



2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2020

[WebEx Meeting Recording](#)

The meeting of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate was held on **Tuesday, November 3, 2020**, at 2:10 as a WebEx meeting.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Purificación Martínez, Chair of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The [October 6, 2020](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Alternate present was: Professor Lynnsay Marsan (Biology)

B. [Announcements](#)

Chair Martínez highlighted that teaching grants have secured funding from the Division of Health Sciences.

Speaking privileges have been granted to Virginia Hardy, Sara Thorndike, Ying Zhou, Paul Zigas and members of the committees reporting today.

C. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Chancellor

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson thanked the faculty senators and officers for their service and wished all a Happy Election Tuesday. The last time the faculty convened, AD Jon Gilbert presented on salary reductions in athletics, and many were appreciative of his remarks regarding his own reduction in pay. Mitchelson said that senior leadership at the university are hopeful to make an announcement soon on their own reduction in salaries.

The next item the Chancellor had been asked to speak about was the potential of early retirement incentives. Early retirement is an existing option for some faculty through phased retirement, which permits some benefits while the employee continues to work half-time. At the most recent Board of Governors meeting, a 2020 legislative proposal was presented that would amend NCGS-116 with HR Programs to Address Impact of COVID-19. Section 2 of the proposal includes early retirement for the UNC System. (See page 9 at this link for the proposal:

<https://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/bog/doc.php?id=64741&code=bog>). Employees would first need to be eligible for retirement through TSERS or OSP. The incentive is one to six months of salary as severance based on criteria to be established by President Hans. It would go into effect if approved by legislators and would be available for use through December 31, 2022.

The Chancellor then spoke about COVID-19 testing. One element is fall exit testing. The university encourages exit testing by the students as they head home in November for the holidays. While exit testing is not mandatory, it may be of interest to the students. There would be quarantine and isolation capacity available for students who test positive at this time. In the spring, there would be mandatory re-entry testing only for residential on-campus students. The students would test either

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

before they return to the dormitories or upon return to campus. There will also be spring prevalence/surveillance testing with ten percent of residential students to be tested weekly with a goal to voluntarily test 2-5 percent of the total on-campus population weekly, which includes employees and students. 9,700 tests this fall have been completed.

The Chancellor then spoke about the election. As it has been a heated season, there has been messaging to students on the election from Vice Chancellor Hardy and communications through social media to encourage voting and respect others regardless how they vote. There has also been discussion on post-election safety on campus between various local agencies. There are no known currently organized protests or issues to date. Student Affairs has met with various student groups to maintain engagement to discuss any potential plans. SafeRide access has been increased at this time, as well.

Questions

Professor Moss (Dental Medicine) asked where the tests would be located and how they would be funded.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that tests will be conducted at Student Health and at the Division of Health Sciences. If it is a mandatory test, the university will pay for it. If the test is not mandatory, the university will bill health insurance programs. There will be a set and marketed program for both East and West Campuses.

D. Michael Van Scott, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development and Engagement

Interim Chancellor Van Scott provided the following details on the Fiscal Sustainability Taskforce. The group has just begun to meet. The objective is currently to plan for the next budget cut or shortfall. They are tasked to build revenue and reserves, increase efficiencies and reduce costs. Reallocations with the least impact to the academic enterprise are the goal. Guiding principles are to sustain and build impactful education and scholarship, maintain and decrease cost of attendance for in-state residents, align resources with the priorities of the mission of the institution, ensure funds flow to the activities that were outlined in strategic plan processes. For the committee and others involved, Van Scott asks all to think holistically and prioritize accordingly, respect opinions, and seek practical strategies.

The coordinating committee has been meeting to look at increasing revenue and efficiencies while reducing costs. There have been 87 responses to date at the online suggestion box. Once the committee has identified areas that can be addressed, the group will draw from other university employees to form working groups to vet the ideas and formulate the final recommendations. Then, these recommendations come back to the coordinating committee, where the ideas will be discussed. A draft report will be formed and then distributed to the university. Then the report will be shared with university executive leadership.

All need to be engaged in this process. Some aspects will be discussed confidentially, but as much as possible information will be shared. The taskforce is open to ensuring good communication during this process. There has been some concern that ECU Athletics and ECU Physicians are not part of this process. These areas are being analyzed currently through other processes outside of this Fiscal Sustainability Taskforce. However, the taskforce may look at those areas as part of a comprehensive look at the university funds, and this would be up to the Chancellor.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Questions

Professor Grodner (Economics) asked how or if the financial discussion is related to the current political situation.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said that this committee would not be addressing the immediate shortfall due to COVID-19. All units and areas have plans in place for budget cuts over the next couple of years, and that budget situation will be managed with those plans. He does not anticipate politics affecting long-term plans for the university budget. The count of students will affect those plans, however, so the university will need to think through those issues and position the institution to be able to succeed.

Professor Brimhall (Human Development & Family Science) said that some out-of-state students say that ECU's tuition for out-of-state students is lower than tuition would be for their in-state institutions. With loss of employee raises and reduced faculty morale, is there any consideration of increasing out-of-state tuition?

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said this is an aspect that should be considered within our state system.

Professor Vogelsong (Recreation Sciences) serves on his college's budget reduction committee. On behalf of his dean, Vogelsong asked why ECU is looking at reductions in recurring permanent funds instead of looking at reductions in short-term expenditures.

Vice Chancellor Thorndike said that we do not know what type of budget cut will be seen by the state legislature, whether it will be temporary or permanent, so the institution is looking at being prepared for both scenarios, looking at both recurring and nonrecurring expenditures. In the past, there were permanent state budget cuts.

E. James Coker, Senior Associate Director of Admissions Operations

Senior Associate Director Coker was present to answer questions related to the report on [Freshman class and home-schooled admissions](#).

Questions

There were no questions at this time.

F. Wendy Creasey, Director of Digital Learning and Emerging Technology Initiatives

Director Creasey reported to the faculty that Digital Badges are a way to verify that activities have been completed. A committee looked at the use of this technology. For the next year, the committee will approve each badge that has been approved and will post those at [badges.ecu.edu](#). These badges can be used, for example, on LinkedIn to verify certain activities have been completed. Some groups that may use badges include Student Affairs, OED, and Career Services.

Questions

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked who would use the badges: employees or students?

Director Creasey said faculty, staff, and students could all use these badges. Employees could use it for professional development. For students, badges are co-curricular, not for learning outcomes. Badges will not be awarded with digitally identifiable data attached to them.

Faculty Senate Meeting November 3, 2020

Professor Wolf (Physics) asked how easy is it to create a badge? For example, could it be worthwhile to create a badge for individual research experiences within a department, for example "Physics Research".

Director Creasey said it would need to be co-curricular and substantive. It would not be for simply attending an event, but rather for participating in an activity.

G. Allen Guidry, Assistant Dean of Planning and Global Engagement

Dr. Guidry provided an overview of Strategic Enrollment Planning (SEP), which is an initiative to prepare for the anticipated decline in student enrollment in 2025.

Slides shared by Dr. Guidry as part of his presentation are located here: <https://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/fsagenda/2020/SEP.Overview.Fall2020.FacultySenate.pptx>

Dr. Guidry requested the following report be linked within the minutes, as well, because he made reference to it within his presentation: https://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/fsagenda/2020/2019.04.25.DRAFT.EMTF.REPORT_FINAL.pdf

Questions

Professor Chambers (Education) said the current recruitment strategy is to focus on highly populated areas; however, some students may seek to enroll at ECU from more rural areas. Would ECU look to increasing recruitment initiatives in the eastern region of the state?

Dr. Guidry said one initiative that is being reviewed is looking at zip code data to try to increase enrollment statewide while also continuing to include recruitment initiatives in the highly populated areas.

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked if the data Dr. Guidry shared included students who were being recruited from community colleges or is that a separate data point.

Dr. Guidry said the military community college (Navy) is newly partnering with ECU. The data that was shared included the pool of graduating students who would be leaving high school to attend a university of any type.

H. Ralph Scott, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Scott was present to answer questions about the report from the October 18, 2020 UNC Faculty Assembly meeting. He said that speaker Chief Academic Officer, Kim Van Noort announced the System Office was pleased with fall enrollment and encouraged faculty to take advantage of the systemwide LMS training. Chief of Staff, Norma Houston, presented a report on behalf of President Hans. She shared four initiatives that Hans would request funding for: keeping college costs down, concerns about crime on campus (there had been 3 shootings on UNC campuses in a week), no new large capital projects, and an initiative to increase faculty salaries.

Questions

Professor Chambers (Education) said with no new capital projects, does that include or not include the new Brody School of Medicine building.

Professor Scott said there was no mention of this specific project or other specific project during this meeting.

I. Purificación Martínez, Chair of the Faculty

Chair Martínez provided her remarks:

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

“I speak to you today, on what it is indubitably one of the most important days in the recent history of this country. I will talk to you about the Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee and the budget cuts that will be coming our way next academic year. I think that we all agree that any discussion about ECU’s budget is connected to the results of this election. Regardless of political affiliation, all of us have cast our votes aware that the make-up of the political landscape will have a profound impact on higher education. That impact will most likely be both short and long term, the same way that we are working on planning scenarios of 10% budget cuts and are working on a Fiscal Sustainability Plan.

The Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee has just started its work. We have met three times in the course of a couple of weeks. During the organizational meeting, Interim Chancellor Mitchelson reminded the committee members that we were not there representing our departments, colleges or divisions, we were there to think institutionally. In his comments to us the Chancellor asked us to be transparent in our decision-making process, to engage often with faculty, students and staff and to consult with all before deciding on any final recommendations. In other words, to communicate. The following two meetings have been devoted to financial updates and information about enrollment, degrees, and faculty in comparison to our peers. We have been granted access to the University of Delaware Instructional Cost Study and ECU’s Productivity Index. Numbers, lots of numbers, charts, lots and lots of charts.

I am sure that in the months to come, the committee will study all those numbers and charts and ask for even more of them. I don’t doubt they will be valuable in our decision-making process, but, as I view them, they are a tool. My intention while looking at each single dollar amount, number or chart is to think of you. You, whose taxes support higher education. You, whose child studies at ECU and who has to pay tuition. You, who works until late at night preparing for class or finishing a research project. You, who is afraid of losing your job if the cuts are too deep. You, who serves on the committee that might have to decide what person stays and what person goes.

As in the United States, Covid-19 has created societal and political havoc in my birth country, Spain. Fernando Vallespín, a sociologist whose work I respect very much just wrote two days ago: “we have lost a sense of community, we lack an ‘us.’ We share the same trauma, but it has been fragmented into a thousand different narratives.” Vallespín argues that the cause of it all is a failure in communication. Communication, with the same etymology as common. Quoting Montaigne, the reader is reminded that when we fail to address the community, we betray the *res publica*.

I am quite certain that Chancellor Mitchelson did not have Montaigne in mind when he asked us to communicate often with the ECU community. But that is exactly what this Coordination Committee must do. We must engage all of you so we, together, reflect on our weaknesses and find a path to overcome them.

This is the time to embrace our identity: an access, research intensive university. We must have frank discussions about our current structural model, to see if there is unnecessary duplication of services, to understand who pays for what and when, to eliminate or significantly reduce what does not support the core mission of the institution. We must find ways to eradicate our long practice of surviving on the backs of faculty who do extraordinary teaching but have no job security. We have to recognize that we cannot significantly increase extramural funding if our

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

teaching loads are increased or we do not have sufficient administrative support. This is the time to abandon once and for all some phrases that I have heard too many times: “We have always done it this way”, “this is ECU, we do more with less.” Let me paraphrase, we cannot continue doing the unbelievable with so little. We cannot attempt to do the impossible with nothing.

Allow me to quote Vallespín once again: “Instead of frank discussions, we have been seized by the silence and the zombie walk of those who do not know where they are going.” You might think that since we have formed this Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee this quote does not apply to our context. I will argue exactly the opposite. I will defend to anyone that, in fact, the general sense among faculty is that we do not know where we are going.

Case in point, as are all other UNC institutions, ECU is supposed to prepare for a scenario with a 10% cut. But, after last year’s 4.7% cut, unique to ECU, nobody here has any idea of how we can possibly do it. The easiest way might be to keep vacant positions unfilled and to fire enough people to make the cut. That number, 10% is so huge that engaging in strategic cuts might not seem possible. However, it must be attempted. And it has to be done in collaboration between administrators and faculty. And it must be done with clear and frequent communications from senior administrators. Some of them must provide the overarching principles and strategies to be used in all planning processes. Others must explain to their constituencies their application of those principles and strategies and seek input from the faculty. We must solve this crisis together, as a community. To each its own is not the way to go at this pivotal time.

During the faculty interviews with candidates for Chancellor, one of them asked us, “what does keep you up at night?” Since we were 14 people, and only 5 of us had a chance to ask questions, I did not answer the candidate’s question. I spoke with the person afterwards to tell them what keeps me up at night: what will be of us if this 10% cut becomes a reality? If this were to happen, the recommendations of the Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee would be meaningless because at that point ECU would be a drastically different place. By the sheer power of cuts, we would have been reorganized. That is why planning for the short-term cuts and for the long term with the Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee must be conducted in similar ways: with guiding principles, with data, with representatives from faculty and administrators at the table, with ample opportunities for engagement at every step of the way.

Many of you have been very active this past four years writing to your representatives to express support, concern. During this election cycle many of you have canvassed. This activity must continue, refocused to our tasks at hand. If you don’t already know, write to your chair, dean, Vice Chancellor, ask them for information, send questions, concerns. Attend town hall meetings, if they call them. Request a town hall meeting if they don’t. The Fiscal Sustainability Coordination Committee has established a website, but that might not give you enough information or opportunity to engage. Don’t hesitate to contact me. Parallel to this activism, I also ask of you to become educated about the realities of ECU’s finances. The Faculty Senate Budget Committee is working with Vice Chancellor Thorndike in the creation of a Budget webpage with easy access to a plethora of information. Until then, reach out to the committee to ask them questions.

My final remark to you is a radical idea: this year for these difficult decisions, let’s not be pirates. Let’s not pilfer from one another in order to get dominance or advance our own interests. We are

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

a community. We must start acting like one. After 12 years of cut after cut, each one worse than the one before, this is our chance to do it right. I am not certain we will have another.”

J. Question Period

Professor McKinnon (History) asked if Chair Martínez could add any further updates on the Chancellor search.

Chair Martínez said she met with faculty leaders and other faculty members in meetings with the candidates. Professors Chambers and Popke contacted the search committee consultant in advance of this meeting of the Faculty Senate to find out what could be shared as they had signed a confidentiality agreement.

Professor Popke (Past Chair/ Member of Chancellor Search Committee) said the search committee ended their work last month. Finalists came to campus in October and met with different groups. Interview participants completed surveys with information that aided the committee in their deliberations. A group of 12 faculty members and 2 Academic Affairs deans comprised a group for faculty interviews of the candidates. Before the process began, the group convened to begin to identify a common set of questions to ask each of the candidates. Faculty Senate Officers met with Professors Chambers and Popke additionally prior to each separate interview to formulate additional questions specifically for each candidate. The group of faculty members would debrief after each interview was complete to discuss each candidate. Popke found this to be an effective method to gain insights into the qualifications and leadership potential of each candidate. After the interview process was complete, the search committee met and agreed on a final slate of no fewer than two candidates. The Board of Trustees then met, and the search now rests in the hands of President Hans. It is anticipated that the search will end soon, and the candidate could begin at the beginning of the year. Each member of the search committee took their obligation seriously, all were respectful, and discussions were thoughtful and substantive.

Senator Thompson Varnell (Engineering) asked if the search committee was in agreement with the finalists submitted by the Board of Trustees.

Professor Popke said the search committee does not know if the search committee's slate of candidates matches what is on the Board's slate that is being sent to President Hans as that was confidential as well. The Board of Trustees should not be submitting different candidates than what the search committee sends, based on the guidance received from former UNC System President Roper, but Professor Popke has no way of ensuring that happened in this case.

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked if there is any additional relevant information that could be shared.

Professor Chambers (Education/ Faculty member of Chancellor Search Committee) said that personnel processes are already highly confidential, and the rules that apply to the Chancellor Search are more intensive than a typical search as it would be hard for a person who is in a position to become a chancellor could find their work is tenuous at their current employer if known by their current employer to have been part of a search with another employer. The confidentiality applied during the search still applies after the search, as well.

Professor Popke feels that in reading the search policy he feels this type of process should not involve this level of confidentiality as the search policy just states that the names of candidates are to be considered confidential. However, the confidentiality that was signed by participants in this chancellor search was quite restrictive.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) said there should be a way to present candidate visions and credits as there would not be a way for the public to know who the candidates were based on those details.

Professor Chambers said there was no public presentation of the candidates to this campus. The interactions were Q&A in format. Chambers speculated that as a candidate tends to get into specifics in terms of a vision, sharing this sort of information outside the search could reveal a candidate as a vision may have been based on something they have done in the past. She reiterated that she has shared what she has been able to share.

Professor Thompson Varnell (Engineering) said that at past institutions where she had worked, chancellor candidates were able to interact with the campus once invited to the site, so the search stopped being confidential at that point. She asked if the confidential practice has always been done at ECU.

Professor Chambers said that in some past UNC System searches confidentiality was breached, so this is to protect the candidates.

Chair Martínez said it is becoming a national trend for these types of searches to be held confidentially.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked who creates the non-disclosure agreements.

Professor Popke said it is up to the search committee chair and the search consultants. The one for ECU's Chancellor Search was drafted by ECU Interim University Attorney Paul Zigas. There was no involvement with the faculty in developing or seeing that agreement before it was time to sign it.

Professor Doty (Engineering) asked if the finalists will be shared with the university before the final candidate is selected.

Professor Popke said no they will not. Next we will hear either that a chancellor has been interviewed and selected and approved by the System President and the Board of Governors or that the search has been returned back to the search committee to continue.

Professor Grodner (Economics) asked who in the nondisclosure agreement has the power and privilege and asked if Attorney Zigas may be able to answer. He also asked if a candidate would be permitted to reveal themselves as part of meeting with the university committee, as an example. Interim University Attorney Zigas answered that personnel records are confidential and that anything that is part of a personnel file is confidential. Applicants can disclose they are candidates, but institutions keep confidentiality at the top of the list to protect the candidates. The UNC Board of Governors is the entity that has the power in this process. ECU Board of Trustees has been operating on behalf of the System President and the Board of Governors who make the ultimate decision. The UNC System does not have the same types of searches as other institutions. Attorney Zigas said searches are so confidential due to this general statute: NC GS 126-24:

https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/PDF/BySection/Chapter_126/GS_126-24.pdf

Professor Bauer (English) said she understands confidentiality and the need for employees to protect the positions where they are currently employed. She asked why not being able to share broader details, such as demographics, included in the confidentiality agreement?

Interim University Attorney Zigas said it is all considered part of the confidential applicant information in the personnel file. The agreement is governed by state law and was crafted to protect the integrity

Faculty Senate Meeting November 3, 2020

of the search. Any information disseminated about an applicant no matter how innocuous it may seem may potentially be tracked back to an individual applicant.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked about who Attorney Zigas is responsible to in terms of developing the nondisclosure agreement that was signed by the Chancellor Search Committee.

Interim University Attorney Zigas operated on behalf of the ECU Board of Trustees with close collaboration with the UNC System Office. They would review the contents of the document and signing off as to whether it was acceptable. Any search like this would include a comprehensive confidentiality agreement.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business to come before the body 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 [October 19, 2020](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [September 2, 2020](#), and [September 16, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-10), including level II action items from the [September 2, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, which were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a revision to existing certificate - Psychiatric-Mental Health Nurse Practitioner, and revision to existing degree program – Masters of Science in Nursing (MSN) in the Department of Advanced Nursing Practice and Education within the College of Nursing; and in the [August 31, 2020](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, which were presented as information only during the October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting, and are now being presented to you for formal faculty advice, including policy action item (GC 20-9) Graduate Catalog editorial revision to the “[General Requirements for Degrees and Certificates](#)” policy, to include clarification to the two research ethics requirements where it clarifies that students can take the HUMS 7004 – Ethics and Research or a discipline specific equivalent of at least two credits of research ethics, human subjects protections, and the responsible conduct of research; and proposed changes to the “[Request for Inclusion](#)”, to help streamline and shorten up the process for a new program approval.

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 [October 19, 2020](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [September 2, 2020](#), and [September 16, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-10), including level II action items from the [September 2, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, which were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a revision to existing certificate - Psychiatric-Mental Health Nurse Practitioner, and revision to existing degree program – Masters of Science in Nursing (MSN) in the Department of Advanced Nursing Practice and Education within the College of Nursing; and in the [August 31, 2020](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, which were presented as information only during the October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting, and are now being presented to you for formal faculty advice, including policy action item (GC 20-9) Graduate Catalog editorial revision to the “[General Requirements for Degrees and Certificates](#)” policy, to include clarification to the two

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

research ethics requirements where it clarifies that students can take the HUMS 7004 – Ethics and Research or a discipline specific equivalent of at least two credits of research ethics, human subjects protections, and the responsible conduct of research; and proposed changes to the “[Request for Inclusion](#)”, to help streamline and shorten up the process for a new program approval.

RESOLUTION #20-65

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. Faculty Grievance Committee, Gregory Lapicki

Professor Lapicki (Physics), Chair of the Committee, presented the overview of 2019-2020 Committee Activities.

There was no discussion, and the report was received by the Faculty Senate.

B. Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, Jen-Scott Mobley

Professor Mobley (Theatre and Dance), member of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [October 12, 2020](#) meeting including writing intensive course designation (WI) removal for NURS 4904: Professionalism in Baccalaureate Nursing Practice, writing intensive course designation (WI) approval for NURS 4906: Community Health Nursing.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [October 12, 2020](#) Writing Across the Curriculum meeting including writing intensive course designation (WI) removal for NURS 4904: Professionalism in Baccalaureate Nursing Practice, writing intensive course designation (WI) approval for NURS 4906: Community Health Nursing were approved. **RESOLUTION #20-66**

Professor Mobley then presented proposed revisions to the WI Syllabus Statement.

There was no discussion, and the proposed revisions to the WI Syllabus Statement were approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-67**

Professor Mobley then presented proposed revisions to the WI Course Proposal Form. The form updated some of the links and language and added an option for revision of an existing WI course.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the WI Course Proposal Form were approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-68**

C. Unit Code Screening Committee, Ken Ferguson

Professor Ferguson (Philosophy and Religious Studies) presented the [revised Department of Chemistry Unit Code of Operations](#).

There was no discussion and the [revised Department of Chemistry Unit Code of Operations](#) was approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-69**

D. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Stacy Weiss

Professor Weiss (Education), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting minutes of [September 24, 2020](#) including curricular actions in

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

the Department of Coastal Studies within Integrated Coastal Programs; and [October 8, 2020](#) including curricular actions in the Department of Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance.

There was no discussion, and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 24, 2020](#) including curricular actions in the Department of Coastal Studies within Integrated Coastal Programs; and [October 8, 2020](#) including curricular actions in the Department of Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-70**

E. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Eli Hvastkovs

Professor Hvastkovs (Chemistry), Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Graduation Requirements, Degrees with Distinction.

Professor Leorri (Geological Sciences) asked if the committee considered how the students are accepted in each of the universities and gave an example of how NC State's ratios are different than ECU's.

Professor Hvastkovs replied that the committee agreed to simplify this to alleviate trouble with students not being able to obtain enough hours at ECU to obtain honors and to eliminate transfer comparison.

The proposed revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Graduation Requirements, Degrees with Distinction were approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-71**

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Mark Bowler

Professor Bowler (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual* Part VI., Section VII. Curriculum Procedures and Program Development.

There was no discussion, and the proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual* Part VI., Section VII. Curriculum Procedures and Program Development were approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-72**

Professor Bowler then presented proposed revisions to the Academic Program Review (APR) guidelines. The revisions were being made to remain in compliance with SACSCOC requirements.

Professor Popke (Past Chair/Faculty Delegate) suggested two editorial changes, including one on page 16 to suggested to change IA to IPAR, and one on page 13 to retain "the" prior to "faculty's".

Professor Chambers (Education) noted the review would be changed from departments to units and mentioned this could affect departments with multiple programs in it. She asked why that change was being made. She also offered to be of aid regarding equity and diversity guidelines.

Professor Bowler replied this area is one part of the committee's motivation to complete an extensive review of this document.

Chair Martínez granted speaking privileges to Director Cynthia Bellacero.

Director Bellacero agreed to Professor Popke's two suggested editorial changes. She then said the wording mentioned by Professor Chambers was suggested as a change to alleviate confusion

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

between departments and programs, but she would be fine to leave those areas unchanged if it changed specific meaning.

Professor Bowler asserted Chambers' suggestion would significantly alter what the committee voted on and withdrew the revisions at this time.

RESOLUTION #20-73

G. General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, George Bailey

Professor Bailey (Philosophy and Religious Studies) presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the meeting of [October 19, 2020](#) including Domestic Diversity designation (DD) for SOC 101 Introductory Sociology (Principles) from Quinsigamond Community College, and Global Diversity designation (GD) for Management 357: Diversity in a Global Environment from Bryant University.

There was no discussion, and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting of [October 19, 2020](#) including Domestic Diversity designation (DD) for SOC 101 Introductory Sociology (Principles) from Quinsigamond Community College, and Global Diversity designation (GD) for Management 357: Diversity in a Global Environment from Bryant University were approved. **RESOLUTION #20-74**

H. Committee on Committees, Melinda Doty

Professor Doty (Engineering and Technology) presented the first reading of proposed revisions to the Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee charge.

She also shared a call for committee participation.

There was no discussion, and formal action on the proposed revisions will take place after the second reading at the December 1, 2020 meeting.

Agenda Item VII. New Business

Professor Crystal Chambers (Education) presented a resolution developed by the ECU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), as follows:

ECU AAUP Resolution On Covid-19 Prevalence Testing
Now and for Reopening in January 2021

Whereas East Carolina University has witnessed over 1200 cases of Covid-19 since March, more than 1000 of those cases since reopening in August 2020;

Whereas the *New York Times* "[Tracking Covid at U.S. Colleges and Universities](#)" ranks ECU in the top universities for Covid-19 infections nationwide and ranks ECU the #1 university for Covid-19 infections in North Carolina;

Whereas Pitt County, North Carolina has witnessed 5,174 total cases, more than 600 active cases and 33 deaths (as of 10/6/2020), most having occurred since the August reopening of East Carolina University;

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Whereas the CDC has published guidance, "[Testing, Screening, and Outbreak Response for Institutions of Higher Education \(IHEs\)](#)" recommending the testing of asymptomatic individuals without known exposure at colleges and universities;

Whereas two recent studies (Paltiel, et. al. and Bradley, et. al.) in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* have concluded that prevalence testing (that is, testing for the proportion of the population infected with Covid-19 at a specific time), when used in conjunction with other behavioral modifications, such as social distancing, frequent hand washing, mask wearing, isolation and quarantine, and contact tracing can keep students and employees safe;

Whereas these two studies employed models demonstrating prevalence testing of all students and employees and - when analyzed together - strongly indicate that 1) such testing every two days is ideal though likely not cost effective, 2) such testing every two weeks maintains the infection rate in certain local conditions, and 3) random testing with the aim of testing every student each month is a cost-efficient and reasonably effective method of limiting spread of infection;

Whereas the Interim Chancellor has announced that ECU will reopen in January 2021; now, and heretofore be it

Resolved, The ECU chapter of the AAUP strongly urges that immediately, and also in advance of opening campus in January 2021, the ECU Administration adopt a "Covid-19 Prevention, Detection and Response Plan" to implement the following aggressive prevalence testing policy:

1. Employ a medical testing laboratory that uses Viral PCR tests (nasal or saliva), the gold standard in Covid-19 testing;
2. Immediately adopt a policy of random testing of asymptomatic employees and students that determines the prevalence of Covid-19 within the ECU community, with the aim of testing every member of the community once a month at minimum (approximately 800-1000 tests per day);
3. Require students and employees to get tested by a doctor or a clinic within seven days before returning to Campus and provide ECU documentation;
4. Require students and employees to self-quarantine at home, beginning January 4th, 2021, before returning to ECU -- that includes monitoring their health and following appropriate disease prevention behaviors;
5. Coordinate with the Pitt County Health Department to offer random testing of asymptomatic members of the community to determine Greenville community prevalence;
6. Continue the testing of asymptomatic students and employees for ECU campus community prevalence beginning in January 2021 and through the spring semester of 2021;

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

7. Reinstate the text and email cluster alerts that previously informed the community of infection clusters, the messaging system ECU abruptly ended on Thursday, September 10, 2020;
8. Provide daily dashboard updates of student and employee testing results, including testing prevalence in the community and ECU campus. ECU must offer the data on this dashboard for purposes of determining when to move classes online, where to quarantine and isolate those students who test positive, where and how to treat those students who are sick and when to reopen campus.
9. Seek recommendation from the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and SGA on disciplinary measures for students and employees who don't follow behavioral and testing protocols.

Adopted by vote of the membership on October 5, 2020.

Dr. Karin L. Zipf
President, ECU Chapter of the AAUP and
Professor of History
East Carolina University

References:

Elizabeth H. Bradley, PhD, Ming-Wen An, PhD, Ellen Fox, MD, ["Reopening Colleges During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 \(COVID-19\) Pandemic—One Size Does Not Fit All,"](#) *JAMA* 3 (2020) 7: Accessed on September 12, 2020.

A. David Paltiel, PhD, Amy Zheng, BA, Rochelle P. Walensky, MD, MPH, ["Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States,"](#) *JAMA* 3 (2020) 7: Accessed on September 12, 2020.

The resolution was presented for endorsement by the Faculty Senate.

Questions:

Professor Popke (Past Chair/Faculty Delegate) inquired about the cost of testing. Professor Chambers responded that she did not have that information but would be able to get that for him.

Professor Haberstroh (Health Sciences Library) said her unit looked at this resolution. Besides the cost, the quarantine requirement brought concern due to circumstances such as ROSE employees such as they may end up being unpaid between January 4 and 19. The library has been set to reopen January 4. Also, there is concern on being quarantined without a known exposure. Interested to learn if this would be up for consideration.

Professor Chambers responded they would take it under advisement.

Professor Pearce (Sociology) said the Chancellor mentioned planned testing plans and asked if that conforms to what Professor Chambers was requesting.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Professor Chambers responded they would need to assess if the tests would be within the same range or if there would be additional costs.

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked if this means anyone on campus would need to be tested even seven days before heading into campus as some faculty go to their offices even when not teaching.

Professor Chambers responded that yes, before the employees returned for the spring, the university would be committed to this testing in the interest of preventing spread of the virus. The details on coming into campus would need to be vetted.

Professor Ticknor (Education) asked for confirmation that any faculty member who does not work on campus but comes to campus would be tested and gave an example of a faculty member coming to campus just to do printing.

Professor Chambers replied that the faculty member would get a baseline test to ensure they were not bringing the virus to campus after the end of the fall semester.

Professor Su (Geography, Planning and Environment) asked that since he is not traveling, and the testing is invasive, would he be forced to do this testing to work.

Professor Martínez acknowledged that Professor Su was against this resolution.

Professor Doty (Engineering) asked if any student who arrives on campus after Winter Break would need to be tested before they would be able to attend classes on campus.

Professor Chambers said this idea is not far from what the Chancellor mentioned regarding residential students but then also would apply to those students who do not reside on campus.

Professor Grodner (Economics) said when he came to the US as a student, he was required to get vaccines. He believes testing is something like what we already do in different settings and did not feel concern with the test itself. He said some universities randomly test professors.

Professor Chambers said other universities did test faculty, staff, and students upon return to campus in the fall.

Professor Bauer (English) said she was troubled about the Chancellor speaking only about the residential students as the students who live in the Greenville community also are in the classroom and the infection could spread in this way. She speaks in favor of this resolution and agrees it is similar to mandatory vaccines.

Professor DiMartino (Music) also supports this resolution as it is dangerous and difficult in his school as playing instruments in person is scary to some of the employees. He is thankful for the hard work put into this resolution.

Professor Doty (Engineering) asked how this would be managed and what ramifications would happen if they were not tested.

Professor Chambers said they would use the Student Code of Conduct to enforce this measure. This would involve working with executive leadership on how this would be managed. Executive Leadership would be more aware of the mechanics of ensuring available testing.

Professor Grodner (Economics) provided an example that if a child goes to school, the school can readily identify if they have a pinkeye and send them home. If there is a test where everyone before

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

they arrived on the schoolground could be identified as having the virus, there would not be a problem with COVID-19.

The resolution was endorsed by Faculty Senate. **RESOLUTION #20-75**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Submitted by,

Marlena Rose
Secretary of the Faculty
Health Sciences Library

Rachel Baker
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 3, 2020 MEETING

Resolution #20-65

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [October 19, 2020](#) Graduate Council meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [September 2, 2020](#), and [September 16, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-10), including level II action items from the [September 2, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, which were forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), and included a revision to existing certificate - Psychiatric-Mental Health Nurse Practitioner, and revision to existing degree program – Masters of Science in Nursing (MSN) in the Department of Advanced Nursing Practice and Education within the College of Nursing; and in the [August 31, 2020](#), Graduate Council meeting minutes, which were presented as information only during the October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting, and are now being presented to you for formal faculty advice, including policy action item (GC 20-9) Graduate Catalog editorial revision to the “[General Requirements for Degrees and Certificates](#)” policy, to include clarification to the two research ethics requirements where it clarifies that students can take the HUMS 7004 – Ethics and Research or a discipline specific equivalent of at least two credits of research ethics, human subjects protections, and the responsible conduct of research; and proposed changes to the “[Request for Inclusion](#)”, to help streamline and shorten up the process for a new program approval.

Resolution #20-66

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [October 12, 2020](#) Writing Across the Curriculum meeting including writing intensive course designation (WI) removal for NURS 4904: Professionalism in Baccalaureate Nursing Practice, writing intensive course designation (WI) approval for NURS 4906: Community Health Nursing.

Resolution #20-67

Revisions to the WI Syllabus Statement, as follows:

The statement below replaces the [current WI Syllabus Statement](#):

Writing Intensive (WI)

_____ [insert course prefix, number, and section] is a writing intensive course in the Writing Across the Curriculum program at East Carolina University. This course will focus on the development of writing skills. Upon completion of the course students will:

1. Use writing to investigate complex, relevant topics and address significant questions through engagement with and effective use of credible sources.
2. Produce writing that reflects an awareness of context, purpose, and audience, particularly within the written genres (including genres that integrate writing with visuals, audio, or other multimodal components) of their major disciplines and/or career fields.
3. Demonstrate that they understand writing as a process that can be made more effective through drafting and revision.
4. Proofread and edit their own writing, avoiding grammatical and mechanical errors.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

5. Assess and explain the major choices that they make in their writing.

This course contributes to the four-course WI requirement for students at ECU. Additional information is available at the following site: <https://writing.ecu.edu/>.

University Writing Portfolio

Students in all writing intensive courses are required to submit at least one completed written project to their University Writing Portfolio. In this course, students will submit assignments using the Portfolio tool. The university uses these writing samples to assess the writing program and to make improvements where necessary. To report problems with Portfolio, contact ITCS: <https://go.ecu.edu/Portfolio>.

By default, assignments that you submit to your University Writing Portfolio become part of your personal Portfolio website (<https://ecu.portfolio.com>), which you may use or not as you please. Be aware that you are in control of the privacy settings of your Portfolio site and should review the settings to ensure your privacy settings are set to your preference. Making items on your personal Portfolio site public or private does not impact your grade in your writing intensive courses. Your Portfolio account remains yours after you leave ECU.

Resolution #20-68

Revisions to the WI Course Proposal Form, as follows:

The proposal form below replaces the [current version](#):

**University Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
Writing Intensive Course Proposal**

(Faculty Senate Resolution #13-91, November 2013; Revised October 2020)

Submission Checklist
<input type="checkbox"/> Memo from Unit Admin
<input type="checkbox"/> WI Course Proposal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Syllabus w/ WI Statement

All new and existing WI courses must comply with the current approved Writing Intensive Course Proposal format and be included in regular audits of all WI courses as part of ongoing assessment of the ECU Writing Across the Curriculum program.

Course Information

1. Course prefix & number: _____ Department: _____
2. Course name: _____
3. Faculty contact: _____ Email: _____
4. This course is for: _____ Majors: Non-majors:

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

SLO 2	How will students produce writing that reflects an awareness of context, purpose, and audience? If this is a WI course specific to majors, please explain how students will produce writing that reflects an awareness of context, purpose, and audience in written genres of their major disciplines and/or career fields.
SLO 3	How will students demonstrate that they understand writing as a process that can be made more effective through drafting and revision?
SLO 4	How will you help students proofread and edit their own writing, avoiding grammatical and mechanical errors?
SLO 5	How will students assess and explain the major choices that they make in their writing?

Additional information about writing intensive course designation (WI) is available online at:
<https://facultysenate.ecu.edu/writing-curriculum-committee/>

Resolution #20-69
Revised [Department of Chemistry Unit Code of Operations](#).

Resolution #20-70
Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [September 24, 2020](#) including curricular actions in the Department of Coastal Studies within Integrated Coastal Programs; and [October 8, 2020](#) including curricular actions in the Department of Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance.

Resolution #20-71

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Academic Advisement, Progression and Support Services, Graduation Requirements, Degrees with Distinction, as follows:

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

Degrees with Distinction

Latin honors distinction for any (i.e. first or subsequent) undergraduate degree is based on the cumulative grade point average calculated solely from all credit hours attempted at East Carolina University. For students returning to ECU under forgiveness policy, only hours included in the GPA following the application of forgiveness will be considered for a degree with distinction. ~~Based on all work completed at all regionally accredited United States colleges and universities throughout a students' academic career,~~ Three levels of distinction are granted to graduating undergraduates as follows:

1. *Summa Cum Laude* for a cumulative average of 3.90 and above
2. *Magna Cum Laude* for a cumulative average of equal to or greater than 3.60 and less than 3.90
3. *Cum Laude* for a cumulative average of equal to or greater than 3.50 and less than 3.60

Note: International credit earned from institutions located outside of the United States is not included in the calculation of cumulative average for awarding degrees with distinction.

~~First Undergraduate Degree~~

~~Degrees with distinction are granted to transfer students under the following conditions.~~

- ~~1. The student must complete through enrollment in East Carolina University at least one-half the minimum number of hours required for the degree.~~
- ~~2. The student must have the required average on all work taken through enrollment in East Carolina University.~~
- ~~3. The student must have a cumulative average that meets the requirements for the appropriate degree with distinction on all work attempted (all ECU and transfer work, including courses where the grade replacement policy has been applied). If transfer work includes grades of D or F, those grades will be included in the calculation for degrees of distinction.~~

~~Second Undergraduate Degree~~

~~Second undergraduate degrees with distinction are awarded under the following conditions.~~

- ~~1. The student must complete a minimum of 30 semester hours through enrollment in East Carolina University.~~
- ~~2. The student must have a minimum GPA of 3.5 on course work for the second degree and a cumulative average that meets the requirement for the degree with distinction on all course work attempted for the first degree as well as for the second degree.~~
- ~~3. If transfer work includes grades of D or F, those grades will be included in the calculation for degrees of distinction.~~

Resolution #20-72

Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* Part VI., Section VII. Curriculum Procedures and Program Development, as follows:

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

PART VI - TEACHING AND CURRICULUM REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES
AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

SECTION VII

Curriculum Procedures and Academic Program Development

(Revised 11-19)

In accordance with ECU's commitment to strong academic programs and the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation, ECU "places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty." Program and curriculum changes are initiated, prepared, and presented for review through ECU's curriculum management system. All proposals follow an approval process inclusive of all relevant ECU campus bodies and voting faculty as defined in this document. Three levels of approval are defined according to the specific delegated authority of final approval bodies. Proposals governed by the policies and procedures of the UNC System Office (UNC-SO) and/or Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) will follow additional approval steps and will therefore take longer to proceed through the entire approval process.

Academic Planning and Accreditation (APA), a unit of Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research, facilitates the curriculum and program development process through administration of ECU's curriculum management system and direct consultation with faculty planners. The Office of Continuing Studies and Distance Education and APA process requests to deliver new and existing academic programs through distance education. Consultation with the unit curriculum liaison, personnel in the Office of the Registrar, and personnel in APA is recommended at the onset of curriculum and program development.

The Academic Program Development Collaborative Team (APDCT), an advisory body to the Academic Council, is comprised of the ~~Undergraduate/Graduate Curriculum Committee chairs;~~ Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) chair; dean of the Graduate School; representatives from the Office of Continuing Studies and Distance Education, Institutional Research, Academic Planning and Accreditation, and Division of Health Sciences; and the Chair of the Faculty. APDCT collaborates with faculty planners to strengthen program proposals and makes recommendations to the Academic Council, EPPC, and the dean of the Graduate School (as applicable) on developing programs.

Academic committees of the Faculty Senate and the Graduate School review course and program proposals in accordance with their stated charges. Faculty Senate committees also approve requests for special course designations, such as service learning, writing intensive, and diversity.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

In cases of financial exigency or the initiation of a discontinuation, curtailment, or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program, the provisions of the *ECU Faculty Manual* will apply.

The Chancellor or designee in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty may establish deadlines of not less than two weeks by which each person and/or committee listed must report its concurrence (approval) or non-concurrence with the proposed action. Failure to report by the established deadline shall be considered an abstention and the proposed action shall progress to the next level for consideration.

A. Definitions

1. Degree Programs

A degree program is a program of study in a discipline specialty that leads to a degree in that distinct specialty area at a specified level of instruction. All degree programs are categorized individually in the University's academic program inventory (API) at the six-digit CIP code level, with a unique UNC-SO identifying code, and teacher licensure area, if applicable. As a rule, a degree program requires coursework in the discipline specialty of at least 27 semester hours at the undergraduate level and 21 semester hours at the doctoral level. A master's level program requires that at least one-half of the total hours be in the program area. Anything less than this within an existing degree program should be designated a concentration. Degree programs require final approval by UNC-SO and the UNC Board of Governors (BOG). Minors and concentrations receive final approval at the campus level. (Paraphrased from Academic Program Guidance, UNC System Office, 1/25/16. Accessed at http://www.northcarolina.edu/sites/default/files/documents/academicprogramdevelopment_guidance_january25.2016v1.pdf, 2/23/18.)

2. Certificates

A certificate program provides an organized program of study that leads to the awarding of a certificate rather than a degree. ECU offers certificate programs at a minimum of 12 credit hours at the pre-baccalaureate level, and a minimum of 9 credit hours at the post-baccalaureate, post-master's, and post-doctoral levels. Once a certificate is approved, it must be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education to determine if the program is eligible for participation in Title IV (financial aid) programs.

3. Teacher Licensure Areas (TLAs)

These are specific course clusters that meet licensure requirements of the State Board of Education but do not lead to the conferral of a particular degree or certificate. These may be at either entry level or advanced level of teacher licensure. When an institution receives authorization from the State Board of Education to offer a TLA, UNC-SO must be notified. A current inventory of teacher licensure programs approved by the State Board of Education is available on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Website.

B. Program Coordination

Each degree program and certificate will have a designated Program Director or Coordinator who must be approved by the unit chair (or, in the case of interdisciplinary programs, appointed by the college dean) and qualified to lead development and review of the program's curriculum. (FS Resolution #19-08)

C. Levels of Delegated Authority for Course and Program Approval Process

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Level I Course and Program Changes: Level I course and program changes require campus approval by the department, college/school, and university Undergraduate Curriculum or Graduate Curriculum Committees. The Faculty Senate delegates authority to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council delegates authority for these actions to the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Level I Course Changes:

1. Revising a course: title, description, objectives, prerequisite(s), prefix, repeatability, credit hours, and content
2. Renumbering an existing course at the same or different level
3. Revising the prefix for an entire course list or program*
4. Banking or deleting courses
5. Removing a 5000-level course from the undergraduate catalog
6. Proposing new courses

* Memo-only action; committee may waive faculty attendance

Level I Program Changes:

1. Revising degrees: revising course selections (excludes total credit hours); revising core requirements, electives, admission standards, and/or descriptive text; adding or removing thesis/non-thesis options
2. Revising certificates: revising course selections (excludes total credit hours); revising core requirements, electives, admission standards, and/or descriptive text
3. Revising concentrations and minors: revising course selections (including total credit hours); revising titles; revising core requirements, electives, admission standards, and/or descriptive text; discontinuing

Program changes excluded from Level I are degree and certificate title and/or CIP code changes; revising total credit hours of degree programs; change in delivery mode; and moving degree and certificate programs to a new academic home, as these actions require EPPC review and some are reported to UNC-SO and/or SACSCOC as indicated below.

Level II Course and Program Changes: Delegated authority to EPPC and Academic Council. Level II changes course and program changes require approval at the department, college or school, and university levels including Undergraduate Curriculum/Graduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, EPPC, Faculty Senate and the Chancellor (Academic Council).

1. Increasing/decreasing **a graduate** degree ~~or certificate~~ total credit hours by less than 25%
2. Moving a prefix, degree, certificate, concentration, or minor program to a new academic home
3. Proposing an accelerated degree program
- 4. Proposing a new certificate**
- 5. Proposing a new concentration in an existing degree program**
- 6. Proposing a new minor**
- 7. Revising an existing certificate title**
- 8. Revising an existing certificate total credit hours**
- 9. Revising a CIP code for an existing certificate**
- 10. Discontinuing an existing certificate (no UCC/GCC review required)**

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Level III Program Changes: Require Chancellor Approval

Level III changes are program changes or proposals that require approval at the department, college/school, and university levels/committees; Chancellor; and UNC-SO and/or SACSCOC approvals or notifications.

1. Discontinuing an existing degree ~~or certificate~~ program (no UCC/GCC review required)
- ~~2. Proposing a new certificate program~~
3. ~~2.~~ Proposing a new degree program
4. ~~3.~~ Revising an existing degree ~~or certificate~~ title
- 4. Increasing/decreasing an existing undergraduate degree outside the UNC mandatory 120 total credit hours**
5. Consolidating two or more existing degrees
6. Proposing a new delivery mode for an existing degree (no UCC/GCC review required)
7. Increasing/decreasing **graduate** degree ~~or certificate~~ total credit hours by 25% or more
8. Changing a degree designation (e.g., MA to MS)

UNCISO and/or SACSCOC approvals or notifications only (no UCC/GCC, or EPPC review required)

1. Revising a CIP code for an existing degree ~~or certificate~~ program
2. Discontinuing an existing teacher licensure area

B. New Degree Program Development Approval Process

Proposed programs must be approved for inclusion on the ECU Academic Program Plan through the Request for Inclusion process and, by special circumstance, through the Academic Council in consultation with the Educational Policies and Planning Committee. All program proposals accepted on the plan undergo a rigorous campus-wide vetting process and are submitted in accordance with UNC-SO policies and procedures. New degree programs may not be advertised until ECU receives UNC BOG approval.

Programs included on the ECU Academic Program Plan require approval at the department, college/school and university levels/committees through approval of the Academic Program Development Collaborative Team. In the first (planning) phase of development, all ECU faculty are invited to participate in a campus-wide process and are invited to provide formal feedback to aid in decision-making by the Academic Council. Upon approval of the Academic Council, the planning document is submitted to the UNC-SO. The establishment phase of development follows normal campus review processes, including curriculum and program proposals.

The proposing academic unit, Academic Planning and Accreditation, and the Office of the Registrar will collaborate to ensure that all approved actions are communicated to the campus community, as well as to UNC-SO and SACSCOC as required.

C. Academic Program Review

Every academic program that is not accredited by a specialized accrediting agency is required to be reviewed as part of a seven-year unit program evaluation. The unit Academic Program Review will be conducted according to the [Academic Program Review Guidelines](#). Changes to these guidelines need to be approved by the Educational Policies and Planning Committee and the Faculty Senate. The unit Academic Program Review shall be used in the development of the unit's operational and strategic plans.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Faculty Senate Resolution #12-50, March 2012
Faculty Senate Resolution #14-62, May 2014
Faculty Senate Resolution #15-63, May 2015
Faculty Senate Resolution #17-13, March 2017
Faculty Senate Resolution #18-22, April 2018
Faculty Senate Resolution #18-68, January 2019
Faculty Senate Resolution #19-08, February 2019
Faculty Senate Resolution #19-71, November 2019
Faculty Senate Resolution #19-79, December 2019
Faculty Senate Resolution #20-31, April 2020

Resolution #20-73

Proposed revisions to the Academic Program Review (APR) guidelines were sent back to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee for further discussion.

Resolution #20-74

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting of [October 19, 2020](#) including Domestic Diversity designation (DD) for SOC 101 Introductory Sociology (Principles) from Quinsigamond Community College, and Global Diversity designation (GD) for Management 357: Diversity in a Global Environment from Bryant University.

Resolution #20-75

Endorsement of ECU AAUP Resolution on Covid-19 Prevalence Testing, as follows:

ECU AAUP Resolution On Covid-19 Prevalence Testing
Now and for Reopening in January 2021

- Whereas* East Carolina University has witnessed over 1200 cases of Covid-19 since March, more than 1000 of those cases since reopening in August 2020;
- Whereas* the *New York Times* [“Tracking Covid at U.S. Colleges and Universities”](#) ranks ECU in the top universities for Covid-19 infections nationwide and ranks ECU the #1 university for Covid-19 infections in North Carolina;
- Whereas* Pitt County, North Carolina has witnessed 5,174 total cases, more than 600 active cases and 33 deaths (as of 10/6/2020), most having occurred since the August reopening of East Carolina University;
- Whereas* the CDC has published guidance, [“Testing, Screening, and Outbreak Response for Institutions of Higher Education \(IHEs\)”](#) recommending the testing of asymptomatic individuals without known exposure at colleges and universities;

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

Whereas two recent studies (Paltiel, et. al. and Bradley, et. al.) in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* have concluded that prevalence testing (that is, testing for the proportion of the population infected with Covid-19 at a specific time), when used in conjunction with other behavioral modifications, such as social distancing, frequent hand washing, mask wearing, isolation and quarantine, and contact tracing can keep students and employees safe;

Whereas these two studies employed models demonstrating prevalence testing of all students and employees and - when analyzed together - strongly indicate that 1) such testing every two days is ideal though likely not cost effective, 2) such testing every two weeks maintains the infection rate in certain local conditions, and 3) random testing with the aim of testing every student each month is a cost-efficient and reasonably effective method of limiting spread of infection;

Whereas the Interim Chancellor has announced that ECU will reopen in January 2021; now, and heretofore be it

Resolved, The ECU chapter of the AAUP strongly urges that immediately, and also in advance of opening campus in January 2021, the ECU Administration adopt a "Covid-19 Prevention, Detection and Response Plan" to implement the following aggressive prevalence testing policy:

10. Employ a medical testing laboratory that uses Viral PCR tests (nasal or saliva), the gold standard in Covid-19 testing;
11. Immediately adopt a policy of random testing of asymptomatic employees and students that determines the prevalence of Covid-19 within the ECU community, with the aim of testing every member of the community once a month at minimum (approximately 800-1000 tests per day);
12. Require students and employees to get tested by a doctor or a clinic within seven days before returning to Campus and provide ECU documentation;
13. Require students and employees to self-quarantine at home, beginning January 4th, 2021, before returning to ECU -- that includes monitoring their health and following appropriate disease prevention behaviors;
14. Coordinate with the Pitt County Health Department to offer random testing of asymptomatic members of the community to determine Greenville community prevalence;
15. Continue the testing of asymptomatic students and employees for ECU campus community prevalence beginning in January 2021 and through the spring semester of 2021;
16. Reinstate the text and email cluster alerts that previously informed the community of infection clusters, the messaging system ECU abruptly ended on Thursday, September 10, 2020;

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2020**

17. Provide daily dashboard updates of student and employee testing results, including testing prevalence in the community and ECU campus. ECU must offer the data on this dashboard for purposes of determining when to move classes online, where to quarantine and isolate those students who test positive, where and how to treat those students who are sick and when to reopen campus.
18. Seek recommendation from the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and SGA on disciplinary measures for students and employees who don't follow behavioral and testing protocols.

Adopted by vote of the membership on October 5, 2020.

Dr. Karin L. Zipf
President, ECU Chapter of the AAUP and
Professor of History
East Carolina University

References:

Elizabeth H. Bradley, PhD, Ming-Wen An, PhD, Ellen Fox, MD, ["Reopening Colleges During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 \(COVID-19\) Pandemic—One Size Does Not Fit All."](#) *JAMA* 3 (2020) 7: Accessed on September 12, 2020.

A. David Paltiel, PhD, Amy Zheng, BA, Rochelle P. Walensky, MD, MPH, ["Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States."](#) *JAMA* 3 (2020) 7: Accessed on September 12, 2020.