculty Manual* for policies regarding evaluation of instructions, and past discussions within the Faculty Senate and the GEIEC about providing access to student comments to department chairs and other evaluators. In addition, the GEIEC created a discussion board so members could continue discussion of the topic beyond the regularly scheduled meetings. During Fall 2019, GEIEC dedicated the majority of three meetings to discuss BTA.

Below is a summary in broad categories of the issues that the GEIEC took into consideration.

ECU use of BTA is anomalous

- For confidentiality reasons, the company that owns BTA can only provide ECU with the names of 3 institutions currently using BTA, although they had indicated that 60+ institutions currently use the software.
- Of the 3 institutions provided, each one uses BTA differently.
- No institution currently using BTA use it at the instructional level, only at the programmatic or college level.
- As indicated by IPAR, with the particular use that ECU has in mind, establishing reliability could be an extraordinarily complex task; almost impossible.
- It might be preferable as a recommendation to pilot BTA not per course but at instructor, program or college level.

BTA potential benefits
- Identification of areas of concern (alcohol, drugs, suicide, sexual harassment) was positive. However, the identification would not happen in a timely manner in order to be used to intervene.
- BTA could be used to demonstrate that there are biases in people's comments (racism, xenophobia, misogyny). In other words, ECU could use it for researching bias.
- SGA would consider ECU's adoption of BTA a good faith effort to address their concerns. However, as indicated by the SGA representative to the GEIEC, they were aware of the BTA shortcomings, and were "not married" to its adoption.

BTA reliability
- Doubtful of the value of BTA at the instructor level.
- Doubtful of the value of BTE at the program level.
- Unit administrators would lack knowledge of the context for the words in the BTA report.
- BTA would be a hindrance for the unit administrator. Instead of helping the administrator to understand the teaching effectiveness of an instructor, it would obscure the picture for him/her.

BTA unintended consequences
- Right now, faculty have the option of sharing comments with unit administrators. An unintended consequence of implementation of BTE would be that faculty would feel that providing the comments was now what was needed for the administrators to have the full context.
- BTA may code as negative words that are not (for example "difficult").
- There was a potential danger that the BTA would generate "false positives" (for example "racist"). This would increase the number of unnecessary investigations.
- Administrators might take actions against faculty if negative words were preponderant in the report generated by BTA.

What should accompany adoption of BTA.
- A statement on limitations of use of BTA;
- A determination of what class size makes the use of BTA worthwhile;
- An assurance that BTA was appropriate for DE courses; and
- Required training for unit administrators on the interpretation and use of BTA, including suggested weighted rubric to be used for annual evaluation purposes and limiting the weight that BTA data would be evaluated/scored at.

On November 4th 2019, in accordance with Chair Popke's request, the GEIEC completed their extensive consideration of the workgroup's recommendation to pilot test BTA software, discussed guidance to the campus for the use and interpretation of the information, and provides now the following resolution as a formal report to the Faculty Senate on this important matter.

Resolution Regarding Recommendation to Pilot Test Blue Text Analytics Software

Whereas, the company that owns the software recommends using Blue Text Analytics Software at the department level and not at the course/section level; and

Whereas, ECU's workgroup recommendation was to use Blue Text Analytics Software at the course/section level so that data could be used in evaluation of teaching of individual faculty members; and

Whereas, universities currently using Blue Text Analytics Software have found that results for small enrollment courses and/or small number of responses were not helpful; and

Whereas, it would be impossible to evaluate the reliability of Blue Text Analytics Software results; and

Whereas, Blue Text Analytics Software is not a marked improvement of our current practices to justify the costs.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee does not recommend to pilot test Blue Text Analytics Software in order to summarize student comments from the SSOI and provide access of the results to unit administrators and other evaluators.

Resolution #19-94
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Service-Learning Committee meeting minutes of November 12, 2019 including removal of Service-Learning designation for RCLS 3004, Service-Learning designation (SL) designation for COMM 6216: Community Engagement and Health Communication, and designation by section (SL*) for COMM 3151: Family Communication.

Resolution #19-95
Revisions to the Department of Psychology Unit Code of Operations and Departmental Guidelines.

Resolution #19-96
Resolution on increased funding of the 2020 Research/Creative Activities Grants

Whereas, thirteen years ago the allocated funding for Research/Creative Activities Grants totaled more than $400,000 and garnered over seventy submitted proposals, with twenty-seven

awards granted; and

Whereas,   ten years ago the allocated funding for Research/Creative Activities Grants totaled more than $200,000 and garnered over forty submitted proposals, with thirteen awards granted; and

Whereas,   in the last six award cycles (2014-2019) the allocated funding for Research/Creative Activities Grants totaled less than $30,000, garnered fewer than forty proposals, with five awards granted; and

Whereas,   the allocated funding for research grants awarded through the Research/Creative Activities Committee this year is expected to be $25,000 from Division funds; and

Whereas,   in comparison, the allocated funding for teaching grants awarded through the Teaching Grants Committee this year is over $70,000 from open faculty position funds.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that Mike Van Scott, Interim Vice Chancellor for the Division of Research, Economic Development & Engagement, demonstrate support for faculty endeavors to achieve the University Mission by increasing the allocated 2020 funding for Research/Creative Activities Grants.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Interim Chancellor strongly supports the increase of allocated funding for 2020 research grants awarded through the Research/Creative Activities Committee.

Resolution #19-97
Revisions to the Guidelines for the 2020-2021 Research and Creative Activity Awards (RCAA) Competition

(Additions are noted in **bold** and deletions are noted in ~~strikethrough~~.)

East Carolina University Faculty Senate
2019-2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Guidelines for 2020 Research and Creative Activity Awards *(RCAA)* Competition

Applications available online at: http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm

The Research/Creative Activities Committee (RCAC) solicits proposals for meritorious research or creative activities from eligible East Carolina University faculty members. The committee has access to a $25,000 pool of funds from which it will fund roughly 4-8 proposals. The committee strongly recommends a cap of $6,250 for project requests. Please note that the committee will consider both the quality of the proposal and the budget as part of its deliberations. **All dispensed funds will need to be spent by June 30, 2021.** Given the current total pool of funds, the committee reserves the right to exclude from consideration those proposals which it deems would be better served by another internal grant proposal such as research development awards.

Proposals are due in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex by 12:00 noon on
Thursday, February 27, 2020.

Eligibility:
Applicants must be **ECU faculty members who do not serve on the Research/Creative Activities Committee** ~~full-time tenured or full-time tenure track faculty. Fixed-term or part-time faculty and current members of the Research/Creative Activities Committee are ineligible for awards~~. While there have been college and/or department restrictions in previous competitions sponsored by this committee, there are no such restrictions for this competition.

Recipients of awards from the following University sources may not apply for new funding under this competition if the award is still active during the 2019-20 academic year:
- Research and Creative Activity Awards
- Faculty Senate Teaching Grants
- Research Development Award Program
- University Startup Funds Program
- East-West Collaborative Program

The Research/Creative Activities Committee funds the following expenses:
Stipends for Research/Creative Activity
Faculty stipends will only be available for 9-month faculty. Keep in mind that the stipend amounts must be in line with the aforementioned budget guidelines and that the committee strongly urges faculty to cap proposal requests at $6,250. Applicants cannot teach during the Summer Session in which he/she receives a stipend.

Project Expenses
These funds are for expenses related to the proposed project. Project expense funds should be expended or encumbered by June 30, 2020. Guidelines for budget preparation and the justification for requested funds are included in the application packet.

Stipend for Research/Creative Activity and Project Expenses (dual)
Applicants who are eligible may apply with proposals that will award money for a stipend plus project expenses. Project expense funds should be expended or encumbered by June 30, 2020. Guidelines for budget preparation are included in the application packet.

Evaluation Criteria:
- That the research/creative activity has the probability of leading to significant contributions in the field, including publication, presentation, performance, exhibition, and to the individual's professional enrichment and growth.
- That the research/creative activity is based on knowledge in the field, and the proposal clearly shows how the proposed effort extends, expands, and/or explores new directions, techniques or processes.
- That the research/creative activity possesses evidence of scholarly importance, consists of more than mere data collection or confirmation of easily anticipated results.
- That the research/creative activity is methodologically sound and within the competency of the applicant.

- ~~That the research/creative activity of this project clearly justifies financial support by this University and would not be more suitably considered under a different funding source such as Research Development Grants, University Start-Up Grants, or Teaching Grants~~

Proposals will be evaluated by the diverse group of faculty that make up the committee. It is to the applicant's advantage to prepare abstracts and proposals in language that can be understood by individuals who are outside the applicant's discipline. Feedback will be provided to applicants who are not funded.
PLEASE NOTE: ALL DECISIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ARE FINAL.

Award Requirements:
Awardees are *required* to submit to the Research/Creative Activities Committee a *final report* detailing the results of the funded work. Final reports are due no later than September 15, 2021. Reports should be mailed to the Faculty Senate office at 140 Rawl Annex, 109 mailstop or emailed to facultysenate@ecu.edu. Report forms are available on the committee's website at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm.

Other Restrictions:
- The final reports from any previous awards must be on file in the Faculty Senate office before a new application will be considered.
- The publication of the results of projects supported by an award from the Research/Creative Activities Committee should carry a printed acknowledgment of financial assistance from the Committee.
- There can be no co-project directors or co-principal investigators listed on the cover page although collaborations with other faculty are acceptable. RCAA applicants are eligible to receive support from only one University funding source in any single year. Persons receiving funding from other such sources (e.g. Teaching Award, Research Development Award) must inform the RCA Committee of the award and will need to decline other awards in order to receive their award.
- Individuals may not submit more than one proposal per funding period.
- Any changes to funded projects must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Research/Creative Activities Committee for possible further consideration by the Committee for approval.
- Applicants for projects involving research on human subjects or animals must be prepared to file the appropriate forms with the University and/or Medical Center Institutional Review Board or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee upon notification of the award. Funding is contingent upon receipt of approval from the appropriate Institutional Review Committee (human or animal) at the time of award activation.
- Failure to adhere to the formatting requirements for proposal may result in the elimination of a proposal from consideration.
- Following the evaluation and awarding of awards, the Committee will handle all appeals internally and their decision is final.

Application Process:
Each award proposal MUST include the attached application form signed by the applicant and the chairperson (or dean, as appropriate) of any unit involved. One original paper copy of the proposal should be submitted to the Research/Creative Activities Committee, c/o Faculty Senate Office, 140 Rawl Annex (109 mail stop) by 12:00 noon on Thursday, February 27, 2020. In addition, the

applicant must send an electronic version of the proposal in PDF format to the Faculty Senate office (facultysenate@ecu.edu) by the deadline. No proposals will be accepted after this deadline.

Applicants have the opportunity to attend any information sessions given by the committee to verify that their proposals are appropriate for consideration. Applicants should also consult funded proposals from the past three years that can be accessed at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm.

Completing Application Cover Pages:

All items 1-11 on the cover sheet must be completed and submitted together with the narrative.

Items 1 through 5: Complete as requested. Please note for item #3: check one of items a, b or c; and if b or c, list the amount of money requested in d. The amount of salary money to be paid will be determined by the office of the Chief Research Officer. The Research/Creative Activities Committee reserves the right to change the category of proposals, as appropriate.

Item 6: Acknowledge that IRB and Animal Care approval will be sought, if appropriate. Approval of the research by the IRB must be demonstrated before funds are made available to the awardee.

Item 7: Acknowledge and sign Application Cover Page.

Item 8: Signature of Unit Head.

Item 9: List of *all* previous awards received from this Committee, indicating if the final report was submitted for each. Describe the publications, presentations, performances, external funding proposals, or related activities, including citations or publications directly resulting from each award. Applicants should provide the committee with some indication of the ranking/prestige of specific journals, shows, or performances in which these funded works were published, performed, or displayed.

Item 10: List current grant/contract support and pending applications. Include project title, sponsor, your role in the project (PI, Co-PI, etc.), project period, award status (current or pending), and total funding level. If previous proposals not funded by this committee received support from another University program, indicate the nature of that support, including the program that provided the funding, the amount of the award, and the period covered by the award.

COMPLETING NARRATIVE:

Give a brief description of the project. Each part of this narrative must be included in the order listed and will be used to evaluate your proposal. The narrative is subject to format requirements listed in the next section.

All of the information listed below should be included and specific guidelines followed. Failure to adhere to the restrictions for the following items or the required formats may result in the proposal's rejection.

<u>Please place the items in the order listed below after the cover page.</u>

A. <u>Abstract</u>: The abstract should not exceed 250 words.

B. <u>Proposal Description</u>: Conciseness is encouraged. Because faculty from different disciplines will review your proposal, it should be clearly written and free of specialized jargon. The Proposal Description should include:
   - Problem/Purpose statement: Develop a clear and sound basis for the project that includes supporting references that establish the context of the research or creative activity.
   - Specific aims: Present clear and attainable objectives and clearly describe potential results and benefits.
   - Methodology: Describe how the project will be carried out, how the results will be analyzed or evaluated, and the proposed schedule of activities. For those proposals where this approach is not possible, this section should then present a clear set of specific tasks and activities that will produce the specific results expected.
   - Expected outcomes and benefits: How your work will contribute to the advancement of your field.

C. <u>Literature Cited</u>: Items referenced in the narrative or abstract. Use a citation format that is appropriate for your discipline.

D. <u>Appendices</u>: Supporting documentation such as contracts from publishers, letters of invitation, award notices, letters of support from school principals or medical centers involved in the project. Please provide English translations of foreign documents. It is inappropriate to include in the appendices any information critical to the description of the project, such as that pertaining to the methodology to be used. Proposals will be excluded from consideration if applicants appear to be attempting to circumvent the proposal page limit by including such material in the appendices.

E. <u>Project Expenses</u>: Itemize expenses on the *Budget for Project Expenses* form.

F. <u>Justification for Support</u>: Briefly justify each item from the *Budget for Project Expenses* form.

G. <u>Vita or Biosketch</u>: Submit a one or two page vita or biosketch. Include degrees earned, institutions and dates, and academic employment history. Include a list of representative publications and/or creative activities. Do NOT submit copies of publications, reports, endorsements, or brochures.

H. <u>Checklist</u>.

Format Requirements (strictly enforced):
- All pages paginated;
- Font: minimum 12 pt Arial or Helvetica <u>for all pages</u>;
- 1 inch margins left/right and top/bottom <u>for all pages</u>;
- The abstract and proposal description altogether <u>may not exceed five (5) single-spaced pages</u> in length;
- Any figures or tables included in the proposal description must fit within the five-page limit;

- A references cited section should follow the proposal description; citation format and spacing is at the discretion of the author;
- The appendices may not exceed four (4) pages in length;
- The budget <u>and</u> accompanying justification may not exceed two (2) pages in length;
- The vita or biosketch may not exceed two (2) pages in length.

Multimedia Content:

Multimedia content can be submitted on CD or DVD. Examples of acceptable multimedia content include high-resolution photographs of sculpture, musical recordings, and animations of a vibrating object. The multimedia CD/DVD cannot include traditional graphs, tables, photos, or illustrations that should appear in the body of the proposal. If multimedia files are included in the proposal, SIX copies of the CD/DVD must be submitted with the original, paper copy of the proposal. Also, each multimedia file must be described in the body of the proposal. The multimedia files will be reviewed by people from diverse backgrounds using different computer platforms and should be platform- and specialized application- independent. The CD/DVD should contain file types that can be viewed on a standard Web browser with normal plugins installed. An HTML navigation page for the multimedia files on the CD/DVD is encouraged but not required.

Examples of these file types include the following:
Still Graphics: JPEG, PNG, GIF, PDF
Animated Graphics: Flash, Animated GIF, Quicktime movie, MPEG movie
Sound: WAV, AIFF, MP3, non-streaming Real Audio

The committee does encourage applicants to put these materials on the web and applicants may provide web links in the proposal instead of providing copies of a CD/DVD. However, if the material has copyright, format, or other issues that may preclude it from being made available or properly viewable online then submissions should be in CD/DVD format only.

Budget and Budget Justification:

Faculty must attach a complete budget justification and are strongly encouraged to limit requested funds to no more than $6,250. Stipends are available at the rate of 16.67% of the applicant's salary, up to a cap equal to the prevailing cap on full-time teaching in one summer session. We anticipate that the proposed cap falls below some faculty members' compensation for other summer session activities and suggest that those faculty members ask only for a portion of their summer session to be covered. The committee also recognizes that some faculty will be forced to choose between using the funds for salary buyout and purchasing materials for the project. We ask that applicants consider all aspects of the proposal carefully and only apply for an award if the research or creative activity can be completed within the budget constraints. Applicants must use the *ECU Business Manual* (copies are available in all departments) in preparing the budget to determine which budget line is appropriate for requested funds and what current rates are allowable.

Budgets should be carefully and reasonably constructed. The need for each item should be clearly established, with sources indicated where appropriate. Budget excesses or budgets lacking essential details and justification will be considered negatively in evaluating the proposal. Every proposal (including stipend-only proposals) MUST have a completed Budget for Project Expenses form (see page 9) to be considered for funding.

Where appropriate, indicate any direct contribution from your department or from any other University office or individual that has been made or will be made toward subsidizing your project. Specify the kind and amount of contribution or support on the budget page*.*

The budget may request money for:

- Research Assistants/Student Wages: Compensation for graduate and undergraduate students should be consistent with the standard compensation offered to these students in your department. Proposals for the sole purpose of support for graduate research assistants must be strongly justified.

- Travel: Applicants may only request funds for travel that is clearly essential to complete the project, such as data collection/observation that is site-specific. Attempts to obtain international travel funds from other (non-ECU) sources should be indicated. Travel for the purpose of presenting results at meetings will not be funded. Applicants requesting payment for use of a personal car must explain why ECU cars cannot be used. Multiple, short-distance trips must be justified. Travel will be reimbursed at state-approved rates.

- Research/Creative Activity Supplies: Itemize all supply requests.

- Printing: Activities involving organizing, presenting, and/or publishing or disseminating the results of completed research/creative activities will not be funded.

- Communications: Itemize.

- Equipment: Requests for equipment or software purchase will <u>not</u> be supported if: a) the needed equipment or software exists elsewhere on campus and is accessible to the applicant; b) the item is to be for general departmental use; or c) the item appears to represent one-time use by one person. Applicants are encouraged to determine the availability of desired equipment in other locations on campus. This is particularly true for computer equipment such as laptops.

- Other documented purposes necessary to the successful completion of the proposed activity and within the general policies of the University should be clearly specified and justified.

COMPLETING THE CHECKLIST:
Complete the attached checklist and submit it as the <u>last page</u> of your proposal.

_____

Proposals are due in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex by 12:00 noon on <u>February 27, 2020</u>.

#2020- _____

Faculty Senate

East Carolina University

2019/2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVIES COMMITTEE

Application Cover Page for a 2020 Research and Creative Activity Award

1. a. Name: _____

   b. Department: _____

   c. Academic Rank: _____

2. Proposal Title: _____

_____

3. Type of Award (check one)
        a. Stipend of Research/Creative Activity   _____
        b. Project expense only   _____
        c. Stipend and Project Expense   _____
        d. Amount of project expense money requested: _____

4. This proposal best fits which of the following categories: (please check only one)
        a. Arts and Humanities   _____
        b. Health Science   _____
        c. Natural Sciences   _____
        d. Social Sciences   _____

5. Type of Faculty position (check all that apply)
        a. Full time, tenured   _____
        b. Full time, tenure track   _____
        ~~c. Clinical~~   ~~_____~~
        c. Fixed-term
        _____Full time   _____Part Time
        d. 12-month contract   _____

6. If your project requires human subjects protection (IRB) approval or animal welfare (IAUCU) approval, please check the appropriate item or mark not applicable.

       Project requires approval from _____IRB, _____IACUC, _____Not Applicable

7. I understand and accept the terms and conditions set forth in the Research/Creative Activities Committee guidelines.

   a. I understand that I must file a final report of the results of the project with the Faculty Senate office no later than September 15, of the year in which the award terminates.

b. I understand that publication, presentation, performance, or exhibit of work resulting from support of this project by ECU must carry a printed acknowledgment of this financial assistance by the University.

c. I understand that if selected, receipt of funding is contingent upon receiving approval from IRB or Animal Care Committee by June 1 of the award year.

_____   _____
                    Signature of Applicant   Date

8. The applicant is ~~a full-time tenured, tenure-track, or clinical~~ **an ECU** faculty member who, I believe, can complete the proposed project.

_____   _____
                    Signature of Unit Head   Date

9. Dates of previous University grants, final reports filed, publications, presentations, performances, external funding proposals, or related activities, including citations or publications directly resulting from each grant. (section may be expanded in length)

10. List current grant/contract support and pending applications. Include project title, sponsor, your role in the project (PI or co-PI), the project period, award status (pending/current) and total funding level. Include in particular any current or pending funding related to the proposed research. (This section may be expanded in length.)

11. If funded, may the Faculty Senate Office provide copies of your application by email request as a model for prospective ECU applicants? (Your answer will not be a factor in the Committee's decision to recommend funding for your proposal.)

☐ YES   ☐ NO

_____

East Carolina University
Faculty Senate
2019/2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVIES COMMITTEE

Budget for Project Expenses with a 2020 Research/Creative Activity Award

Item	Requested Funding	Funds from Other Sources*
1) **Personnel Costs: Stipend, Research Assistants (University personnel only), Student wages**	$	$
Description:		
2) **Travel (Mode/Sources, etc.)**	$	$
Description:		
3) **Research/Creative Activity Supplies**	$	$
Description:		
4) **Printing**	$	$
Description:		
5) **Communication**	$	$
Description:		
6) **Equipment**	$	$
Description:		
7) **Other (Specify)**	$	$
Description:		
Total	$	$

*Identify Other Sources of Funding:

A BRIEF JUSTIFICATION (ONE PAGE MAXIMUM) IS NEEDED
FOR ALL PROJECT EXPENSES.

East Carolina University
Faculty Senate
2019-2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVIES COMMITTEE
Checklist for a 2020 Research/Creative Activity Award
This checklist must be submitted with the proposal <u>as the last page</u>.

I. Please check that you qualify for a Research/Creative Activity Award:

☐ ~~full-time tenured or tenure-track~~ **faculty** member at ECU

☐ not currently a candidate for an advanced degree

☐ ~~not a fixed-term or part-time faculty member~~

☐ completed all previous Final Report forms (Lists of previous awarded grants with reference to completed forms are available here for verification.)

II. Please check that you qualify for a stipend for research/creative activity if requested.

☐ do not hold a 12-month contract

III. Please check the following proposal requirements:

☐ Application Cover Page, including:

   ☐ Applicant's name, school department, academic rank

   ☐ Proposal title

   ☐ Type of award

   ☐ Amount of project expenses, as applicable

   ☐ ~~Tenure status~~ **Faculty status (tenured, tenure-track, fixed-term, etc.)**

   ☐ 9-month or 12-month

   ☐ IRB/animal approval

   ☐ Applicant's signature and date

   ☐ Applicant's unit head's signature and date

   ☐ List of prior research/creative activity awards received

   ☐ List of current/grant contract support and pending applications

☐ Narrative formatted along guidelines

☐ Abstract

☐ Description of proposal (5 single-spaced pages maximum including abstract)

☐ Literature cited, if appropriate

☐ Appendices (4 pages maximum), if appropriate

☐ Budget, if appropriate

☐ Justification for support (2 page maximum for budget and justification)

☐ Vita or Biosketch (2 pages)

☐ Proposal checklist

IV. Please explain briefly any suggestions you have concerning the proposal guidelines and application format.

East Carolina University
Faculty Senate
2019-2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVES COMMITTEE
Final (or Progress) Report for a 2020 Research/Creative Activity Award
<u>Due September 15, 2021 in the Faculty Senate office (140 Rawl Annex)</u>

Future award proposals will not be considered unless Final Reports have been filed on <u>all</u> previous awards.

Name: _____

Academic Unit:_____

Award Number: #2020 - _____   Is this a Progress Report _____ or Final Report ____?
Award Amount: $ _____
Award Title: _____

Project Summary: Concisely describe the activities undertaken, addressing the goals and aims presented in your proposal. Include citations of any presentations, publications, performances, external proposals or related activities which have resulted from this project. Indicate any activities of this sort that are planned in the near future. (Use the reverse side if necessary.)

USE AS GUIDE FOR FUTURE REPORT
DO NOT INCLUDE WITH PROPOSAL APPLICATION

_____   _____
(Signature of Applicant)   (Date)

_____   _____
(Signature of Unit Head)   (Date)

East Carolina University
Faculty Senate
2019-2020 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVES COMMITTEE

Comments on a 2020 Research/Creative Activity Award

This page will be used by the committee to capture substantive and constructive comments about the award proposal from the reviewers. This page will then be transmitted to the applicant following the awarding process.

Name: _____

Academic Unit:_____

Award Number: #2020 - _____
Award Amount: $ _____

Award Title: _____

Reviewer Comments:

Resolution #19-98
Resolution for Notification about Non-Member of the University Community groups Access to Campus

In April 2015, and again in October 2019, the Genocide Awareness Project (GAP) conducted a political campaign promoting anti-abortion perspectives. The GAP includes a large installation of images and text that purports to represent the results of actual medical procedures as well "juxtaposes images of aborted embryos and fetuses with images of victims of historical and contemporary genocides and other injustice" (https://www.abortionno.org/college-campus-outreach-gap/). The campaign is shocking, upsetting, and triggering to many in the campus community. More disturbing, however, is that the campus community at large is not informed of the GAP's plans for visiting campus and therefore not prepared to engage in an informed dialog that should be the hallmark of academic life. The campus community is also not made aware that members of the GAP who interact with campus community members wear body cameras that may be used to record interactions.

WHEREAS, the University recognizes that shocking, upsetting, and triggering words, images, and ideas may be a legitimate part of academic inquiry; and

WHEREAS, "all Members of the University Community share the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which Academic Freedom flourishes and in which the rights of each member of the academic community are respected" (PRR REG07.30.06, section 6; revised July 15, 2019); and

WHEREAS, Academic Freedom cannot flourish in an environment where an exchange of ideas is not promoted through access to information about planned, formal presentations of ideas; and

WHEREAS, members of the academic community should be made aware that their actions are being recorded;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

1. to promote the free exchange of ideas at the center of academic endeavors, the Faculty Senate requests that the university community be notified in a timely manner about all non-spontaneous, Non-Member of the University groups and speakers whose presence on campus has been approved by the Campus Reservation Office (CRO), including days, times, and locations; and

2. the Faculty Senate requests that notification provided to the campus community include that member of the community may be recorded if that is the case;

3. the Faculty Senate urges the university to support faculty, staff, and student engagement with non-spontaneous visiting groups and speakers in thoughtful dialogue representative of freedom of thought and expression, academic inquiry, and intellectual integrity; and

4. the Faculty Senate urges that faculty be represented on the CRO committee charged with approving non-spontaneous event requests from Non-Member of the University Community groups.

Resolution #19-99
Resolution on the Service of Lori Lee

Whereas, Lori Lee has faithfully, steadfastly, and proactively served in the Faculty Senate Office for 30 years, redefining the role of office manager and fulfilling it with diligence, patience, and good cheer; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has acted as the institutional memory of the Faculty Senate and served as the face and voice of the Faculty Senate Office; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has passionately advocated for shared governance and consistently and effectively promoted the voice of the faculty in the affairs of East Carolina University; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has served 15 Chairs of the Faculty, providing critical support to maximize their success; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has deployed her incredible organization skills to support the operations of twenty-two Academic and five Appellate Committees, served as executive secretary to their chairs, and supported the participation of thousands of faculty committee members; and

Whereas, Lori Lee has been instrumental in organizing more than 200 meetings of the ECU Faculty Senate, and has managed and catalogued the passage of more than 1,800 Faculty Senate Resolutions; and

Whereas, Lori Lee was honored with the Chancellor's Award for Excellence, Devotion to Duty in 2000, the Women of Distinction Award by the Chancellor's Committee on the Status of Women in 2015, the Faculty Senate 50th Anniversary Medallion also in 2015, and the Centennial Award for Excellence, Spirit Award, in 2017 for her many contributions to the Faculty Senate, ECU, and the larger community; and

Whereas, Lori Lee is perpetually ready to play any role to advance our collective efforts; and

Whereas, Lori Lee moves through her work and her life animated by the sterling values of integrity, fairness, inclusion, and kindness towards others;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the East Carolina University Faculty Senate, representing all ECU faculty members, commends Lori Lee for her countless, selfless contributions to our community over three decades of outstanding service; and

Be it Further Resolved That, Lori Lee is recognized as a model exemplar of ECU's motto, To Serve.