



# 2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 2020

[Video Live Stream](#)

The sixth regular meeting of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate was held on **Tuesday, February 25, 2020**, 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 [January 28, 2020](#) meeting minutes were approved as presented.

## **Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day**

### **A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Tuttle-Newhall (Medicine), Horsman (Geological Sciences), Arnold (Art & Design), Moss (Dental Medicine)

Alternates present were: Kirchoff (Business), Lawrence (Business), Medina (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Herron (English), Abney (Engineering and Technology), Liu (Economics)

### **B. [Announcements](#)**

Professor Popke summarized a few of the announcements. He noted that next month's Senate meeting will be in the Mendenhall Great Rooms. He called attention to the Leadership Profile developed by the Chancellor Search Committee and asked that nominations for chancellor candidates be sent to the address specified in the Announcements. He reminded everyone that the Research and Creative Activity grant applications were due on Thursday (February 27), and thanked Lisa Barricella for serving as a teller for this meeting. He explained that a teller was necessary for this meeting because there would be elections for the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee and went on to describe the requirements and responsibilities of that committee. Professor Popke highlighted the Green Dot training information.

There was a motion to rearrange agenda slightly so that Interim Chancellor Mitchelson and Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott could both attend another meeting scheduled for the same time as Senate. The proposed change was to switch the order so that Associate Vice Chancellor Bill Koch would speak before Interim Vice Chancellor Michael Van Scott. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

### **C. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Chancellor**

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson began by thanking all of the Senators for their leadership and governance. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson's remarks focused on how recent scandals with the Board of Trustees have impacted the Chancellor search. He opened his remarks by asking who in the Senate was troubled, embarrassed or terrified about current leadership issues. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson then admitted that an unusual sequence of events has occurred at ECU but he asserted that he refuses to have our identity as a university confused with these governance issues.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said he has found sources of confidence and signs ECU can and will move forward in a positive fashion. He asked that ECU faculty let this process unfold before responding. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson does not want ECU faculty to be part of the “crappy chemistry” (aka, vitriol surrounding these events).

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson admitted that what happened with the Board of Trustees has likely slowed the Chancellor search process down. In March the committee will be working through the pool of qualified applicants. He asked members of the search committee to raise their hands and told the Senate that he knows these members of the committee well and that they will do the job and insist that the right thing happens. They will make decisions in the best interest of ECU. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said he is thankful for this strong search committee.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said another source of confidence is that there are people in the North Carolina state legislature who have integrity (and he has talked to a few of them). Another source of confidence are Board of Governors members who are also unhappy with the recent Board of Trustees scandals. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that we saw evidence of their displeasure in the two Board of Trustee resignations (Moore and Lewis).

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said his greatest source of confidence is that ECU’s voice had an impact: the students, faculty, and staff spoke up, and that led to these resignations. Collective voice is still valued here at ECU. He also noted that Senator Burr and UNC President Erskine Bowles came together to write a statement about corruption. These, too, are all positive developments and another reason to maintain confidence in our institution.

## **Questions**

Professor Ticknor (Education) thanked Interim Chancellor Mitchelson for sharing his confidence. She shares his confidence as well but is also worried how recent events will impact our pool of candidates for the Chancellor position. Whomever is hired has a tough job ahead of them.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson responded that “we will cross that bridge in a few weeks.” If the search committee determines that it is not a good pool, then we might need to hire a search firm. He acknowledged that the next Chancellor will have their hands full. Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that we deserve a great leader. The good news is that other universities have great leaders—we will have that too, here at ECU. He has confidence that the next Chancellor will be powerful enough to deal with the governance issues.

Professor Bauer (English) asked about fixed term contracts. When will those go out? If a fixed-term faculty member has not yet heard whether they will be getting a contract, how confident should they be?

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said that questions was better addressed to the Acting Provost, but said the green light is on and those requests can come forward and the contracts will be processed in short order. He wants faculty to be in the loop and know what’s going on.

Professor McKinnon (History) asked about promotion raises.

Interim Chancellor Mitchelson said yes, promotion raises will occur this year.

**D. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor with Campus Operations and  
Deb Garfi, Director of Parking Services**

Associate Vice Chancellor Koch stated that parking at ECU must be self-supporting. No state dollars or student fees are allocated to support parking. Most of it is funded via permit fees. He said Parking Services works hard to keep costs low for everyone. Fees are based on convenience and distance from campus. They have identified additional revenues—like pay-by-station events and the new parking garage. He noted that Faculty Senators do not have to pay to park in the garage for Faculty Senate meetings (Ms. Baker validates parking for Senators). The Board of Trustees passed a 2% increase which means A permits go up by \$8/year and B permits will go up by \$4/year. These increases will generate \$60,000 and will begin in July. Garage fees are excluded from fee increases because they are still gathering data on those. Reserve parking permits will go from \$560/year to \$720/year in next fiscal year.

Associate Vice Chancellor Koch said the Student Center parking garage is breaking even, which is good. The garage is set up with spaces for faculty and staff. They have sold 150 of those permits and rest are available as hourly space, as well as evening and weekend space. They are filling up.

There is sometimes back up in the garage because they were limited in the number of entrances and exits they could install. They needed the garage to work with the imprint of Student Center. They have 3 entry/exit lanes which can be switched depending on traffic patterns. The best way to move quickly through the garage is to pay at a kiosk, rather than at the gate.

Current parking challenges include construction and barriers throughout the city, which are unavoidable.

**Questions**

Professor Herron (English) asked about the relationship of the Associate Vice Chancellor's office with parking downtown as ECU begins expanding their operations downtown. Professor Herron noted that much of the parking downtown is blanketed in asphalt without much concern for environmental impact, and he asked whether such impacts had been considered, keeping in mind the hotel that will be built.

Associate Vice Chancellor Koch replied that ECU owns some of the land and city space in the uptown area. They partnered with the city to hire a consultant to conduct parking studies. They are working with the city to design more places to park and determine which spaces are being utilized. He acknowledged the hotel will disrupt student parking that will have to be made up in another area. There is a Town/Gown committee that meets regularly, as well as a development group. Every initiative is collective in an effort to create parking that works for both ECU and Uptown.

Professor Herron (English) asked whether the planning process takes into account beautification and environmental issues. How sensitive are people to environmental issues and quality of living when it comes to parking?

Associate Vice Chancellor Koch says retention and drainage are built into some new construction, and said it is a nicer looking parking lot. He said the parking they own in the Reade Street area is really undeveloped, and there have been several plans to just asphalt that as a surface lot, in which

case they would be looking at trees and runoff. But they are currently in a holding pattern regarding further development. Beautification is definitely an interest.

#### **E. Michael Van Scott, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Economic Development and Engagement**

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said he was here 3 years ago and the environment was very different then compared to now. He stated that he does not have lofty goals and priorities. Instead, he aims to navigate current economic shortfalls and to prepare the campus for a new Vice Chancellor. In November 2019, when Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott started in his current position, the Research, Economic Development and Engagement (REDE) office was spending twice as much as they were taking in, and were forecasted to end next year a couple of million dollars in the red. That was from a residual balance of about 10 million dollars a few years ago. REDE has balanced their budget but there is very little left for anything else. Therefore, Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott terminated all new start up requests (but will honor all previous commitments). He expressed hope that in 2022 REDE would be able to entertain new start up requests again.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott wants to look at current investments, focus on priorities and invest in those, and then hold those people accountable. Those decisions won't be made by him or his staff alone, but by faculty and the leadership across the university. He acknowledged that there are some difficult decisions ahead and he would be reaching out across campus for guidance on how best to manage them.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott next spoke about issues with eTRACS. For years ECU used Ramses for grant submissions, which required attachments that had to be manually typed into Banner and compliance systems. This created errors and discrepancies going into Banner, and the billings and accounts receivables were off. They could not balance accounts or bill for the total amount of grants and contracts because they could not verify cost shares. They were not doing business very well. He explained that the UNC system researched electronic research administration systems and they decided on InfoEd. The entire system except UNC Chapel Hill made that decision. NC State was the last one to come in and they delayed the decision by about two years which really put ECU behind. A couple years ago REDE had the money to staff the effort to put eTRACS in place. Now, REDE has put eTRACS in place but they had to do it with a skeleton crew. He stated that eTRACS is a good system but requires data entry up front, so the primary investigators and the research administrators in the hubs have to do more work in this system. ECU faculty and staff have not yet experienced the benefits of this new system, in which the data will automatically roll into the Banner system, set up the grants there, and do all of the reporting out of that—just the front end, which is labor intensive.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott next discussed the “10/5/2 timeline” for grants, which was requested by Associate Deans of Research when eTRACS was implemented:

- proposal submitted in eTRACS—10 days ahead
- proposal locked down for routing—5 days ahead
- completed application in REDE, ready to be reviewed and submitted—2 days ahead

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott pointed out that last minute submissions did not give eTRACS staff time to review. This timeline gives them time to review. Even when faculty were on time, the staff was dealing with loads of late submissions. He noted that in January, they have 4 sponsored program

officers, and 1 person was out sick most of the month. The 3 remaining officers had 111 action items to complete in January 2020. Of those actions, 76 were submissions and the rest were things like budget approvals and no-cost extensions. Under current staffing limitations, the REDE office cannot function well with late submissions and must have that buffer so they will have time to review. For award acceptance and set-up lags, Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott explained that they previously had 2 contract negotiators, but they are down to 1. The second position is advertised and they hope to fill it soon and that it will speed that process.

### **Questions**

Professor McKinnon (History) asks about feedback from faculty users on the system and said there used to be a form that could be filled out. How is that feedback going to be collected and fed back into the system?

Associate Vice Chancellor Van Scott said he is getting feedback from research administrators and also some faculty have contacted him directly. He agrees they need to get that set back up.

Professor Ticknor (Education) says annual evaluation season is here and that what is being pulled into Faculty 180 is not accurate in terms of grants. Is there a plan for that to be corrected before we submit our annual evaluations?

Associate Vice Chancellor Van Scott replied that mapping new data to old data and then fitting that into reports is definitely a challenge. They are working with ITCS to make sure Ramses and eTRACS data is accurate in Faculty 180. It will be corrected soon but please contact him if it is not.

### **F. Justin Yeaman, Director of Learning and Organizational Development**

Director Yeaman discussed the faculty and staff assistance program, ComPsych. These services are free for all ECU employees and are also available to family members of all employees. He said these resources are available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. It is confidential in every respect. The only information they have is the number of people using service and what services are being used. The only time information would be shared is if a threat were communicated to the university, so the university could react. He went on to describe some of the services:

1. Confidential emotional support
  - 3 free face to face sessions with a counselor per issue, per year.
2. Work-life solutions
  - Their job is to help you find resources for you and your family. For example: where to plan a birthday party, or help with relocation, etc.
3. Legal Guidance
  - They have on staff attorneys to help with speeding tickets, set up wills, etc. They assess your needs and then put you in touch with one of their attorneys. You get a free, 30-minute consultation with an appropriate attorney and also discounted fees.
4. Financial services
  - They can advise on matters such as taxes, mortgages, and other financial advice and resources

This program offers online support, and users must fill out an employee profile. Faculty and staff can also call in to speak with a person—it's a 1-800 number but it is solely dedicated to ECU employees.

#### Questions

Professor Jones (Criminal Justice) asks about the location of this service. Where are these people located?

Director Yeaman responded that this company has been around since 2006 and is located in Chicago (but of course if they refer you to a lawyer, this lawyer will be local).

#### **G. Shaun Simon, Associate Director Ledonia Wright Cultural Center**

Associate Director Simon mentioned that the Ledonia Wright Cultural Center began in 1970s and was originally called the African American Cultural Center. The center was then named after the center's first director, Ledonia Wright. The Center celebrates cultural heritage and identity development. They host workshops on social justice education, bringing ideas to action, and an academic success series in addition to other topics. The Center hosts the A.L.A.N.A. graduation ceremony that celebrates student graduates of color. They will present in classrooms on cultural and identity issues upon request. Associate Director Simon said the Center works closely with student groups and faculty programs. She noted that this year they collaborated with the African and African American Studies program on the Constitution Week programming.

The Ledonia Wright Cultural Center is located on first floor of Student Center. The space offers many amenities, including a lactation space, a conference room, a meditation and prayer room, a kitchen, an art gallery, and lending library.

Associate Director Simon invited ECU faculty and staff to take advantage of all the Center has to offer.

#### Questions

Professor Chambers (Education) asked Associate Director Simon to offer more information on how faculty can take advantage of the Center's services.

Associate Director Simon said if faculty wish to partner with them in the Fall on a program that fits their mission, now is the time to get in touch with the Center. Associate Director Simon said that they plan very early. They will meet with faculty and discuss ideas and questions. Last semester they had 50 program partnerships and 20 large events.

#### **H. Approval of Spring 2020 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates**

Professor Roberson (Nursing) moved approval of the Spring 2020 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates. There was no discussion and the Spring 2020 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-08**

#### **I. Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty**

Professor Popke shortened his remarks in deference to the packed agenda. He outlined some of the points during the meeting, but his full remarks appear below:

“Context and Recommendations for Higher Education Governance

I thought I would say a few words about university governance, since that seems to be on everyone's mind these days. I think we can agree that we saw a good outcome in the resignations of two

members of the ECU Board of Trustees since we last met. I do not wish to dwell further on that specific matter, but I know that there are lingering concerns about the ability of our governing boards, at both the system and campus level, to play a constructive role in the life of our university. So I'd like to offer some general observations about the state of higher education governance in North Carolina and nationwide.

And the first thing I would point out is that, though it may come as small solace, we are not the only university to have made headlines in recent months because of actions by governing boards. Somewhat ominously, perhaps, two recent cases involve controversial leadership selections. At the University of Mississippi, the 12-member State Board of Trustees—all appointed by Republican Governor Phil Bryant—abruptly cut short their ongoing Chancellor search, by-passing the list of eight named finalists to hire Glenn Boyce, who was not a formal candidate but was serving as the consultant for the search. This, predictably, led to widespread and [highly publicized protests](#) by students and faculty.

And down the road in South Carolina, after heated criticism that the four named finalists for their Presidential search were all men, the board announced that they were suspending the search and starting over, only to reverse course after public [lobbying by the Governor](#), to appoint Retired General Robert Caslen in a sharply divided vote. This led, among other things, to a [formal finding by SACS](#), their accrediting body, that the University “has not ... demonstrated that its governing board protects the institution from undue influence by external persons or bodies.”

And this is to say nothing about the very public failure of governing boards to stop or effectively respond to an admissions scandal at USC and sexual assault scandals at Penn State and Michigan State.

These and other scandals have placed the role of higher education governing boards [under some scrutiny](#), and while we as faculty may have once viewed their machinations as remote from our day-to-day work, we now know that a dysfunctional board can severely hinder our ability to focus attention on our contributions and successes.

### *The Erosion of Shared Governance and the Rise of the Partisan Board*

I think it is instructive to view university board controversies in the context of the wider erosion of shared governance in higher education. So, a brief history lesson: Until the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, trustees were deemed to have nearly complete authority over institutions of higher learning, including the ability to hire and fire faculty members at will. But the increasing professionalization of faculty and the disciplinary specialization of knowledge made it essential to give faculty the protections of tenure and to involve faculty in the organization and operation of universities, and it is this necessity that has given rise to the ideal of share governance that guides American higher education today.

I have spoken before about the well-known AAUP [Statement on Shared Governance](#) that in many ways still guides the broad understanding of the distinct but complementary roles of faculty, administration and governing board. That ideal gives to faculty, by virtue of their expertise, primary responsibility for academic matters, such as the curriculum, standards of faculty competence, and student achievement. University governing boards, for their part, are seen to have primary authority over institutional mission, strategic direction, physical assets, and fiscal resources. So, the faculty

guide and protect the intellectual life of the university, while trustees and governors engage in long-term strategic thinking, compliance, and fiduciary oversight.

Well, like many facets of contemporary higher education, this shared governance model is suffering under the strains of political polarization and rapid change. We have seen declining public support for higher education, disruption caused by massive student debt, declining enrollments, and competition from online learning. The increasing use of contingent faculty has eroded academic freedom and shifted the balance of power away from faculty and toward administration and governing boards.

There have been two major consequences of these trends for university governance. The first is that different ideas about how best to respond to a changing landscape has led to the political polarization of higher education policy. And because the majority of most governing boards are appointed by some combination of state Governors and Legislatures, the partisan tone of education policy has been reflected in increasingly partisan appointments to governing boards. Too often members are selected not for their expertise or perspective, but because of their political fealty or the level of their campaign contributions.

The second consequence has been the growing propensity for boards to respond to higher education's challenges by becoming more activist and intrusive in their oversight. A 2014 Report by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni is a good example of this. Titled "[Governance for a new era](#): A Blueprint for Higher Education Trustees", the Report is a politically-inflected call for Boards to take more control, including greater involvement in academic programs and disciplines to ensure 'intellectual diversity' and protect the 'academic freedom' of students (for which read: more conservative viewpoints).

It also calls on boards to act with little concern for the views of faculty. "Shared governance," the Report states, "cannot and must not be an excuse for board inaction ... those who hold on to the old strategy of passive governance can never be effective agents of change." Boards must act "even when not everyone agrees." This kind of view has unfortunately become increasingly common, and has promoted greater meddling and micromanaging by governing boards in more and more areas of university operations.

So, we are living through a time in which university governing boards are more activist at the same time that they are more partisan and, as a consequence, less diverse and less competent. This is not a felicitous combination, as we in Greenville and across North Carolina can attest.

### *A Call for Reform*

So, I want to add my voice to those who are calling for a reform of North Carolina's higher education governance. There is now a [website and petition](#) dedicated to this effort, and there have been a number of high-profile Op Ed pieces, including [one recently](#) by Former UNC President Erskine Bowles and Senator Richard Burr, [another](#) by Bowles and former Charlotte Mayor Richard Vinroot, and commentaries by former Board of Governors Chair [Louis Bisette](#) and former Chair of the Faculty Assembly [Stephen Leonard](#). It is time to build momentum for a set of commonsense reforms to the selection, background, training, and appropriate roles for both the UNC Board of Governors and the Boards of Trustees of our constituent institutions.



I want to draw here from a [second report](#), this one by the National Commission on College and University Board Governance (also in 2014), which offers something of a counter-balance to the more activist blueprint that I just mentioned. In line with that Report's recommendations, let me suggest four important principles that should guide board reform.

First, although we should not have to mention it, we must insist that board members adhere to the highest standards of character, integrity and ethical conduct. The Commission Report makes this clear, noting that "Boards must ... lead a restoration of public trust in higher education itself ... [they] must hold themselves accountable ... by modeling the same behaviors and performance they expect from others in their institutions." Sadly, recent evidence does not flatter our governing boards on this count, and we should demand better.

Second, Governing Board must become less partisan. North Carolina's board disfunction began after the 2010 election, when the newly-elected legislature began appointing Governors more for their political connections than their expertise. Today, not a single member of the 24-person Board of Governors is from the minority party. Five of its members are former Republican lawmakers, and 6 are current or former lobbyists. Seventeen of the 24 members have [made campaign contributions](#) to House Speaker Tim Moore, and 15 have financially supported Senate Majority Leader Phil Berger. This narrowly partisan remaking of university governance was extended to Boards of Trustees in 2016, when lawmakers stripped the longstanding authority of the Governor to make four of the 12 appointments, giving them instead to the General Assembly.

And it's not just here. After the controversy in South Carolina, a consult was hired to do an assessment of their Governing Board, and the [ensuing Report](#) called attention to precisely this problem. "What's needed now," the Report concluded, "is a proactive, planned transition from a political culture" – one in which appointees are beholden to the legislature and act out of self-interest – to what it called "a fiduciary governance culture" – in which decisions are made in the best interests of the institution.

The same transition is needed in North Carolina. We should adopt rules requiring at least some political balance on our governing boards, and we should consider new procedures for board nominations and elections. This should start with the restoration of the Governor's traditional appointment authority for trustees, but there are other options to consider as well. In some states, a percentage of board members are nominated or elected by current trustees rather than politicians, and in other cases, some or all board members are elected by the public. Either model would help to reduce the role of partisan loyalty and campaign cash in favor of board members who are selected for their qualifications and experience.

And on that point, thirdly, our boards must become more diverse. As has been widely noted, 73% of the [Board of Governors members are white men](#) in a system in which white men account for only 25% of the student body. Prior to the two resignations, our Board of Trustees was 75% white men, and it would have been higher but not for an outcry from our students during the last round of nominations. If our Boards are to play a constructive role in confronting higher education's challenges, they must reflect a diversity of backgrounds, life experiences, and opinions, and use this diversity to generate productive dialogue and strategic thinking rather than rubber stamping the wishes of political patrons.

And fourth, Boards must support and contribute to a reinvigoration of shared governance, in which faculty, administration, and governing boards have integrated but distinct responsibilities. As the Commission Report puts it, "Boards ought to be more engaged than many currently are, but engagement does not constitute board member activism, nor should it mean that boards substitute their judgments for those of the people who do the work of the university." Well, as those who do the work of the University, I think that most faculty would agree.

I think we can all acknowledge that our governing Boards do have an important role to play in shared governance, and if they are properly constituted and guided by their institutional mission and values, they can provide valuable oversight, strategic thinking, and big picture planning. Indeed, faculty can play a crucial part in helping our Governors and Trustees to become more informed about the issues facing higher education today. The challenge and complexity of these issues will require a partnership, one that I hope can be rededicated to the shared governance model that will be necessary for our trustees and governors to be able to maximize their value to the institutions that they serve."

### **Question**

There were no questions posed at this time.

### **J. Election of Five Members to the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee**

Chair Popke asked for nominations to the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee. The nominees are as follows:

1. Professor Herron (English) nominates Professor Bauer (English) and she accepts.
2. Professor McKinnon (History) nominates Professor Ticknor (Education) and she accepts.
3. Professor Roberson (Nursing) self nominates and receives a second.
4. Professor Campbell (Health Sciences) self nominates and receives a second.
5. Professor Bauer (English) nominates Professor McKinnon (History) and she accepts.

Following a call for volunteers by Chair Popke, Professors Bauer, Ticknor, Roberson, Campbell, and McKinnon were nominated by acclamation to serve on the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee and charged with providing a slate of 2020/2021 Faculty Officer nominees during the May 5, 2020 organizational meeting.

### **K. Question Period**

Professor Ticknor (Education) asked for clarification on the \$10 million discussed by Van Scott that is gone.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said that if you look at the end of year residual amounts in the F&A account, and look back over time, we came up in 2012 to the 10 million dollar level. It has been coming down and ended last year at about 5.9 million, and we were on schedule to end next year at 2 million under. If you consider that we have a 5 million dollar a year revenue source source, we are spending twice as much as we are bringing in.

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said he had two follow-ups to questions from before. Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research (IPAR) and Information Technology and Computing Services

(ITCS) emailed him about the data transfer issue, and said there would be a download on Monday. He encouraged everyone to check their data on Monday to be sure it was right. He then said there is a feedback form on the eTRACS website that faculty can access.

Professor Thompson (Biology) asked if the hub model is being reevaluated in any way, particularly in Arts and Sciences, where so many departments submit to so many different granting institutions. Are there conversations about specialists being hired to deal with all the different kinds of grants being submitted?

Interim Vice Chancellor Van Scott said that departmental administration of grants has been eroded over the years and it has gotten to the point where ECU needs an institutional conversation about this. They are going to start in Academic Affairs and have a meeting coming up between the Provost and Harriot College of Arts and Sciences and Health and Human Performance, who have a lot of grant activity, to talk about exactly that. They will address things like the best way to help get proposals in and how can we better help faculty and make sure grants are administered appropriately.

Professor Bauer (English) asked Interim Provost Hayes about the timeline for fixed term contracts and whether fixed-term faculty can rest assured that they will be rehired.

Interim Provost Hayes responded that on 2/20/20 colleges were given the okay to forward those requests to Academic Affairs. Once Academic Affairs receives those requests, they should be able to turn those contracts around quickly.

#### **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 [February 06, 2020](#) Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [January 15, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-2) within the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, which was forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), including a revision of an existing program (Level II), Master of Music (MM) from the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, and policy action item (GC 20-3) acted on and recorded in the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes including revisions to the "Graduate Banked Courses" process policy.

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 [February 06, 2020](#) Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [January 15, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-2) within the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, which was forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), including a revision of an existing

program (Level II), Master of Music (MM) from the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, and policy action item (GC 20-3) acted on and recorded in the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes including revisions to the “Graduate Banked Courses” process policy. **RESOLUTION #20-09**

## **Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**

### **A. Unit Code Screening Committee, Ken Ferguson**

Professor Ferguson (Philosophy and Religious Studies), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies Unit Code.

There was no discussion and the revised unit code was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-10.**

Professor Ferguson then presented proposed revisions to the College of Health and Human Performance Constitution.

There was no discussion and the revised Constitution was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-11**

### **B. 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 [February 11, 2020](#) including approval of Service-Learning course designation (SL) for HLTH 4880 Capstone: Applied Principles of Health Education and Promotion.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Service-Learning Committee meeting minutes of [February 11, 2020](#) including approval of Service-Learning course designation (SL) for HLTH 4880 Capstone: Applied Principles of Health Education and Promotion were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-12**

### **C. 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 [January 23, 2020](#) including curricular actions within the Departments of Sociology, History, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Geological Sciences, and Geography, Planning, and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences, within the Department of Health Education and Promotion in the College of Health and Human Performance, and within the College of Engineering and Technology and the College of Education; and in the meeting minutes of [February 6, 2020](#), including curricular actions in the Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, the Departments of Kinesiology, Human Development and Family Science, and Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance, and the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 23, 2020](#) including curricular actions within the Departments of Sociology, History, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Geological Sciences, and Geography, Planning, and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences, within

the Department of Health Education and Promotion in the College of Health and Human Performance, and within the College of Engineering and Technology and the College of Education; and in the meeting minutes of [February 6, 2020](#), including curricular actions in the Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, the Departments of Kinesiology, Human Development and Family Science, and Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance, and the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION # 20-13**

**D. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Mark Bowler**

Professor Bowler (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 14, 2020](#) meeting minutes including a new minor Public Health in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; a request to deliver online/hybrid for the MS in Clinical Counseling in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; and an Academic Program Review response for the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Ticknor (Education) explained that the College of Education had concerns about this program coming through. She acknowledged it was not in the purview of this report, but because the Counselor Education program in the College of Education have been consulted about the request to deliver online/hybrid for the MS in Clinical Counseling, they want it on the record that they have concerns with and were not consulted about the previous name change of the Master of Science in Clinical Counseling, and they would like that to be noted.

Professor Bowler said that no name change was brought to the Committee for this report, and that the only change was to deliver the program online.

Professor Ticknor said the name change took place a few years ago to take Addictions from the title and the program is confused with the Master of Science in Counselor Education (which offers specializations in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling and Student Affairs and College Counseling). The two programs are nearly identical in name--one is a master's degree in clinical counseling, and the other a master's degree in clinical mental health counseling. The move to a hybrid delivery is now another similarity to the College of Education's Master of Science in Counselor Education program.

Professor Bowler said the Committee's concern with approving the online format is that it is being offered that way currently, and the program took over a year to respond to IPAR's request to process the paperwork to offer the program as online/hybrid. Not approving the request would impact the students who are in the program now. The program should have processed the paperwork earlier but did not want a negative impact on the students in the program.

Following discussion, the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's [February 14, 2020](#) meeting minutes including a new minor Public Health in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; a request to deliver online/hybrid for the MS in Clinical Counseling in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; and an Academic

Program Review response for the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION # 20-14**

### **E. Faculty Governance Committee, Jeff Popke**

Professor Popke (Geography, Planning and Environment), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the first reading of proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual Part II. East Carolina University Organization and Shared Governance, Section II. Faculty Constitution and By-Laws, subsection By-Laws of the Faculty of East Carolina University, IV. Faculty Senate, Academic and Administrative Committees, Membership, and Structure.* He explained that the changes arise from a series of conversations from this academic year, and that it had been a few years since the rules were loosened to allow fixed-term faculty to serve on committees. There is a sentence that a majority of all members on committees must be tenured or tenure-track, and the Faculty Governance committee propose striking the sentence and eliminating the cap. This change would not affect the Faculty Governance Committee or the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, because their charges restrict membership to tenured faculty.

There was no discussion and formal action on the proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual Part II. East Carolina University Organization and Shared Governance, Section II. Faculty Constitution and By-Laws, subsection By-Laws of the Faculty of East Carolina University, IV. Faculty Senate, Academic and Administrative Committees, Membership, and Structure* will take place during the required second reading at the March 31, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Popke then presented revisions to the Resolving Allegations of Discrimination Interim Policy. The Committee worked with University Counsel and the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) on this regulation. He explained that there was much review and discussion in Committee but not many substantial changes. Most of the changes are reordering and clarifying language. One change was related to how concerns are investigated by OED staff and whether respondents have a right to be informed if a complaint is made about them and what due process rights stem from that. There were concerns that faculty might have a “secret” file of complaints about them. The committee did make some small changes to further clarify this process. To see all changes and revisions, consult Attachment 2 in the agenda.

Professor Herron (English) wanted to know what the committee had to say about free speech issues in the classroom. How do we accommodate faculty who speak on controversial subjects in their pedagogy, and then receive a grievance? He also had a question about the definition of harassment in the by-laws wherein it states a single comment could count as creating a “hostile environment.” He also asked about the distinction between protection of academic speech and professional communication among faculty members.

Chair Popke responded that the committee spent a lot of time discussing the “hostile environment of harassment” and they felt that the phrasing “if sufficiently severe” qualified this and provided a means for dealing with a legitimate complaint about a one-time event. As for free speech, they also discussed that. Free speech is addressed in our by-laws as well. But this particular document is a legal one to comply with Title IX, which protects people from discrimination based on sex in education programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance. Chair Popke noted that the term “hostile environment” makes it clear that grievances would not be based on specious claims. The committee does not feel that OED has been overzealous in this regard.

Professor Herron (English) asked about inquiries lodged with the OED. If a student or faculty member lodges a complaint against someone at university, it is anonymous and not shared with person being accused. This all under the purview of OED. This seems unfair to the accused, who is not aware that this is happening.

Chair Popke replied that yes, they discussed the OED's process. There are far more complaints than there are investigations of complaints. The OED must have leeway to consider each case individually before alerting the accused. They have the expertise, training, and formal knowledge to do this job.

Professor Chambers (English) noted that in going through this process that it is up to unit administrator to adjudicate once a complaint is formally filed. There needs to be further follow up work on restitution.

After this discussion and the Faculty Senate approved, as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor, the revised Resolving Allegations of Discrimination Interim Policy. **RESOLUTION # 20-15**

#### **F. 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 [February 10, 2020](#) meeting minutes including approval of Writing Intensive course designation (WI) for AERO 4400 National Security Affairs/Preparation for Active Duty and change from Writing Intensive course designation (WI) to Writing Intensive by section (WI\*) for ARTH 4942 Survey of Twentieth-Century Modern Art: 1950-2000, ARTH 4944 Studies in Contemporary Art: Post 1960s Art, and ARTH 4948 Art of the United States.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [February 10, 2020](#) including approval of Writing Intensive course designation (WI) for AERO 4400 National Security Affairs/Preparation for Active Duty and change from Writing Intensive course designation (WI) to Writing Intensive by section (WI\*) for ARTH 4942 Survey of Twentieth-Century Modern Art: 1950-2000, ARTH 4944 Studies in Contemporary Art: Post 1960s Art, and ARTH 4948 Art of the United States were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-16**

#### **G. 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 [February 17, 2020](#) meeting minutes including retention of General Education Mathematics Designation (GE:MA) for MATH 2228 Elementary Statistical Methods I after notification of prerequisite removal; removal of Global Diversity Designation (GD) for FREN 2440 Readings in the Culture of France I and FREN 2441 Readings in the Culture of France II; approval of General Education Social Sciences Designation (GE:SO) for AAAS 1000 Introduction to African and African American Studies, and MUSC 1406 Music History and Literature I; Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for MUSC 3227 Beginning Instruction in Vocal-General Music Education, MUSC 3287 Choral Laboratory, General Education Designation for the following study abroad courses: Humanities Designation (GE:HU) for CREL 2603 World Religions and EGPT 1099 Temples and Gods from The American University in Cairo; General Education Fine Arts Designation (GE:FA) for ARIC 2206 Art and Architecture of City of Cairo from The American University in Cairo; Diversity Designation for the following transfer courses: Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for SO 201 Introductory Sociology from Cumberland County CC, SOC 110

Introduction to Sociology from Kirkgood CC, SOCI 1011 Introduction to Sociology from Montana State University-Bozeman; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for BIBL 3040 The Life and Teaching of Jesus from King College; and approval of the following courses for expedited Domestic Diversity Designation (DD):

ADRE 2000	Survey of Community Resources in Rehabilitation and Health Care
ADRE 4000	Interviewing Techniques for Health and Rehabilitation Settings
ANTH 3026	Forensic Anthropology
ART 1827	Photography Changes Everything
ART 3850	Art in Elementary School
ART 3860	Classroom Participation in Art
ARTH 3961	Native North American Art and Ritual
COMM 3151	Family Communication
COMM 3190	Health Communication
COMM 3520	Sports Media Survey
DNCE 4044	History of Dance I
ELEM 3500	Teaching Social Sciences in Elementary School
ENGL 2230	Southern Literature
ENGL 3570	American Folklore
FINA 2244	Legal Environment of Business
GENS 2400	Introduction to Gender Studies
GEOG 3004	Urban Geography
GEOG 3010	Social Justice and Sustainability
HDFS 1103	Marriage and Family Relations
HDFS 2400	Introduction to Gerontology
HIST 2444	The History of Sports in Western Society
HIST 3100	North Carolina History
HIST 3110	History of African-Americans
HIST 3140	Women in American History
HIST 3170	History of Native Americans
HIST 3225	The Era of Sectionalism and Civil War, 1848-1877
HIST 3230	The Birth of Modern America, 1865-1892
HIST 3240	The Age of Franklin Roosevelt, 1919-1945
HIST 3245	The United States Since 1945
HIST 3907	Pirate Nation: An ECU History
JUST 3700	Race, Gender and Special Populations in the Criminal Justice System
LING 3700	History of the English Language
MGMT 4343	Organizational Leaders and Leadership
MGMT 4402	Human Resource Management
MKTG 4732	Consumer Behavior
MSL 4002	Company Grade Leadership
PHIL 1175	Introduction to Ethics
PHIL 2274	Business Ethics



PHIL 3281	Introduction to Philosophical Ethics in the Healthcare Professions
PSYC 3375	Abnormal Psychology
PSYC 4350	Psychology of Sexual Behavior
READ 3000	Literacy Learning in a Diverse World
RELI 2340	Religion and Science
RELI 3700	Religion and Social Issues
RELI 4900	Internship in Religious Studies
SOCI 3025	Sociology of Mass Media
SOCI 3220	Sociology of Deviant Behavior
SOCI 4320	Sociology of Law
SOCI 4322	Law and Social Change
SOCI 4325	Marriage and the Family
SOCI 4330	Criminology
SOCI 4360	Sociology of Protest and Activism
SOCI 4400	Sociological Perspectives of Sport
SOCW 2400	Introduction to Gerontology
THEA 3035	Theatre History-Literature II

The committee is happy to report that they received 199 proposals across the university. Created an expedited process, and this is the result. In the next meeting you will see the expedited approval for the global diversity courses.

In addition, the following items were discussed in the meeting and are provided for information only: Memo to Chairs regarding 3000 level General Education Courses, and Assessment Reports and Action Plans for General Education Health Promotion.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 17, 2020](#) General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes including retention of General Education Mathematics Designation (GE:MA) for MATH 2228 Elementary Statistical Methods I after notification of prerequisite removal; removal of Global Diversity Designation (GD) for FREN 2440 Readings in the Culture of France I and FREN 2441 Readings in the Culture of France II; approval of General Education Social Sciences Designation (GE:SO) for AAAS 1000 Introduction to African and African American Studies, and MUSC 1406 Music History and Literature I; Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for MUSC 3227 Beginning Instruction in Vocal-General Music Education, MUSC 3287 Choral Laboratory, General Education Designation for the following study abroad courses: Humanities Designation (GE:HU) for CREL 2603 World Religions and EGPT 1099 Temples and Gods from The American University in Cairo; General Education Fine Arts Designation (GE:FA) for ARIC 2206 Art and Architecture of City of Cairo from The American University in Cairo; Diversity Designation for the following transfer courses: Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for SO 201 Introductory Sociology from Cumberland County CC, SOC 110 Introduction to Sociology from Kirkgood CC, SOCI 1011 Introduction to Sociology from Montana State University-Bozeman; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for BIBL 3040 The Life and Teaching of Jesus from King College; and approval of the courses for expedited Domestic Diversity Designation (DD). **RESOLUTION #20-17**

#### **H. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Eli Hvastkovs**

Professor Hvastkovs (Chemistry), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity were approved as submitted. **RESOLUTION #20-18**

Professor Hvastkovs then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I., subsection VIII.A. Grades and Grading. This revision is in regard to paid non-ECU grading services.

Professor Ticknor (Education) asked if we could use “unpaid” ECU personnel for grading.

Professor Hvastkovs (Chemistry) said that perhaps the committee needs to edit the language of these revisions to read “paid as well as unpaid.”

There was a motion to revise this language by striking the word “paid” from the language.

Professor Stiller (Biology) noted that faculty use textbook resources, like quizzes, that are then graded by the textbook company. How do those fit into this new policy?

Professor Chambers (English) responded that she does not think new revisions are necessary since the policy is specifically about grading, not about where the assignments come from.

Professor Popke called a vote and the Faculty voted to remove the word “paid” from the policy to add some clarity.

Professor Stiller (Biology) proposed that this report be returned to the Admission and Retention Policies Committee to address some of these concerns.

After this discussion the faculty voted that the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I., subsection VIII.A. Grades and Grading be returned to the committee for further review.

#### **RESOLUTION #20-19**

Professor Hvastkovs went on to present proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Grading System, Grade Replacement Policy.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Grading System, Grade Replacement Policy were approved as submitted.

#### **RESOLUTION #20-20**

Professor Hvastkovs then presented proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, Readmission.

Professor Su (Geology) asked why these regulations were put in place.

Professor Hvastkovs replied that this change would help facilitate students who are close to graduating.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, Readmission were approved as submitted.

**RESOLUTION #20-21**

**I. Calendar Committee, Rick McCarty**

Professor McCarty (Philosophy and Religious Studies) presented the proposed 2021-2022 University Academic Calendars.

There was no discussion and the proposed 2021-2022 University Academic Calendars were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-22**

Professor McCarty then presented the proposed 2024-2025 Abridged University Academic Calendar.

There was no discussion and the proposed 2024-2025 Abridged University Academic Calendar was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #20-23**

Professor McCarty then noted that the Calendar Committee did not propose any changes to the Making Up Missed Instructional Time Due to Suspension of Instruction Interim Policy.

There was no discussion and the Making Up Missed Instructional Time Due to Suspension of Instruction Interim Policy was approved as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #20-24**

**Agenda Item VII. New Business**

There was no new business to come before the body at this time.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Amanda Ann Klein  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Department of English

Rachel Baker  
Faculty Senate

## FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE FEBRUARY 25, 2020 MEETING

### Resolution #20-08

Approval of Spring 2020 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates.

### Resolution #20-09

Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Graduate Council's [February 06, 2020](#) Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, including level I action items from the [January 15, 2020](#) Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes which were approved by its delegated authority and are reported here for informational purposes, programmatic action item (GC 20-2) within the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes, which was forwarded to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC), including a revision of an existing program (Level II), Master of Music (MM) from the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and Communication, and policy action item (GC 20-3) acted on and recorded in the [February 06, 2020](#), Graduate Council virtual meeting minutes including revisions to the "Graduate Banked Courses" process policy.

### Resolution #20-10

Revisions to the [Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies Unit Code](#).

### Resolution #20-11

Revisions to the [College of Health and Human Performance Constitution](#).

### Resolution #20-12

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Service-Learning Committee meeting minutes of [February 11, 2020](#) including approval of Service-Learning course designation (SL) for HLTH 4880 Capstone: Applied Principles of Health Education and Promotion.

### Resolution #20-13

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [January 23, 2020](#) including curricular actions within the Departments of Sociology, History, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Geological Sciences, and Geography, Planning, and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences, within the Department of Health Education and Promotion in the College of Health and Human Performance, and within the College of Engineering and Technology and the College of Education; and in the meeting minutes of [February 6, 2020](#), including curricular actions in the Department of Physical Therapy within the College of Allied Health Sciences, the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management within the College of Business, the Departments of Kinesiology, Human Development and Family Science, and Recreation Sciences within the College of Health and Human Performance, and the Department of Special Education, Foundations and Research within the College of Education.

### Resolution #20-14

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's [February 14, 2020](#) meeting minutes including a new minor Public Health in the Department of Health Education and Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance; a request to deliver online/hybrid for the MS in Clinical Counseling in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences; and an Academic

Program Review response for the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Resolution #20-15

Formal faculty advice to the Chancellor on the revised Resolving Allegations of Discrimination Interim Policy, as follows:

In August 2017, John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty, charged the Committee with reviewing this policy to provide formal faculty advice. The review was postponed on the advice of the Office of University Counsel to await potential state or federal changes to Title IX policy. The Committee made suggested revisions to the policy in collaboration with representatives from the Office of University Counsel and the Office for Equity and Diversity.

Provided [here](#) is the document with tracked changes detailing all proposed revisions and below is the clean copy that includes the incorporated revisions.

### **Resolving Allegations of Discrimination - Interim**

**Policy:** REG06.35.03

**Title:** Resolving Allegations of Discrimination

**Category:** Human Resources

**Sub-category:** Dispute Resolution, Grievances, and Appeals

**Authority:** Chancellor

**History:** August 18, 2017

**Contact:** Associate Provost for Equity and Diversity, Office for Equity and Diversity, Suite G-406 Old Cafeteria Building, Phone: 328-6804, Email: oed@ecu.edu

**Related Policies:**

- [Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy](#)
- [ECU Equal Employment Opportunity Plan](#)
- [Regulation on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence \(REG06.40.03\)](#)
- [Policy of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina Concerning Improper Relationships between Students and Employees](#)
- [Mediation and Grievance Procedure for SHRA Employees \(REG06.35.02\)](#)
- [Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Unlawful or Prohibited Harassment, Discrimination or Improper Relationships Brought Against East Carolina University Faculty Members or Administrators Holding Faculty Status \(ECU Faculty Manual, Part XII, Section IV\)](#)
- [Review Process and Procedure for EHRA Non-Faculty Employees \(POL06.35.01\)](#)
- [Clinical Support Services \(CSS\) Disciplinary Policy \(POL12.40.01\)](#)
- [Appointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Advancement Policies and Procedures and Performance Review of Tenured Faculty \(ECU Faculty Manual, Part IX\)](#)
- [Personnel Action Dossier and Tenure and Promotion Schedule \(ECU Faculty Manual, Part X\)](#)

## Additional References:

- [Title VI](#) and [Title VII](#) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended
- [Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972](#)
- [Section 799A and 845 of the Public Health Service Act](#)
- [Equal Pay Act of 1963, as amended](#)
- [Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended](#)
- [Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended](#)
- [Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978](#)
- [Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988](#)
- [Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, as amended](#)
- [Civil Rights Act of 1991](#)
- [Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended](#)
- [Title II of the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act of 2008](#)
- [Executive Order 11246 of 1965, as amended](#)
- [N.C. General Statutes Section 126-16, as amended](#)
- [N.C. General Statutes Section 116-11\(3a\)](#)
- [The Code of the University of North Carolina, Section 103](#)
- [The Age Discrimination Act of 1975](#)

Other applicable federal and state laws:

- [U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission](#)
- [U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights](#)
- [North Carolina Civil Rights Division of the Office of Administrative Hearings](#)

## 1. Introduction

1.1. East Carolina University ("ECU" or "University") prohibits unlawful discrimination, harassment and/or related retaliation as defined in the [Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy](#) ("Policy") based on the following protected classes: race/ethnicity, color, genetic information, national origin, religion, sex (including pregnancy and pregnancy related conditions), sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, political affiliation, and veteran status ("Protected Class"). ECU will promptly, equitably, impartially, and thoroughly resolve complaints of unlawful discrimination, harassment and/or related retaliation based on an ECU Protected Class.

1.2. This regulation provides the resolution procedures for complaints of unlawful discrimination, harassment and/or related retaliation; discrimination against employees or applicants because they have inquired about, discussed, or disclosed their own pay or the pay of another employee or applicant (as defined in the [Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy](#)); and, reports of improper relationships, as defined in the [Policy of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina Concerning Improper Relationships between Students and Employees](#) (collectively, within this regulation, hereafter referred to as "Prohibited Conduct").

1.3. The University will take appropriate steps to address all allegations of Prohibited Conduct, whether an individual requests the formal or alternative resolution or reports a concern informally and/or anonymously.

#### 1.4. Complaints of Prohibited Conduct Not Covered by this Regulation

1.4.1. Complaints of Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence. Complaints of sexual and gender-based harassment, sexual assault, offensive touching, sexual exploitation, dating and domestic violence, stalking, complicity, and related retaliation are exempted from this regulation and will be handled in accordance with procedures outlined in Appendices A and B of the [Regulation on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence](#).

1.4.2. Complaints of Prohibited Conduct Filed by an SHRA Employee within 15 Calendar Days. Complaints filed by an SHRA employee are governed by the grievance procedures presented in the [Mediation and Grievance Procedure for SHRA Employees](#) (Regulation 06.35.02) (“SHRA Grievance Procedure”) if the SHRA employee files the complaint within fifteen (15) calendar days after the last incident of conduct grievable under the SHRA Grievance Procedure. Note: Complaints filed by an SHRA employee more than 15 calendar days after the last incident will be addressed in accordance with this regulation.

1.4.3. Complaints of Prohibited Conduct Brought Against ECU Students. Complaints brought against ECU students are governed by the [Student Conduct Process](#) (REG11.30.01) except complaints filed by an ECU SHRA employee as described above in paragraph 1.4.2.

## 2. Definitions

2.1. **Complainant** – an individual alleging Prohibited Conduct and/ or the individual(s) allegedly subjected to the Prohibited Conduct.

2.2. **Discrimination** - actions that subject individuals to unfavorable or unequal treatment based on a Protected Class.

Discrimination includes but is not limited to failing to provide reasonable accommodations to a qualified person with a disability, failing to provide a reasonable religious accommodations, and failing to provide a reasonable accommodation for pregnancy or pregnancy related conditions, consistent with state and federal law.

2.3. **Harassment** - unwelcome conduct based on a Protected Class, a form of discrimination as defined in Paragraph 1.1 above, which creates either quid pro quo harassment or a hostile environment, as defined in Paragraph 2.3.1 and Paragraph 2.3.2, below. It also includes Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Harassment as defined and addressed in the [Regulation on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence](#).

2.3.1. **Quid Pro Quo Harassment** – submission to or rejection of such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of a person’s employment, academic standing, or

participation in any University programs and/or activities or is used as the basis for University decisions affecting the individual.

**2.3.2. Hostile Environment Harassment** - A “hostile environment” exists when the conduct is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive that it unreasonably interferes with, limits, or deprives an individual from participating in or benefitting from the University’s education or employment programs and/or activities. Conduct must be deemed severe, persistent, or pervasive from both a subjective and an objective perspective. A hostile environment can be created by persistent or pervasive conduct or by a single or isolated incident, if sufficiently severe. The perceived offensiveness of a single verbal or written expression, standing alone, is typically not sufficient to constitute a hostile environment.

**2.4. Investigator** - the individual responsible for reviewing and/or investigating Complaints of Prohibited Conduct and ensuring effective and efficient resolution of those Complaints.

**2.5. Preponderance of the Evidence Standard** - meeting the preponderance of evidence standard means that it is more likely than not that the alleged Prohibited Conduct occurred. This standard will be used to evaluate the evidence for purposes of making findings and drawing conclusions for an investigation conducted under this regulation.

**2.6. Respondent** - an individual accused of Prohibited Conduct in a complaint.

**2.7. Retaliation** - any adverse action taken against an individual because of protected activity that might deter a reasonable person from engaging in protected activity. It includes any act of interference, restraint, penalty, discrimination, coercion, reprisal, intimidation, threats, or harassment against an individual for using the applicable policies responsibly (including making a charge of discrimination protected by this policy; testifying, assisting, or participating in a hearing, proceeding, review process or investigation of discrimination; opposing an illegal act; or exercising any other right protected by this policy).

**2.8. Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s)** - all references to the appropriate Vice Chancellor mean the Vice Chancellor with supervisory responsibility over the Respondent or, in the Chancellor’s Division, the supervisor that the Chancellor determines to be appropriate, such as the Director of Athletics, Chief of Staff, Chief Audit Officer, or Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs. However, the Chancellor may assume this responsibility or designate another Vice Chancellor in the event the Vice Chancellor with supervisory authority over the Respondent is unavailable; is a witness in the investigation; has a conflict of interest; or when the Chancellor determines that a substitution is necessary to ensure a fair and timely review.

### **3. Resolving Complaints of Prohibited Conduct**

#### **3.1. Obligation to Review Prohibited Conduct**

Consistent with the [Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy](#), if the Office for Equity and Diversity becomes aware of any information or concerns related to prohibited discrimination, harassment, and/or related retaliation, the Office for Equity and Diversity will address those concerns with an informal review or formal investigation.



## 3.2. Office for Equity and Diversity Resolution Procedures for Complaints of Prohibited Conduct

### 3.2.1. Reporting the Prohibited Conduct

3.2.1.1. A Complainant may try to resolve an incident of Prohibited Conduct by talking with their supervisor (or other member of management in the supervisory chain if the supervisor is the Respondent). In such cases, supervisors must consult with the OED in a timely fashion prior to attempting to resolve the complaint. If the Complainant is not satisfied with the outcome of that discussion or does not feel comfortable talking with the supervisor about the issue, the Complainant should report the Prohibited Conduct to OED and seek alternative or formal resolution as explained below.

3.2.1.2. Complaints of Prohibited Conduct reported to OED should be submitted within one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days of the alleged conduct. Complaints submitted after one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days will be reviewed by OED and handled appropriately depending on the facts of each case but may not be able to be investigated due to the passage of time and unavailability of witnesses or other relevant information necessary to complete an investigation. In cases that also involve the State Human Resources Act grievance process, the timelines stated in that Act apply.

3.2.1.3. Complaints outlining details of Prohibited Conduct can be submitted to OED by any of the following means:

3.2.1.3.1. Completing the online Complaint Form. (<http://www.ecu.edu/oed/grievance-form.cfm>)

3.2.1.3.2. Submitting a written report in person or via mail using the contact information provided in this regulation.

3.2.1.3.3. Submitting a report verbally in person or by telephone using the contact information provided in this regulation.

3.2.1.4. Complaints should include, if possible, the following information:

3.2.1.4.1. Complainant name(s) and contact information.

3.2.1.4.2. Name(s) of the Respondent(s).

3.2.1.4.3. Details of Prohibited Conduct, including the date(s), time(s), and place(s).

3.2.1.4.4. Name(s) of individuals with knowledge of issue(s) or event(s).

3.2.1.4.5. The desired outcome or corrective action sought.

3.2.1.5. At any time, a complaint may be filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights ("OCR"), or the

North Carolina Civil Rights Division of the Office of Administrative Hearings. The agency website links can be found above in the Additional References section.

#### 3.2.1.6. Preliminary Assessment:

3.2.1.6.1. Upon receiving a complaint, the investigator will conduct a preliminary assessment and assess the details of the complaint to determine whether the report alleges facts that, if true, constitutes Prohibited Conduct within OED's jurisdiction. If the complaint is unclear, the investigator may seek additional information from the Complainant.

3.2.1.6.2. If the preliminary assessment of the complaint indicates that, if true, does not constitute Prohibited Conduct, the investigator may suggest resolving this type of complaint through the alternative resolution process and notify the Complainant of the resolution (see 3.2.2.2 below).

3.2.1.6.3. If the preliminary assessment indicates that the complaint is not within OED's jurisdiction, the investigator will notify the Complainant of the appropriate University office for referral.

3.2.1.6.4. Additionally, if the report of Prohibited Conduct includes matters that fall within the jurisdiction of one or more University offices, OED may conduct a joint review with those offices as necessary.

#### 3.2.2. Alternative Resolution Process

3.2.2.1. The Complainant may request, or the investigator may suggest an alternative resolution in place of formal resolution. OED has the discretion to determine if the nature of the Prohibited Conduct is not appropriate for alternative resolution, to limit the type of alternative resolution that may be appropriate in a specific case and, to refer a report for formal resolution at any time. At any point prior to the conclusion of the alternative resolution, the Complainant may withdraw their request for an alternative resolution and initiate the formal resolution process.

3.2.2.2. Alternative resolutions may include, but are not limited to, providing the Complainant with University and community resources, referring the concerns to the Respondent's supervisor, referring the complaint to the Ombuds Office, and/or providing education to the Respondent.

3.2.2.3. The request for an alternative resolution is not a finding of Prohibited Conduct, which can only be established through a formal investigation as described below.

#### 3.2.3. Formal Resolution Process

3.2.3.1. Formal resolution is an investigation to determine, considering the totality of all evidence available and using the Preponderance of Evidence Standard, whether the

Prohibited Conduct occurred. Formal resolution also includes steps taken to address findings of Prohibited Conduct to remedy its effects and to prevent its recurrence.

#### 3.2.3.2. Confirmation of Specific Allegations:

3.2.3.2.1. If the Complainant would like to proceed with formal resolution, and/or the investigator determines formal resolution is necessary, the Complainant will be asked to confirm the details of the complaint in writing prior to commencement of the investigation. The Complainant should maintain confidentiality of the investigation information and must not conduct their own review and/or investigation of the allegations. The Complainant, Respondent and any employee who provides information or otherwise participates in the investigation will be notified of the University's policy prohibiting retaliation.

3.2.3.2.2. OED does not make any conclusions or presumptions regarding the complaint prior to a complete investigation of the complaint. OED is committed to treating all parties equitably and impartially.

#### 3.2.3.3. Notice of Investigation:

3.2.3.3.1. Upon the initiation of an investigation, the investigator will notify the Complainant and the Respondent in writing of the complaint and the specific allegations. The Respondent will be given the opportunity to submit any information relevant to the complaint, including a written or verbal response. The Respondent must not conduct their own review and/or investigation of the complaint. In addition, the Respondent should not contact or speak with the Complainant about the complaint and should not engage related retaliation prohibited by the Notice of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy. The Respondent may, at any time, elect to resolve the formal resolution process by accepting responsibility for the Prohibited Conduct, in which case the investigator will refer the matter to the appropriate Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s) for imposition of sanction(s) and/or other appropriate action. The Complainant will be notified of the conclusion of the investigation and any action taken as permitted by applicable law.

#### 3.2.3.4. Advisors:

3.2.3.4.1 Throughout the process, each party has the right to choose and consult with an advisor. The advisor may be any person, including an attorney, who is not otherwise a party or witness involved in the investigation. The parties may be accompanied by their respective advisors at any meeting or proceeding related to the investigation and resolution of a report under these Procedures. While the advisors may provide support and advice to the parties at any meeting and/or proceeding, they may not speak on behalf of the parties or otherwise participate in, or in any manner disrupt, such meetings and/or proceedings, except advisors may participate as required/permitted by any applicable UNC policy or state or federal law.

#### 3.2.3.5. Evidence:

3.2.3.5.1. Both the Complainant and the Respondent will have the opportunity to provide evidence and/or witnesses relevant to the complaint. The parties will have timely and equal access to information that will be used during the formal resolution process and related meetings, as allowed by applicable law.

3.2.3.5.2. The investigator will meet with the witness(es) the investigator deems relevant to the investigation.

3.2.3.6. Timeframes and Notification:

3.2.3.6.1. OED will make every effort to promptly, equitably, and thoroughly investigate claims of Prohibited Conduct within approximately sixty (60) business days from the issuance of the notice of the investigation outlined in 4.2.3.4. Although investigations are generally completed within approximately sixty (60) business days, occasionally the process may take longer depending on the nature or complexity of the issues, extenuating circumstances, the availability of witnesses, and/or University closures.

3.2.3.6.2. OED will contact the Complainant and Respondent with a status update of the investigation approximately thirty (30) business days from the Complainant's confirmation of the complaint. If the investigation extends beyond sixty (60) business days, the Complainant and Respondent will be provided a status update at sixty (60) business days and then at every thirty (30) business day interval thereafter.

3.2.3.7. Conclusion of Investigation:

3.2.3.7.1 Upon completion of the investigation, the OED will issue a written report with the findings of the investigation to the Respondent's divisional Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s).

3.2.3.7.2. OED will concurrently issue a notice of findings to both the Complainant and Respondent. If an investigation reveals conduct that may violate other University policies, the investigator will notify the applicable University office of the conduct.

3.2.3.7.3. OED's findings may not be appealed and constitute the University's final decision except that OED may exercise discretion to amend its findings in the event it becomes aware of new information that materially impacts the findings of the investigation or if material facts relied upon to reach its findings are later determined to be inaccurate. In the event OED amends its findings it will reissue its report to the Respondent's divisional Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s) and notice of findings to the Complainant and Respondent.

3.2.3.8. Vice Chancellor Review:

3.2.3.8.1 Upon receipt of the written report with the findings of the investigation, the appropriate Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s) will review and, as appropriate, take disciplinary and/or other action in accordance with applicable policy.

### 3.2.3.9. Sanctions:

3.2.3.9.1. Disciplinary action imposed against a Respondent who engaged in Prohibited Conduct or other misconduct revealed by the investigation may include one or more of the following: training, progressive disciplinary action, restrictions on interactions with students or other members of the ECU community, No-Contact Directive, transfer of position, removal of administrative appointment, demotion, suspension without pay, and discharge from employment. A Respondent may appeal the imposition of disciplinary action as permitted by any disciplinary policy applicable to the Respondent.

3.2.3.9.2. Any sanction or combination of sanctions imposed upon a Respondent will be documented in the Respondent's personnel file.

## 4. Obligation to Provide Truthful Information

4.1. All University community members are expected to provide truthful information in any report or proceeding under this Regulation. Providing false or misleading information is prohibited and may subject the individual to disciplinary action consistent with University policy applicable to the individual. This provision does not apply to information provided in good faith, even when the alleged facts cannot be substantiated or are found to be incorrect.

## 5. Privacy

5.1. OED will protect the privacy of both the Complainant and the Respondent to the extent possible under applicable law. In some situations, including those in which disciplinary action is a possible outcome, due process may require disclosure of information, including Complainant's identity, to the Respondent.

5.2. If the Complainant would like to remain anonymous, the investigator will explain that OED will endeavor to investigate the complaint in a manner that honors the Complainant's request for anonymity, but that the University cannot ensure complete confidentiality and/or it may be limited in its ability to take disciplinary action if the Complainant insists he/she remain anonymous.

## 6. Conflict of Interest

6.1. If any party involved in an investigation is or becomes aware of a real or perceived conflict of interest that will prevent OED or a particular investigator from rendering an impartial decision, the party should notify OED and request an alternate investigator. The University may also, by exercise of its own discretion, appoint an alternate investigator absent a request if it knows of or learns of a real or perceived conflict of interest. If this occurs, the parties will be notified as appropriate.

## 7. Records

7.1. ECU will maintain confidentiality of all OED records pertaining to this policy in accordance with applicable law, including but not limited to, the N.C. personnel records statute found at N.C. General Statute Chapter 126, Article 7 et seq., the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

(FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99), and the [University General Records Management Policy](#). The information contained in records generally will not be released without the written consent of the individuals who are the subject of the records. However, records may be shared with third parties, such as the EEOC, OCR or other government investigatory body, to the extent required or allowed under applicable law.

7.2. OED reports that do not eventuate in a formal Complaint can suggest avenues for investigation when they form a pattern, but reports that have not been investigated formally, in a manner consistent with due process, cannot be used to substantiate subsequent Complaints.

## 8. Prevention and Education

### 8.1. Employees

8.1.1. All employees are responsible for completing educational modules about Prohibited Conduct every five years. New employees must complete these required trainings within ninety (90) days of their hire date.

8.1.2. Education is one of the most effective ways to create an environment free of discrimination, harassment, and related retaliation.

8.1.3. The modules are accessible for all permanent employees via Cornerstone and via Blackboard for temporary or short-term employees as well as student employees.

8.1.4. OED will track employee completion of the module and will notify an employee's respective Vice Chancellor and/or other appropriate University administrator(s) of noncompliance.

8.1.5. Questions about the educational modules should be directed to OED at the contact information above and below in paragraph 10.

## 9. Contact Information

Office for Equity and Diversity  
East Carolina University  
Suite G-406 Old Cafeteria Building  
Greenville, NC 27858  
(252) 328-6804  
Oed@ecu.edu

---

### Resolution #20-16

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [February 10, 2020](#) including approval of Writing Intensive course designation (WI) for AERO 4400 National Security Affairs/Preparation for Active Duty and change from Writing Intensive course designation (WI) to Writing Intensive by section (WI\*) for ARTH 4942 Survey of Twentieth-Century Modern Art: 1950-2000, ARTH 4944 Studies in Contemporary Art: Post 1960s Art, and ARTH 4948 Art of the United States.

---

Resolution #20-17

Curriculum and academic matters acted on and recorded in the [February 17, 2020](#) meeting minutes of the General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, including retention of General Education Mathematics Designation (GE:MA) for MATH 2228 Elementary Statistical Methods I after notification of prerequisite removal; removal of Global Diversity Designation (GD) for FREN 2440 Readings in the Culture of France I and FREN 2441 Readings in the Culture of France II; approval of General Education Social Sciences Designation (GE:SO) for AAAS 1000 Introduction to African and African American Studies, and MUSC 1406 Music History and Literature I; Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for MUSC 3227 Beginning Instruction in Vocal-General Music Education, MUSC 3287 Choral Laboratory, General Education Designation for the following study abroad courses: Humanities Designation (GE:HU) for CREL 2603 World Religions and EGPT 1099 Temples and Gods from The American University in Cairo; General Education Fine Arts Designation (GE:FA) for ARIC 2206 Art and Architecture of City of Cairo from The American University in Cairo; Diversity Designation for the following transfer courses: Domestic Diversity Designation (DD) for SO 201 Introductory Sociology from Cumberland County CC, SOC 110 Introduction to Sociology from Kirkgood CC, SOCI 1011 Introduction to Sociology from Montana State University-Bozeman; Global Diversity Designation (GD) for BIBL 3040 The Life and Teaching of Jesus from King College; and approval of the following courses for expedited Domestic Diversity Designation (DD):

- ADRE 2000 Survey of Community Resources in Rehabilitation and Health Care
- ADRE 4000 Interviewing Techniques for Health and Rehabilitation Settings
- ANTH 3026 Forensic Anthropology
- ART 1827 Photography Changes Everything
- ART 3850 Art in Elementary School
- ART 3860 Classroom Participation in Art
- ARTH 3961 Native North American Art and Ritual
- COMM 3151 Family Communication
- COMM 3190 Health Communication
- COMM 3520 Sports Media Survey
- DNCE 4044 History of Dance I
- ELEM 3500 Teaching Social Sciences in Elementary School
- ENGL 2230 Southern Literature
- ENGL 3570 American Folklore
- FINA 2244 Legal Environment of Business
- GENS 2400 Introduction to Gender Studies
- GEOG 3004 Urban Geography
- GEOG 3010 Social Justice and Sustainability
- HDFS 1103 Marriage and Family Relations
- HDFS 2400 Introduction to Gerontology
- HIST 2444 The History of Sports in Western Society
- HIST 3100 North Carolina History
- HIST 3110 History of African-Americans
- HIST 3140 Women in American History
- HIST 3170 History of Native Americans
- HIST 3225 The Era of Sectionalism and Civil War, 1848-1877

HIST 3230	The Birth of Modern America, 1865-1892
HIST 3240	The Age of Franklin Roosevelt, 1919-1945
HIST 3245	The United States Since 1945
HIST 3907	Pirate Nation: An ECU History
JUST 3700	Race, Gender and Special Populations in the Criminal Justice System
LING 3700	History of the English Language
MGMT 4343	Organizational Leaders and Leadership
MGMT 4402	Human Resource Management
MKTG 4732	Consumer Behavior
MSL 4002	Company Grade Leadership
PHIL 1175	Introduction to Ethics
PHIL 2274	Business Ethics
PHIL 3281	Introduction to Philosophical Ethics in the Healthcare Professions
PSYC 3375	Abnormal Psychology
PSYC 4350	Psychology of Sexual Behavior
READ 3000	Literacy Learning in a Diverse World
RELI 2340	Religion and Science
RELI 3700	Religion and Social Issues
RELI 4900	Internship in Religious Studies
SOCI 3025	Sociology of Mass Media
SOCI 3220	Sociology of Deviant Behavior
SOCI 4320	Sociology of Law
SOCI 4322	Law and Social Change
SOCI 4325	Marriage and the Family
SOCI 4330	Criminology
SOCI 4360	Sociology of Protest and Activism
SOCI 4400	Sociological Perspectives of Sport
SOCW 2400	Introduction to Gerontology
THEA 3035	Theatre History-Literature II

---

Resolution #20-18

Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity, as follows:

The Committee originally proposed revisions to this section of the *ECU Faculty Manual* and had them approved by Faculty Senate in October 2018 (Faculty Senate Resolution #18-56). The Chancellor returned the policy to the Committee for further review and the revised text below is.

Provided [here](#) is the document with tracked changes detailing all proposed revisions and below is the proposed text that includes incorporated revisions.



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

SECTION II

Academic Integrity

(Text moved from former Part IV)

CONTENTS

- I. Statement of Academic Integrity
- II. Purpose and Scope
- III. Definitions of Academic Integrity Violations (AIV)
- IV. University-Wide Responsibility to Report Academic Integrity Violations
  - A. Responsibilities of Faculty, Teaching Assistants, and other Instructional Personnel
  - B. Responsibilities of the Student
  - C. Responsibilities of other University Community Members
  - D. Responsibilities of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR)
  - E. University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI) Composition and Membership
- V. Rights and Responsibilities of Participants
  - A. Respondent Rights and Responsibilities
  - B. Complainant Rights and Responsibilities
  - C. Bias
  - D. Contact Information
- VI. Procedure for Reporting a Suspected Academic Integrity Violation
  - A. Notice of Suspected AIV and Scheduling the Initial Meeting
  - B. Provisions for Special Cases
  - C. Formal Departmental Meeting
  - D. Outcome of Formal Departmental Meeting
  - E. AIB Hearings
  - F. Appeals
  - G. Appeal of Expulsion
- VII. Records
- VIII. Annual Reports
- IX. Review of AIV Process

I. Statement of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is the application of pertinent personal virtues, such as honesty, responsibility, authenticity, honor, and justice, to academic work. Academic integrity is a cornerstone value of the intellectual community at East Carolina University. Academic integrity is required for students to derive optimal benefit from their educational experience and their pursuit of knowledge. Violating the principle of academic integrity damages the reputation of the university and undermines its educational mission. Without the assurance of integrity in academic work, including research, degrees from the university lose value; and the world beyond campus (graduate schools, employers, colleagues, neighbors, etc.) learns that it cannot trust credits, or a diploma earned at ECU. For these reasons, academic integrity is required of every ECU student.

Maintaining the academic integrity of ECU is the responsibility of all members of the academic

community. Faculty should ensure that submitted work accurately reflects the abilities of the individual student. Toward this end, faculty should—through both example and explicit instruction—instill in students a desire to maintain the university’s standards of academic integrity and provide students with strategies that they can use to avoid intentional or accidental violation of the academic integrity policy.

## II. Purpose and Scope

This document sets forth democratic procedures to follow for suspected academic integrity violations (AIVs) at ECU as well as possible penalties. These procedures comply with the minimal due process standards of 700.4.1 of the UNC Policy Manual (<https://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php>). These procedures pertain to anyone registered for an academic course at the University, including but not limited to, undergraduate and graduate students who are classified as degree or non-degree seeking as well as visiting students, and students studying abroad. The Academic Integrity Policy also applies to student violations discovered after the student has completed the course, has left the University, or has graduated. Depending on the circumstances of the case, degree revocation may be a consequence, as outlined in the relevant catalog. All students are responsible for conducting themselves in a manner that enhances a learning environment where the rights, dignity, worth, and freedom of each member of the academic community are respected. Upon acceptance of admission to ECU, each student agrees to abide by the policies of the University and to conduct themselves on- and off-campus in a manner consistent with its educational mission. Students have a responsibility to review the Academic Integrity Policy and other policies, and, if necessary, to seek clarification from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR).

ECU’s policy on research misconduct is a separate and independent process from this AIV process. The determinations, results, procedures, and outcomes of the Research Misconduct Proceedings shall rely on ECU’s PRR on the Regulation on Research Misconduct (<https://www.ecu.edu/prr/10/45/01>), which is necessary for university compliance with this UNC system policy as well as with state and federal laws. It is recommended that all faculty, staff, and students be familiar with it. The procedures for reporting, investigating, and determining penalties in cases of academic integrity violations shall not supersede procedures for reporting, investigating, and determining penalties for research misconduct. These cases should be reported to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR).

1. Certain academic departments, programs, colleges, and schools, especially at the professional and graduate level, may have additional ethical and behavioral expectations of their students, including expectations for the conduct of research, and may establish additional penalties for AIVs. In addition, various academic units and administrative departments have policies specific to their area of responsibility. It is the responsibility of each student to be familiar with University policies and procedures. This Academic Integrity Policy and related policies and procedures are available on-line.

2. In addition to the consequences outlined in this Policy and the possible penalties discussed below, students who represent units within the University, such as medical students, dental students, graduate students, student athletes, resident advisors, student organization leaders, and residential students may be subject to additional consequences under the standards set by those units.

### III. Definitions of Academic Integrity Violations

An academic integrity violation (AIV) is defined as any activity that exhibits dishonesty in the educational process or that compromises the academic honor of the university. Examples of AIVs include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Cheating: Unauthorized aid or assistance or the giving or receiving of unfair advantage on any form of academic work. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to: copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz or examination; using books, notes, or other devices when these are not authorized; improperly obtaining tests or examinations; collaborating on academic work without authorization and/or without truthful disclosure of the extent of that collaboration; allowing or directing a substitute to take an examination.
2. Plagiarism: Copying the language, structure, ideas, and/or thoughts of another and adopting the same as one's own original work. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to: submitting a paper that has been purchased or downloaded from an essay-writing service; directly quoting, word for word, from any source, including online sources, without indicating that the material comes directly from that source; omitting a citation to a source when paraphrasing or summarizing another's work; submitting a paper written by another person as one's own work.
3. Falsification/Fabrication: The statement of any untruth, either spoken or written, regarding any circumstances related to academic work. This includes any untrue statements made with regard to a suspected AIV. Examples of falsification/fabrication include, but are not limited to: making up data, research results, experimental procedures, internship or practicum experiences, or otherwise claiming academic-related experience that one has not actually had; inventing or submitting deceptive citations for the sources of one's information; submitting a false excuse for an absence from class or other academic obligation.
4. Multiple submission: The submission of substantial portions of the same academic work for credit more than once without authorization from the faculty member who receives the later submission. Examples of multiple submission include, but are not limited to: submitting the same essay for credit in two courses without first receiving written permission; making minor revisions to an assignment that has already received credit in a course and submitting it in another class as if it were new work.
5. Violation assistance: Knowingly helping or attempting to help someone else in an act that constitutes an AIV. Examples of violation assistance include, but are not limited to: knowingly allowing another to copy answers during an examination or quiz; distributing test questions or examination materials without permission from the faculty member teaching the course; writing an essay, or substantial portions thereof, for another student to submit as his or her own work; taking an examination or test for another student; distributing information involving clinical simulation and skills assessments.
6. Violation attempts: Attempting any act that, if completed, would constitute an AIV as defined herein. In other words, it does not matter if a student succeeds in carrying out any of the above violations, the fact that a violation was attempted is itself a violation of academic integrity.

7. Research Specific Definitions: In addition to the above definitions, specialized definitions of some terms as they apply to research are defined in The University of North Carolina Policy on Research Conduct (<https://www.ecu.edu/prr/10/45/01>) referenced above. For example, this Policy defines research misconduct as “fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting the results.” When specifically concerning Research misconduct:

- Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. The research record is the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from the research inquiry and includes, but is not limited to research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, books, dissertations, and journal articles.
- Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

#### IV. University-Wide Responsibility to Report AIVs

AIVs are unfair to honest students and they damage the quality and reputation of the entire university. Thus, ignoring AIVs is as problematic as actively committing an AIV.

##### A. Responsibilities of Faculty, Teaching Assistants, and other Instructional Personnel

Faculty, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel are responsible for communicating university-wide expectations for academic integrity, for example, by providing this AIV policy or a reference to it in their course syllabus to ensure that students are accountable for conforming their conduct to these expectations. It is also recommended that faculty, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel communicate clear ground rules for academic work conducted under their supervision and take reasonable steps to prevent AIVs. For example, faculty, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should prevent unauthorized access to examinations during development, duplication, and administration; avoid reusing prior examinations in whole or in part to the extent possible; take all reasonable steps consistent with physical classroom conditions to reduce the risk of cheating during the administration of examinations; and maintain proper security during the administration of examinations, including as appropriate overseeing distribution and collection of examinations and proctoring the examination session.

If faculty, teaching assistants, or other instructional personnel suspect an AIV, they should:

- follow the procedures for responding to suspected AIVs (enumerated below, Section VI) including, but not limited to: obeying time constraints, providing proper notice, refraining from taking unilateral punitive action, and reporting the alleged violation to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR), and the department chair (or his/her designee); and
- cooperate with the OSRR and the Academic Integrity Board (AIB) when it conducts an investigation. The cooperation may call for actions such as providing testimony or other evidence, recommending appropriate sanctions, or helping to bring the matter to a prompt conclusion.

#### B. Responsibilities of the Student:

ECU students are responsible for promoting academic integrity in the ECU community by upholding it in their own work and by reporting any suspected violations. A student knowing of circumstances in which an AIV may have occurred or is likely to occur should bring this knowledge to the attention of a faculty member or the OSRR.

ECU students are responsible for understanding what plagiarism is, learning the recognized techniques of proper attribution of sources used in the preparation of written work, and identifying allowable resource materials or aids to be used during examination or in completion of any graded work. Students should seek clarification from faculty if it is not clear whether a certain action would violate this Academic Integrity Policy.

ECU students are responsible for complying with faculty classroom procedures designed to reduce the possibility of cheating—such as removing unauthorized materials or aids from the classroom and protecting one’s own examination paper from the view of others.

ECU students are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of examinations by divulging no information concerning an examination, directly or indirectly, to another student.

ECU students are responsible for reporting any instance in which reasonable grounds exist to believe that a student has given or received unauthorized aid in graded work or in other respects committed an AIV. Such report should be made to the OSRR, the Office of the Dean of Students (DOS), or other appropriate instructor or official of their college or school.

ECU students are responsible for cooperating with the OSRR in the investigation and hearing of any incident of alleged violation, including providing testimony when called upon.

#### C. Responsibilities of other University Community Members

Other ECU community members are responsible for promoting academic integrity in the ECU community both by upholding it in their own work and by reporting any suspected AIV. An ECU community member knowing of circumstances in which an AIV may have occurred or is likely to occur should bring this knowledge to the attention of a faculty member or the OSRR. The AIV form for reporting to OSRR can be found at <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>

#### D. Responsibilities of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR)

The OSRR is responsible for discussing the suspected AIV with the instructor of record for the course(s) involved. The OSRR, in consultation with the faculty member(s), will follow the procedures outlined in this policy. The OSRR is responsible for acting as a source of information and liaison concerning this policy and procedure for faculty, teaching assistants, other instructional personnel, department chairs, administrators, and students. The OSRR is also responsible for coordinating the staffing and maintaining of the University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI), the Academic Integrity Review Committee (AIRC), and the Academic Integrity Board (AIB).

#### E. University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI) Composition and Membership

1. Faculty members – Sixteen faculty members, at least six of whom should have graduate faculty status, elected for three-year staggered terms by the Faculty Senate. 2. Student members – Sixteen students, at least six of whom should be graduate students, elected by and from among the members of the Student Conduct Board. These students shall serve for a year and may be reelected for one additional year.

The Director of the OSRR, or designee, shall serve as administrative officer of the committee, but shall not participate in hearings.

- AIRC: Is a three-member panel consisting of: one administrator from OSRR (designated by the Director of OSRR), one student member from UCAI and one faculty member from UCAI. In cases involving possible violations of graduate students the faculty must have graduate faculty status and the student must be a graduate student. The AIRC is charged with reviewing student appeals of the Department's finding and/or penalty. The AIRC will review the appeal request to determine if it is appropriate to forward it to the AIB. (See below for appeal grounds and standard of review.)
- AIB: Is a panel of five UCAI members; three faculty members and two students. The AIB is charged with determining whether a student has violated this policy and, if appropriate, assigning sanctions. The AIB is utilized when a case is referred to the OSRR for UCAI review. This includes: appeals of the results of the Initial Meeting, cases in which the department recommends additional sanctions (e.g. suspension or expulsion) after an Initial Meeting, in cases of repeat violations, multi-student violations, or suspected violations at the undergraduate level that occur outside of a specific course. If the case involves possible violations by a graduate student, every attempt should be made to ensure that all three faculty members on the board have graduate faculty status; however, in all graduate level cases, at least two of the three faculty members must have graduate faculty status. In cases involving possible violations by graduate students, the student members of the board must be graduate students. The AIB will select a chair from among its faculty membership. All members of the AIB may vote on the selection of a chair.

#### V. Rights and Responsibilities

##### A. Respondent Rights and Responsibilities

A student whose conduct is under review is a Respondent and has the rights and responsibilities listed below. The Respondent forfeits any of these rights if the Respondent fails to exercise that right after having been given appropriate notice and opportunity to do so.

##### Respondent Rights:

- The right to an objective and impartial evaluation of the complaint.
- The right to be present during the meeting with the instructor of record and during the AIB hearing (if applicable).
- The right to reasonable access to all information gathered throughout the investigation pertinent to the alleged violation.

- The right to present information relevant to the alleged violation, including inviting witnesses.
- The right to respond to information presented against the Respondent.
- The right to a separate meeting with a faculty member or AIB hearing in cases involving multiple Respondents. Charges against multiple Respondents involved in the same incident may be heard in a single case only if each Respondent consents to such a proceeding.
- The right not to provide information, with the understanding that the University will make a determination with or without the Respondent's information.
- The right to review of the decision, after receiving written notice of the outcome, including to appeal as described below.
- The right to be informed of pertinent University-based support services.

**Respondent Responsibilities:**

- The responsibility to be honest and direct in communicating with individuals involved in the Academic Integrity process.
- The responsibility to review this Academic Integrity policy and procedures and to seek clarification if necessary.
- The responsibility to respond in a timely manner to University requests for information, to promptly schedule meetings when requested, and to arrive on time for scheduled meetings.
- The responsibility to provide the decision-maker with pertinent information that the Respondent would like considered in the review of the alleged violation.
- The responsibility to participate in the Academic Integrity process in a manner that is civil and respectful.

**B. Complainant Rights and Responsibilities**

A faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel who alleges a violation of this Policy is the Complainant and has the rights and responsibilities listed below. The Complainant forfeits any of these rights if the Complainant fails to exercise that right after having been given appropriate notice and opportunity to do so.

**Complainant Rights:**

- The right to an objective and impartial evaluation of the complaint.
- The right to invite relevant witnesses with knowledge of the alleged AIV.
- The right to submit a written statement.
- The right, after receiving written notice of the outcome, to review the decision, if permitted under ECU policies, University of North Carolina System policies and local, state, and federal laws.

**Complainant Responsibilities:**

- The responsibility to provide a copy of the course syllabus and all relevant controlling documents (e.g. project instructions).
- The responsibility to be honest and direct in communicating with individuals involved in the conduct process.

- The responsibility to review this Academic Integrity Policy and its procedures, and to seek clarification if necessary.
- The responsibility to respond in a timely manner to University requests for information, to promptly schedule meetings when requested, and to arrive on time for scheduled meetings.
- The responsibility to provide the decision-maker with pertinent information that the Complainant would like considered in the review of the alleged violation.
- The responsibility to participate in the Academic Integrity process in a manner that is civil and respectful.

#### C. Bias

If the Respondent and/or Complainant believes that one or more of the fact finders, such as the Department Chair (or designee), a member(s) of the AIRC, or the AIB, has a conflict with, bias about, or an interest in a case that may unduly influence the decision making either positively or negatively, the Respondent and/or Complainant may request a different Panel or Official. The challenging party will be asked to provide specific reasons for the challenge. If the challenge is made concerning the Formal Departmental Meeting, then the Department Chair (or designee) will determine whether to recuse and replace themselves. If the challenge is made concerning the AIRC, or the AIB, then the Chair of the UCAI along with the Director of the OSRR, or designee, will determine whether the identified panel member should be removed. If the removal of a panel member results in fewer than five panel members being able to serve, parties will be given the option to continue with the existing panel or to reschedule the hearing for review by a full panel.

#### D. Contact Information

Students have the responsibility to update personal contact information on their Pirate Port account as soon as it changes and to consistently monitor their ECU e-mail account and telephone answering equipment, as the University frequently communicates through these modes. U.S. Postal System letters will be sent to the local address provided by the student in the Pirate Port system or to the permanent address if attempted contact with the student through other means is unsuccessful.

### VI. Procedure for Reporting a Suspected Academic Integrity Violation

Outlined below is a formal procedure for reporting suspected AIVs. This procedure applies to all ECU students regardless of mode of instruction. Additional information regarding AIVs in distance education (DE) courses is available from OSRR.

**Standard of Evidence:** The standard used throughout the academic integrity process to reach case resolution is preponderance of the evidence. This standard will be used to evaluate the evidence for purposes of making findings and drawing conclusions for an investigation conducted under this policy. To meet the standard of preponderance of evidence, the evidence must indicate the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the alleged conduct occurred. Formal rules of evidence do not apply to student conduct cases.



All complaints will be reviewed by the OSRR to track and to determine whether the reported behavior is governed by this policy. Anonymous complaints may result in a formal charge if they contain sufficient information to independently establish a violation of this policy.

Retaliation: The University does not tolerate retaliation against individuals who file a complaint. Retaliation means any act of interference, restraint, penalty, coercion, reprisal, intimidation, threats, or harassment against an individual for using applicable policies responsibly (including testifying, assisting, or participating in a hearing, proceeding, review process or investigation; opposing an illegal act; or exercising any other right protected by this policy). Students who retaliate against such persons will be held accountable under the Student Conduct Process (<https://www.ecu.edu/prr/11/30/01>). It is the responsibility of the target of the retaliation to immediately report the behavior to OSRR.

#### A. Notice of Suspected AIV and Scheduling the Initial Meeting and (if applicable) the Formal Departmental Meeting

If it is believed that an AIV has occurred in the Complainant's course, then the student will be invited to a gathering of information meeting ("Initial Meeting") with the Complainant.

In a case where the AIV involves multiple students (for example, cheating rings), the Complainant should submit a report of the suspected AIV(s) to OSRR. In the event that OSRR receives credible reports of multi-student violations, it reserves the right to refer the case to theUCAI for an AIB hearing.

To initiate the formal review of a suspected AIV, the Complainant (as a designated University official) will provide notice of the Initial Meeting to the Respondent. This notice:

1. must be sent by some method with evidence of dispatch (e.g., email from the Complainant's official ECU email account to the Respondent's official ECU email account, or hand-delivered letter accompanied by a brief form that the Respondent signs to indicate the note was delivered, or receipt-request postal mail);
2. must be sent to the Respondent(s) involved within seven calendar days of the time the suspected violation comes to the attention of the Complainant. (If the AIV is discovered during a time when regularly scheduled classes are not being held, the seven calendar days shall be counted starting with the next day regularly scheduled classes are held.);
3. must communicate the following important information:
  - a. a specification of the suspected AIV(s)
  - b. a brief description of the major evidence supporting the allegation
  - c. a list of the possible sanctions/penalties including any program specific AIV penalties, if appropriate. If the alleged violation(s) could result in expulsion, this possibility must be stated that expulsion precludes matriculation at any UNC constituent institution.
  - d. instructions for the Respondent to contact the Complainant to set up the Initial Meeting, including appropriate contact information for the Complainant

- e. a statement presenting the option to bypass the Initial Meeting and accept a sanction/penalty proposed by the Complainant, including instructions for how to do so
- f. a copy of the student's rights and responsibilities form (available on the OSRR webpage <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>)

A student may not withdraw from a course while a suspected AIV is being investigated. The AIV investigation is commenced once notice of the Initial Meeting or notice of the AIB hearing is sent, whichever comes first. If hand-delivered, then the commencement date is based upon the signed note of receipt.

If a faculty member finds an AIV at the end of the semester and the student has already attended the last scheduled class session and final exam, the faculty member should follow the steps above and notify the Respondent in writing of a suspected violation and mark a grade of Incomplete (I) until the investigation is complete.

Upon delivery of the written notification from the Complainant, the Respondent has seven calendar days to contact the Complainant and schedule a meeting day and time. If the Respondent fails to respond to Complainant notification within seven calendar days, the Respondent shall forfeit the opportunity to present the Respondent's understanding of the situation to the Complainant. If, after the seven days have passed, the Respondent responds with extenuating circumstances that explain their failure to respond in a timely manner (e.g. medical issue, family death, etc.), the Director of OSRR (or designee) will decide whether to reopen the case.

In the event that the Respondent fails to respond to the notice, the Complainant may find the Respondent responsible for the AIV and may impose sanctions (as outlined below; see Section VI.C). If so, the Complainant will need to complete an Academic Integrity Violation Form (AIV form) (which is available on the OSRR webpage <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>) and submit it to the OSRR within twenty-four calendar days of the date on which the notice of a suspected violation was sent to the Respondent. The OSRR will notify the Respondent, in writing, of the Complainant's decision and penalty within seven calendar days of receiving the AIV form. The written notice shall include a copy of the student's rights and responsibilities form and inform the Respondent of their right to appeal and the appeal process (described below). In the event that the Respondent involved in the violation is a graduate student or is in a degree program that has additional penalties for or policies regarding academic integrity violations, the OSRR will also submit a copy of the AIV form to the appropriate program administrator.

Formal review of a suspected AIV is initiated upon sending notice of the Initial Meeting with Faculty (or OSRR if applicable). Any informal discussions between faculty and student about coursework prior to the Initial Meeting is not considered part of the formal AIV review process. The Initial Meeting is designed for the Complainant to gather information, discuss the allegation with the Respondent, and provide evidence of the suspected violation. Before or during the Initial Meeting, the Respondent may waive the right to the Formal Departmental Meeting and accept a penalty/sanction proposed by the Complainant. If so, determination and/or assignment of penalty/sanction may be made at, or following, the Initial Meeting.

If the Respondent does not waive their right to the Formal Departmental Meeting or decides to appeal the penalty/sanction after waiving, then the Formal Departmental Meeting shall be held within twenty-four calendar days of the time that the suspected AIV has come to the Complainant's attention. The Respondent, Complainant, or the Department Chair (or designee) may request a reasonable postponement of the Formal Departmental Meeting by contacting the other parties in writing no fewer than two business days before the scheduled meeting. Any requests for postponement must explain the reason for the request and provide an alternate meeting date and time. The Department Chair (or designee) will make the final determination of the meeting date and time.

#### B. Provisions for Special Cases

1. If a Complainant discovers a suspected violation in which the currently enrolled Respondent has used the work of a student either in a different section of the course or has taken a course at a different time, the Complainant should follow the procedures for the Initial Meeting and what follows (described in the previous section and below) for the Respondent enrolled in their course. If the other student involved is enrolled in another section of the course or if the student took the class during a different time (different semester), then the Complainant should submit the AIV Form directly to OSRR for an AIB hearing.

2. If a Complainant discovers a suspected violation at a time immediately after which the Complainant will no longer be under contract with the University, the Complainant should refer the case, including all evidence related to the suspected violation, directly to OSRR for an AIB hearing via the AIV Form. The AIB will review the evidence submitted (e.g., syllabus, any AI statement signed by the student, documents such as the paper and SafeAssign or other software used to find a suspected violation, etc.) through its normal hearing procedures and impose an appropriate academic penalty if a violation is found.

3. University Community Complainant: If the suspected AIV occurs outside of a specific course, the case will be referred directly to OSRR for an AIB hearing. (The AIV Form is available at <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>). In the case of a suspected AIV reported directly to OSRR for which an instructor of record can be identified, OSRR will first consult with the faculty member(s) in charge of the course(s) affected. The faculty member will determine whether to pursue the alleged violation against the student in their course. If the faculty member decides to pursue, the procedures of the Initial Meeting and subsequent procedures (as described below) shall be followed. Following this consultation, if the suspected violation(s) is egregious, pervasive, or involves multiple students, OSRR may decide to pursue the alleged AIV(s) and additional academic penalties outside of that course by taking the case to the UCAI for an AIB hearing.

4. Graduate Advisor or Director Complainant: If the suspected AIV involves a graduate student and occurs outside of a specific course, the case will be referred to the student's Faculty Advisor who will serve in the role of the faculty member in the steps above and below. In the event that no Faculty Advisor can be identified, the Graduate Program Director will serve in the role of the faculty member in the process described above and below. The Advisor or Director will then follow the procedures of the Initial Meeting and what follows or refer the case to the OSRR, whichever is applicable.

If the suspected academic violation involves a professional school student, the school may have its own ethical panel and process which presents the occasion for additional sanctions, as long as it comports with 700.4.1 of the UNC Policy on Minimum Substantive and Procedural Standards for Student Disciplinary Proceedings, Federal, State and Local Law. The Complainant is still required to follow the procedures of this Policy and report the suspected AIV to OSRR. Also, the professional school's ethical panel does not have the power to suspend or expel from the University; that remains a University decision housed under the guidance of the OSRR.

### C. Formal Departmental Meeting

The Formal Departmental Meeting is designed as the primary formal hearing for Academic Integrity Violations. The Formal Departmental Hearing is not necessary, nor required, if the Respondent waives their right to this Formal Departmental Meeting during the Initial Meeting. A determination and/or assignment of penalty/sanction may be made at, or following, the Formal Departmental Meeting.

#### 1. Participating Parties and Nonparticipating Observers

The required participating parties are the Complainant and the Department Chair (or designee). The Respondent is strongly encouraged but not required to participate. Witnesses with information relevant to the alleged AIV may be invited by the Respondent or Complainant. Character witnesses may not participate in the Meeting but may submit written statements. The Respondent and the Complainant may each have a nonparticipating observer at the Formal Departmental Meeting. The Complainant's nonparticipating observer should be another faculty member from the same department. The Respondent may select a faculty member, parent, or student who is not involved in the suspected AIV. The observer(s) may attend the Meeting and take careful notes for reference in the event of an appeal of the Formal Departmental Meeting result, but they may not actively participate or present information. (See Appeals, Section F below.) The Meeting is closed to the public and no individuals except those described above may attend.

#### 2. Meeting Procedures

The Department Chair (or designee) shall ensure an orderly meeting and that both the Complainant and Respondent have the opportunity to present evidence, including but not limited to witness testimony and relevant documents.

The Respondent may waive the Formal Departmental Meeting and accept a sanction proposed by the Complainant. The waiver and acceptance must be in writing and signed by the Respondent. Waivers are made available by the OSRR at <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>

### D. Outcome of the Formal Departmental Meeting

The Department Chair (or designee) shall evaluate evidence presented at the Formal Departmental Meeting and determine if a preponderance of evidence supports the conclusion

that the Respondent committed an AIV. The Department Chair (or designee) shall also determine the appropriate sanction based upon the Complainant's recommendation. One of the following outcomes of the Formal Departmental Meeting shall be communicated to the student within ten calendar days of the Meeting. If a determination is made in the absence of the Respondent, the Complainant must complete and submit the Academic Integrity Violation Form (AIV form; available on the OSRR webpage <https://osrr.ecu.edu/faculty-staff/>) to OSRR within twenty-four calendar days from the date of Respondent notification.

1. No violation found

The Department Chair (or designee) determines that the evidence fails to indicate that an AIV occurred and therefore no penalty will be imposed. The Department Chair will notify the student in writing of this decision, and no AIV form will be submitted to the OSRR.

2. Violation found

The Department Chair (or designee) determines that the evidence indicates that the Respondent has committed an AIV and that an academic penalty is appropriate. If the Respondent does not appear for a scheduled meeting, the Department Chair (or designee) may make a determination in the Respondent's absence. The Department Chair shall impose the sanction recommended by the Complainant provided that the penalty is minor (i.e., less severe than suspension or expulsion). The Department Chair (or designee) shall submit a completed AIV form to OSRR within ten calendar days of the Meeting. If the Department Chair (or designee) deems the penalty to be disproportionate to the AIV, they will indicate this on the AIV Form submitted to OSRR. Furthermore, if the Complainant or Department Chair (or designee) believe the violation is egregious enough to warrant further university action, the Department Chair (or designee) will include that statement on the AIV Form submitted to OSRR.

Possible minor penalties include, but are not limited to, written warning, additional work or learning opportunity, reducing the grade on the assignment(s), or reducing the overall course grade.

If, in the Complainant's discretion, the Complainant determines the response to the alleged AIV should be something less than a grade reduction (e.g., a warning, some additional work or learning opportunity) then the Complainant is only required to formally notify the Respondent and to formally report their decision to their respective Department Chair (or designee) and OSRR (for their records). If at any point, however, the Complainant determines that the AIV warrants a grade reduction or other substantial academic penalty, either as a result of the initial infraction or as a result of a student not sufficiently completing the additional work agreed to, the Complainant must follow the reporting process outlined below, including reporting the situation to OSRR for its review, support, and coordination.

If the penalty is a failure for the course, OSRR will inform the registrar to record a final grade of "XF" on the Respondent's transcript to indicate that failure in the course was the result of an AIV. If the Complainant regards the AIV as severe enough to warrant suspension or expulsion, the Department Chair shall indicate this on the AIV form. The decision to pursue suspension or expulsion will be made by OSRR.

The “X” designation must remain on the student’s transcript for at least one year and will be removed from the official transcript after one year only if the student has completed the academic integrity training module and obtained the approval of the Director of the OSRR. The approval of the Director of the OSRR must be obtained through the submission of a formal written request for removal of the “X” designation. Courses in which a student receives a grade of “XF” are not eligible for grade replacement even if the “X” is removed from the official transcript. All courses for which a student receives an “XF” will be factored into the student’s GPA, even if the “X” is removed from the official transcript and the course is retaken.

OSRR shall provide written notification to the Respondent of the Department Chair’s decision and penalty within seven calendar days of receiving the AIV form. The written notice shall include a copy of the student’s rights and responsibilities form and inform the Respondent of their right to appeal and the appeal process (described below). In the event that the Respondent involved in the violation is a graduate student or is in a degree program that has additional penalties for or policies regarding AIVs, the OSRR will also submit a copy of the AIV form to the appropriate program administrator.

### 3. Disagreement between Complainant and Department Chair (or designee).

If there is a disagreement between the Department Chair (or designee) and Complainant regarding the violation or penalty imposed, the Complainant may appeal the decision to the respective college Dean (or administrative designee) for review. In such cases, all information related to the AIV shall be submitted to the Dean (or designee) for review. The review shall be resolved within 14 calendar days. If the Dean (or designee) rules in favor of the Department Chair (or designee), that decision will be final. If the Dean (or designee) rules in favor of the Complainant, the AIV process will resume following the procedure to report the AIV to OSRR as outlined in part VI.D.2.

### 4. Referral to the UCAI for AIB Review

If a Respondent’s case is referred for AIB review, OSRR will notify the Respondent of the referral within seven calendar days of receiving the AIV form. The role of the AIB hearing is to review the entirety of the case, including determination of responsibility, assignment of grade penalty, and University sanctions (if applicable). There are three situations in which OSRR will refer the case to the UCAI for AIB review:

1. In a case where the recommended penalty is suspension or expulsion.
2. In a case where the student has prior AIV. If OSRR finds that the Respondent has a prior AIV on file, the case will be referred to the UCAI for an AIB hearing to consider more severe academic penalties.
3. In a case where the AIV involves multiple students. OSRR will receive all reports of suspected AIVs involving multiple students (for example, cheating rings). Faculty members, students, and community members should, in all cases, report suspected AIVs involving multiple students to OSRR. In the event that OSRR receives credible reports of multi-student violations, it reserves the right to refer the case to the UCAI for an AIB hearing.

The AIV form, and all records concerning disciplinary actions brought against Respondent(s) for academic infractions, including charges, evidence, transcripts, recordings, summaries, appeals, correspondence, and other related records, shall be kept by the OSRR for eight years in cases involving neither suspension nor expulsion and permanently in cases involving either suspension or expulsion. This is in compliance with the most recent UNC Records Retention and Disposition Schedule (§12.13) and Federal Code 20 USC 1232g; and is subject to change to remain in compliance with the governing law.

#### E. AIB Hearings (In lieu of Formal Departmental Meeting and for appeals Formal Departmental Meeting )

As stated above, an AIB Hearing will be convened as an appeal of the Formal Departmental Meeting or when the alleged AIV occurs outside a specific course or is egregious enough that it involves possible sanctions of suspension or expulsion. (In addition to Formal Departmental Meeting appeal, examples include, but are not limited to, sanction of suspension or expulsion, cases of repeat AIVs, multi-student AIVs, or suspected violations at the undergraduate level that occur outside of a specific course.) If the case of an alleged AIV by a graduate student, every attempt should be made to ensure that all three faculty members on the board have graduate faculty status; however, in all graduate level cases, at least two of the three faculty members must have graduate faculty status. If the case of an alleged AIV by a graduate student, the student members of the board must be graduate students. The AIB will select a chair from among its faculty membership. All members of the AIB may vote on the selection of a chair.

All AIB hearings are de novo (from the beginning), meaning that whether the case originates from a Formal Departmental Meeting or as an AIB hearing, the case will be reviewed in its entirety to determine responsibility, penalty/sanctions (if applicable).

The Director of the OSRR (or designee) will notify the parties involved of a meeting of the AIB within ten calendar days of notice of a case that requires an AIB hearing. The Complainant (if appropriate), the Respondent, witnesses, Student Advisors, and the five Panel members shall be provided not less than 10 calendar days' notification of the date, time, and place of the meeting. Appropriate waivers of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) must be obtained prior to any hearing. If a grade for the Respondent must be submitted, the Complainant shall record a grade of incomplete, pending a decision by the AIB.

#### 1. Participating Parties and Nonparticipating Observers

The required participating parties are the Complainant, the Respondent, and the five AIB panel members, witnesses for the Complainant and/or Respondent, and any other person called by the AIB Chair. If the Respondent or Complainant would like to request the assistance of a Student Advisor, the Respondent or Complainant may contact OSRR for assistance. The Director of the OSRR (or designee) is a nonparticipating observer.

If the Respondent or Complainant (if appropriate) fail to appear without prior approval of the OSRR administrative officer, the AIB will proceed with an absentia hearing.

Attorneys are not permitted to participate unless the Respondent is facing pending criminal charges stemming from the incident in question or if the University is otherwise required by law to allow an attorney to be present. In such situations, the attorney may only advise their client. The attorney is not permitted to ask questions or present information, except and unless allowing the Respondent's attorney to participate is otherwise required by law. The Respondent will assume all responsibility for attorney fees.

## 2. Hearing Procedures

The AIB Chair will give an extensive and detailed summary of the case, present materials relevant to the case, and direct the AIB hearing. Detailed procedures for AIB hearings are available from the OSRR. A determination of whether the Respondent committed the AIV, and a determination of an appropriate sanction/penalty, if applicable, will be made by a simple majority of the AIB. The AIB chair will vote only in the case of a tie. Detailed procedures for AIB hearings are available from the OSRR.

The Director of the OSRR (or designee) will serve as administrative officer and is responsible for maintaining accurate and complete records of the proceedings. The hearing will be audio recorded; however, recording quality problems and/or malfunctions will not invalidate or nullify the decision of the AIB.

AIB hearings are closed to the public.

AIB members and staff assigned to perform work related to the hearing shall report any potential procedural irregularities or procedural errors that come to their attention, which may have occurred before or during the hearing, to the Director of OSRR for review by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee). The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee) shall have the authority to determine whether corrective action, including but not limited to, a new hearing, is necessary to correct such procedural errors. This review does not constitute an appeal, and is a separate, independent review of the hearing procedures.

## F. Appeals

During an appeal, the appealing party has the burden of showing either (1) a violation of due process; or (2) a material deviation from Substantive and Procedural Standards adopted by the Board of Governors:

- **Violation of Due Process.** Due Process requires notice and an opportunity to be heard. A violation of due process means that the appealing party was not provided the required notice or an opportunity to be heard due to specified procedural errors, or errors in interpretation of University policies or regulations, that were so substantial as to effectively deny the Respondent a fair hearing. Reasonable deviations from the procedures set out in this Regulation will not invalidate a decision or proceeding unless the Respondent can show that, but for the deviation or error, there likely would have been a different outcome in the case.



- Material Deviation from Substantive and Procedural Standards. Material Deviation from Substantive and Procedural Standards require that the decision reached be neither arbitrary nor capricious. A material deviation from substantive standards means that there is a lack of information in the record that could support the decision or sanction(s). This does not mean the information presented at the hearing can be re-argued on appeal; rather, it requires showing that no reasonable person could have determined the Respondent was responsible or could have imposed the sanction that was issued, based upon the information in the record. A material deviation from procedural standards means that a lack of information in the record that could support the decision is due to a procedural error that resulted in the proffered evidence or testimony being excluded.

The Respondent must specify in writing (“appeal letter”) which grounds form the basis for the Respondent’s appeal. The Respondent must provide factual information to support that claim and explain what outcome is sought. The Respondent has a right to be assisted in preparing their written challenge by a licensed attorney or non-attorney advocate, at the Respondent’s expense.

The appeal letter must be dated, signed by the Respondent, and received by OSRR within five calendar days from the date that the written decision on sanctions is provided to the Respondent, either by hand delivery or by delivery or attempted delivery through e-mail or postal mail. Appeals should be directed to [osrr@ecu.edu](mailto:osrr@ecu.edu); or 364 Wright Building. Failure to deliver the written notice of appeal within this time limit will render the decision of the Department Chair/AIB final and conclusive. An extension of time may be requested within the five day limit, but it is within the discretion of OSRR to grant or deny such requests.

Appeals will be limited to the record of the hearing, including the supporting documents provided by the Respondent and available records (“written record”) within the OSRR.

In appeals from a Formal Departmental Meeting, the AIRC will review the written record and make a determination as to whether a decision and/or sanction should be altered. If the AIRC determines that an appeal is not granted, the decision of the Department Chair and any assigned sanctions will go into effect and the student will have no further appeal opportunities. The AIRC decision is final.

The final decision of the AIRC will be made within 45 calendar days after the hearing and will be shared with the Respondent in writing within ten calendar days of the date the decision was made. The letter will include a brief summary of the information upon which the decision was based.

In appeals from a hearing before the AIB where suspension is assigned, the Director of OSRR will compile the written record and provide it to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee) who will make the final administrative determination. The Vice Chancellor (or designee) will determine whether to impose the sanctions recommended by the AIB, to modify the sanctions recommended by the AIB, to refer the case back to OSRR for a new hearing before a different AIB, or to take other necessary administrative action.

In appeals from a hearing before the AIB where expulsion is assigned, the Director of OSRR

will compile the written record and provide it to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee) who will make the final administrative determination. The Vice Chancellor (or designee) will determine whether to impose the sanctions recommended by the AIB, to modify the sanctions recommended by the AIB, or to refer the case back to OSRR for a new hearing before a different AIB, or to take other necessary administrative action. If the Vice Chancellor (or designee) determines that the student should be expelled from the University, the student has the right to file an appeal by following the process described in Section G below.

The final decision in cases where suspension or expulsion is the sanction will be made within 45 calendar days after the hearing and will be shared with the Respondent in writing within ten calendar days of the date on which the decision was made. The letter will include a brief summary of the information upon which the decision was based and any appeal rights, including the time limits during which to appeal and the permitted grounds for appeal.

Requests for reconsideration based on new information, sufficient to alter a decision and not reasonably available at the time of the decision, should be directed to the original decision-maker. A Complainant or Respondent has one calendar year after the final imposition of sanctions by the University to present new information.

#### G. Appeal of Expulsion

Should the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee) uphold a recommendation of expulsion, the Respondent has the right to appeal the decision to the East Carolina University Board of Trustees. The Respondent should send a written appeal by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by another means that provides proof of delivery to the Assistant Secretary to Board within ten calendar days after the notice of the Vice Chancellor's decision is sent to the Respondent. A copy should also be provided to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs and University Counsel of East Carolina University. If the appeal is received in a timely manner, the Board of Trustees will establish a schedule for its review. If the Respondent fails to comply with the schedule, the Board of Trustees may dismiss the appeal. The decision of the Board of Trustees is final.

### VII. Records

A. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974: Academic Conduct case information is recorded and maintained by OSRR in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). Generally, information contained in OSRR files that personally identifies a student will not be released without the written and dated consent of the student identified in the record. However, disciplinary records may be shared with third parties to the extent allowed under FERPA. For specific information on FERPA, please contact the Registrar's Office.

B. Maintenance of Records: Academic Conduct records are maintained by the OSRR for at least eight years from the completion of the last sanction imposed. Records of students, who have been expelled, and of those who have a pending case or have not completed sanctions are kept indefinitely.

C. UNC Suspension/Expulsion Database: Information about students who are suspended,

expelled, or have serious pending cases is entered into a UNC database, where it is stored permanently. All UNC constituent institutions have access to this information.

D. Transcript Notation: Academic Conduct suspensions and expulsions will be permanently marked on the student's transcript.

E. Awarding of Degrees: The University does not award degrees solely because a student successfully completed all academic requirements. Violations of this policy and Student Conduct, including academic and non-academic violations, might result in a degree not being awarded. When a student has a disciplinary complaint pending, the awarding of the degree might be delayed until the complaint is resolved, and, if imposed, the sanctions have been completed.

F. Withdrawal: Students with a pending AIV case will not be permitted to withdraw from the University without first resolving the case or receiving permission from the Director of OSRR to do so.

G. Continual Enrollment: Students with a pending AIV case might be prohibited from future enrollment until the AIV matter is resolved by the University.

#### VIII. Annual Reports

At the end of each academic year, the UCAI shall prepare a report summarizing its work. This annual report shall be submitted early in the fall semester to the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association (SGA), and the Academic Council.

#### IX. Review of the AIV Process

The Faculty Senate will convene the AIV Review Committee every three years. This committee will assess the effectiveness of the AIV process and related policies and recommend any changes in policy or procedure to the Faculty Senate.

---

Originally Approved (entire document): Faculty Senate Resolution #83-26, April 1983  
East Carolina University Chancellor

Amended:

FS Resolution #83-30 thru #83-34, April 1983 Chancellor

FS Resolution #84-42, January 1985 Chancellor

FS Resolution #87-16, October 1987 Chancellor

FS Resolution #11-36, June 2011 Chancellor

---

Resolution #20-19

Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section I., subsection VIII.A. Grades and Grading, as follows:

In October 2019, Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty, charged the Committee with consideration of the use of external grading systems, in response to the appearance of advertisements in faculty email inboxes from a service called “Gradify.” The Committee was asked to consider whether such services should be allowed and to propose revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* based on their deliberations. The Committee decided that the below language, which prohibits the use of paid, non-ECU personnel to grade materials assigned in a course, should be added to the *ECU Faculty Manual*.

(Additions are noted in **bold** text.)

VIII. Grades

A. Grades and Grading

Instructors assign grades on the basis of their evaluation of the academic performance of each student enrolled in their courses. Course grades are based on the quality of the student’s performance as evaluated by the performance criteria stated in the course syllabus. **Instructors shall not use paid, non-ECU personnel to grade materials assigned in a course.**

(FS Resolution #10-08, February 2010)

---

Resolution #20-20

Revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Grading System, Grade Replacement Policy, as follows:

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

**Grade Replacement Policy**

A student is permitted to use the Grade Replacement Policy a maximum of four times for courses in which he or she has earned a grade C-, D+, D, D- or F. For example, a student may replace a grade in four different courses or may replace a single course grade a maximum of four times or a combination thereof not to exceed the limits of the policy. ~~Approval to use the policy will not be given if a student wishes to repeat a course after he or she has successfully completed an advanced course covering the same or similar material (e.g. a course for which the repeated course is a prerequisite.)~~

The grade replacement will be automatically processed for courses worth 3 or more semester hours. The student must request a grade replacement for 1 or 2 semester hour courses by completing a grade replacement form located on the [Office of the Registrar website](#). The grade replacement form must be submitted by the last day of classes of the semester in which the student retakes the course in order for the grade replacement(s) to be reflected in the student’s GPA and Academic Standing for the current semester. Although the original grade will not be used in determining the GPA of the student, the original grade will remain on the student’s permanent academic record and will be included in the calculation for degrees with distinction. The replacement grade, or last grade, stands. Students receiving an F on the replacement grade must repeat the course if credit is required for graduation. In the event that the original grade was a C-, D+, D, D-, no additional credit hours will be awarded. ~~The grade replacement policy does not apply to courses taken prior to fall 1994.~~

**This policy is retroactive for all students completing degree requirements in catalogs which have not yet expired.**

---

Resolution #20-21

Revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, Readmission, as follows:

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

### Following Suspension

Students must apply for readmission to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Eligibility to apply for readmission after suspension does not guarantee acceptance as the university must adhere to enrollment restrictions.

Students readmitted to East Carolina University after suspension are placed on “Probation after Suspension” and expected to achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0. If during the semester a student is on probation and he or she does not achieve a cumulative 2.0 GPA, the student will be suspended unless he or she earns at least a 2.5 GPA in that semester, in which case he or she remains on probation.

A student may remove academic deficiencies only by attending ECU. Quality points do not transfer.

### Readmission Under Forgiveness Policy

Former East Carolina University students who have not been enrolled at ECU for a minimum of two consecutive academic years (four semesters, summer sessions excluded) ~~may request readmission under the~~ **are eligible for** Forgiveness Policy. ~~Such requests must be submitted on the application for readmission according to application deadline dates, or after meeting with their academic advisor upon readmission to the university. Students who have been enrolled at another regionally accredited college or university since their last enrollment at East Carolina University must submit to the Office of Admissions official transcripts indicating that a minimum cumulative 2.5 average has been earned in all transferable courses attempted.~~

**Once Forgiveness is applied**, subsequent East Carolina University-based GPAs ~~of students readmitted under this policy~~ will be computed without inclusion of previous course work in which a failing grade (F) was received.

Students **who** returning **to the University** under the **after** Forgiveness **has been applied** Policy will return under one of the following classifications:

1. Students whose cumulative GPAs are 2.0 or above once the failing grades are removed will be placed on good standing during the first semester of attendance.
2. Students whose cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 once the failing grades are removed will be placed on probation during the first semester of attendance.

Students will be held accountable for the academic standing and academic progress requirements as identified in the Academic Regulations section of this catalog.

~~A student may be readmitted under the Forgiveness Policy only one time.~~ **Forgiveness will only be applied one time. Forgiveness will be initiated upon the first occasion that the student has not been enrolled for two consecutive academic years and the student has course work in which a failing grade (F) was received.**

For degrees with distinction, all ECU grades, including those earned prior to ~~readmission under the Forgiveness~~ **being applied** Policy, will be included in calculations.

Students should be aware that the ~~Readmission under~~ Forgiveness Policy is an ECU policy that is not recognized in the US Department of Education’s calculation of financial aid eligibility. Students who plan to apply to or receive financial aid should contact the financial aid office. Cashier accounts must be cleared of any outstanding balance, if any, prior to registration for the term of readmission.

---

Resolution #20-22  
 2021-2022 University Academic Calendars, as follows:

University Academic Calendar – Summer Sessions 2021

First Summer Session 2021

(Actual Class Days: 5 Mondays, 5 Tuesdays, 5 Wednesdays, 5 Thursdays, 5 Fridays;  
 1 day for final examinations)

March 26, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 29, Monday	Registration for Summer Sessions 2021 begins.
May 14, Friday	Advising, registration and schedule adjustments
May 17, Monday	Classes begin; schedule adjustments.
May 18, Tuesday	Last day for registration and schedule adjustments (drop / add), by 5:00 pm
May 19, Wednesday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm.)
May 31, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
June 8, Tuesday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades, by 5:00 pm; block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
June 15, Tuesday	Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) becomes available.
June 21, Monday	Last day for graduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during First Summer Session 2020
June 21, Monday	Classes end; last day for Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI); last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
June 22, Tuesday	Final Examinations

June 25, Friday	Grades due at 8:00 am
-----------------	-----------------------

Second Summer Session 2021  
 (Actual Class Days: 4 Mondays, 5 Tuesdays, 5 Wednesdays, 6 Thursdays, 5 Fridays;  
 1 day for final examinations)

March 26, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 29, Monday	Registration for Summer Sessions 2021 begins.
June 23, Wednesday	Advising, registration and schedule adjustments
June 24, Thursday	Classes begin; schedule adjustments.
June 25, Friday	Last day for registration and schedule adjustments (drop / add), by 5:00 pm
June 28, Monday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm.)
July 5, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
July 16, Friday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades, by 5:00 pm; block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
July 23, Friday	Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) becomes available.
July 29, Thursday	Last day for graduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during Second Summer Session 2020
July 29, Thursday	Classes end; last day for Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI); last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
July 30, Friday	Final Examinations
August 2, Monday	Grades due at noon

Eleven-week Summer Session 2021  
 (Actual Class Days: 9 Mondays, 10 Tuesdays, 10 Wednesdays, 11 Thursdays, 10 Fridays;  
 1 day for final examinations)

March 26, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 29, Monday	Registration for Summer Sessions 2021 begins.
May 14, Friday	Advising, registration and schedule adjustments
May 17, Monday	Classes begin; schedule adjustments.
May 18, Tuesday	Last day for registration and schedule adjustments (drop / add), by 5:00 pm
May 19, Wednesday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm.)
May 31, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)

June 22 – 23, Tuesday – Wednesday	Mid-Summer Break
June 30, Wednesday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades, by 5:00 pm; block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
July 5, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
July 23, Friday	Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) becomes available.
July 29, Thursday	Last day for graduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during the Eleven-week Summer Session 2020
July 29, Thursday	Classes end; last day for Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI); last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
July 30, Friday	Final Examinations
August 2, Monday	Grades due at noon

University Academic Calendar – Fall Semester 2021

(Actual Class Days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays)

March 26, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 29, Monday	Registration for Fall Semester 2021 begins.
August 20, Friday	Faculty Convocation at 9:00am; Faculty Meetings
August 20, Friday	Advising, registration and schedule adjustments
August 23, Monday	Classes begin; schedule adjustments.
August 27, Friday	Last day for registration and schedule adjustments (drop / add), by 5:00 pm
September 3, Friday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm.)
September 6, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
October 9 – 12, Saturday – Tuesday	Fall Break
October 13, Wednesday	8:00 am – Classes resume.
October 25 – 29, Monday – Friday	Advising for Spring Semester 2021
November 1, Monday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades, by 5:00 pm; block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
November 2, Tuesday	Election Day / Civic Engagement Day
November 5, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.



November 8, Monday	Registration for Spring Semester 2022 begins.
November 23, Tuesday	Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) becomes available.
November 23, Tuesday	Last day for undergraduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during Spring or Summer Sessions 2021
November 24 – 28, Wednesday – Sunday	Thanksgiving Break
November 29, Monday	8:00 am – Classes resume.
December 6, Monday	Last day for graduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during Fall Semester 2020
December 6, Monday	Classes end; last day for Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI); last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
December 7, Tuesday	Reading Day
December 8, Wednesday	Final Examinations begin.
December 15, Wednesday	Exams for Fall Semester end.
December 17, Friday	Commencement
December 17, Friday	Grades due at 4:30 pm

Final Examinations Schedule – Fall Semester 2021

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one credit hour classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes. Clinical and non-traditional class schedules, including graduate level courses, may also adopt a modified examination schedule as required. A final course meeting during the exam period is required in order to satisfy the 750 contact minutes per credit hour required by the University of North Carolina Office of the President. Department Chairs are responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.

Classes beginning 6:00 pm or later are considered night classes. Examinations in classes meeting one night a week will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 8 – 15). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning before 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 8 – 15). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning at or after 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the second night of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 8 – 15).

Distance education classes should give their final examinations in a timely fashion to allow submitting grades in time. Classes beginning on the half hour or meeting longer than one hour will have their final examination at the time determined by the hour during which the classes begin (e.g., 9:30-11:00 am TTh classes will follow the examination schedule of the 9:00 am TTh classes; 8:00-10:00 am MWF classes will follow the examination schedule of the 8:00 am MWF classes).

Common examinations, including DE sections, will be held according to the following schedule:

FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 – 7:30 Monday, December 13
---	---------------------------------

FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 2003, GERM 1002	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, December 8
MATH 0045, 1064	5:00 – 7:30 Friday, December 10

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Friday, December 10
8:00 TTh	8:00 – 10:30 Monday, December 13
9:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Thursday, December 9
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 – 10:30 Tuesday, December 14
10:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Wednesday, December 8
10:00 TTh	8:00 – 10:30 Wednesday, December 15
11:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Friday, December 10
11:00 TTh	11:00 – 1:30 Monday, December 13
12:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Thursday, December 9
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 – 1:30 Tuesday, December 14
1:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Wednesday, December 8
1:00 TTh	11:00 – 1:30 Wednesday, December 15
2:00 MWF	2:00 – 4:30 Friday, December 10
2:00 TTh	2:00 – 4:30 Monday, December 13
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 – 4:30 Thursday, December 9
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 – 4:30 Tuesday, December 14
4:00 MWF	2:00 – 4:30 Wednesday, December 8
4:00 TTh	2:00 – 4:30 Wednesday, December 15
5:00 MWF (5:30)	5:00 – 7:30 Thursday, December 9
5:00 TTh (5:30)	5:00 – 7:30 Tuesday, December 14

University Academic Calendar – Spring Semester 2022

(Actual Class Days: 14 Mondays, 15 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 13 Fridays;  
 Effective Class Days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays)

November 5, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
November 8, Monday	Registration for Spring Semester 2022 begins.
January 7, Friday	Advising, registration and schedule adjustments
January 10, Monday	Classes begin; schedule adjustments.
January 14, Friday	Last day for registration and schedule adjustments (drop / add) by 5:00 pm

January 17, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
January 24, Monday	Census Day (Official enrollment count taken at 5:00 pm.)
March 6 – 13, Sunday – Sunday	Spring Break
March 14, Monday	8:00 am – Classes resume.
March 14 – 18, Monday – Friday	Advising for Summer Sessions and Fall Semester 2022
March 24, Thursday	Last day for undergraduate and graduate students to withdraw from term-length courses or withdraw from school without grades, by 5:00 pm; block courses may be dropped only during the first 60% of their regularly scheduled class meetings.
March 25, Friday	Early registration for special populations begins at 1:00 pm.
March 28, Monday	Registration for Summer Sessions and Fall Semester 2022 begins.
April 13, Wednesday	Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI) becomes available.
April 14, Thursday	Last day for undergraduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during Fall 2021
April 15 – 16, Friday – Saturday	State Holiday (no classes)
April 26, Tuesday	Last day for graduate students to submit work for removal of incompletes given during Spring Semester 2021
April 26, Tuesday	State holiday makeup day; classes which would have met on Friday, April 15 will meet on this day so there will be effectively the same number of Fridays and Tuesdays as every other weekday during the semester. Tuesday classes will not meet.
April 26, Tuesday	Classes end; last day for Survey of Student Opinion of Instruction (SSOI); last day for submission of grade replacement requests.
April 27, Wednesday	Reading Day
April 28, Thursday	Final Examinations begin.
May 5, Thursday	Exams for Spring Semester end.
May 6, Friday	Commencement
May 9, Monday	Grades due at 8:00 am

### Final Examinations Schedule – Spring Semester 2022

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one credit hour classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes. Clinical and non-traditional class schedules, including graduate level courses, may also adopt a modified examination schedule as required. A final course meeting during the exam period is required in order

to satisfy the 750 contact minutes per credit hour required by the University of North Carolina Office of the President. Department Chairs are responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.

Classes beginning 6:00 pm or later are considered night classes. Examinations in classes meeting one night a week will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 28 – May 5). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning before 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the first night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 28 – May 5). Examinations in classes meeting two or more nights a week and beginning at or after 8:00 pm will be held at 7:30-10:00 pm on the second night of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 28 – May 5).

Distance education classes should give their final examinations in a timely fashion to allow submitting grades in time. Classes beginning on the half hour or meeting longer than one hour will have their final examination at the time determined by the hour during which the classes begin (e.g., 9:30-11:00 am TTh classes will follow the examination schedule of the 9:00 am TTh classes; 8:00-10:00 am MWF classes will follow the examination schedule of the 8:00 am MWF classes).

Common examinations, including DE sections, will be held according to the following schedule:

FREN 1001, 2003, SPAN 1001, 2004, GERM 1001	5:00 – 7:30 Friday, April 29
FREN 1002, SPAN 1002, 2003, GERM 1002	5:00 – 7:30 Monday, May 2
MATH 0045, 1064	5:00 – 7:30 Wednesday, May 4

Times class regularly meets	Time and day of examination
8:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Tuesday, May 3
8:00 TTh	8:00 – 10:30 Wednesday, May 4
9:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Friday, April 29
9:00 TTh (9:30)	8:00 – 10:30 Thursday, April 28
10:00 MWF	8:00 – 10:30 Monday, May 2
10:00 TTh	8:00 – 10:30 Thursday, May 5
11:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Tuesday, May 3
11:00 TTh	11:00 – 1:30 Wednesday, May 4
12:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Friday, April 29
12:00 TTh (12:30)	11:00 – 1:30 Thursday, April 28
1:00 MWF	11:00 – 1:30 Monday, May 2
1:00 TTh	11:00 – 1:30 Thursday, May 5
2:00 MWF	2:00 – 4:30 Tuesday, May 3
2:00 TTh	2:00 – 4:30 Wednesday, May 4
3:00 MWF (3:30)	2:00 – 4:30 Friday, April 29
3:00 TTh (3:30)	2:00 – 4:30 Thursday, April 28
4:00 MWF	2:00 – 4:30 Monday, May 2

4:00 TTh	2:00 – 4:30 Thursday, May 5
5:00 MWF (5:30)	5:00 – 7:30 Tuesday, May 3
5:00 TTh (5:30)	5:00 – 7:30 Thursday, April 28

Resolution #20-23  
 2024-2025 Abridged University Academic Calendar, as follows:

University Academic Calendar – Academic Year 2024-25

Summer Sessions 2024

First Summer Session		Second Summer Session	
May 13, Monday	Classes begin.	June 20, Thursday	Classes begin.
May 27, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)	July 4, Thursday	State Holiday (no classes)
June 17, Monday	Classes end.	July 25, Thursday	Classes end.
June 18, Tuesday	Final Examinations	July 26, Friday	Final Examinations
Eleven-week Summer Session			
May 13, Monday		Classes begin.	
May 27, Monday		State Holiday (no classes)	
June 18 – 19, Tuesday – Wednesday		Mid-Summer Break	
July 4, Thursday		State Holiday (no classes)	
July 25, Thursday		Classes end.	
July 26, Friday		Final Examinations	

Fall Semester 2024

August 19, Monday	Classes begin.
September 2, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
October 5 – 8, Saturday – Tuesday	Fall Break
November 27 – December 1, Wednesday – Sunday	Thanksgiving Break
December 3, Tuesday	Classes end.
December 13, Friday	Commencement

Spring Semester 2025

January 13, Monday	Classes begin.
January 20, Monday	State Holiday (no classes)
March 9 – 16, Sunday – Sunday	Spring Break
April 18 – 19, Friday – Saturday	State Holiday (no classes)
April 29, Tuesday	Classes end.
May 9, Friday	Commencement

---

Resolution #20-24

Formal faculty advice on the Making Up Missed Instructional Time Due to Suspension of Instruction Interim Policy, as follows:

Following the Committee's review, there are no revisions being suggested.

Related Policies:

- [REG 02.07.01 Definition of a Semester Credit Hour](#)

Additional References:

- [ECU Credit to Contact Hour Guidelines](#)
- [UNC Policy Manual 400.1.6 – The University of North Carolina Academic Calendar](#)
- [REG 06.45.02– Adverse Weather and Emergency Event Regulation](#)
- [34 CFR 668.8: Federal Definition of a Credit Hour](#)
- [ECU Academic Calendars](#)
- [Faculty Senate Resolution #14-59 – Policy for Making Up Missed Class Days](#)
- [Contingency Plan and Continuity of Instruction: During a Catastrophic Event](#)
- [SACSCOC Emergency Temporary Relocation of Instruction Policy](#)

Contact for Info: Director of Academic Planning & Accreditation: (252) 737-3614

---

1. Purpose and Applicability

ECU adheres to [REG02.07.01](#), the associated [ECU Credit to Contact Hour Guidelines](#), & UNC policy manual 400.1.6 which mandates the minimum amount of instructional time per credit hour. The purpose of this amendment is to establish guidelines and procedures for making up missed instructional time due to the closure of the University because of inclement weather and emergencies. ECU policy on campus closures due to adverse weather and emergency events are outlined in [REG06.45.02 – Adverse Weather and Emergency Event Regulation](#).

2. Definition of a Semester Credit Hour

ECU [REG02.07.01](#) outlines the institutional definition of a credit hour, which adheres to the federal definition of a credit hour, UNC Policy 400.1.6 outlined below, and the Carnegie unit for contact time. This regulation applies to all courses at all levels that award academic credit regardless of mode of delivery or site of instruction, including but not limited to self-paced, online, blended/hybrid, lecture, seminar, studio, laboratory, independent studies, internship, practicum, service learning, and other experiential learning activities. Academic units are responsible for ensuring that credit hours are awarded only for work that meets the requirements outlined in this regulation.

For purposes of the application of this regulation at ECU and in accord with federal regulations, a credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

2.1 One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time, or

2.2 At least an equivalent amount of work as required outlined in item 2.1 above for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. (34 CFR 668.8, July 1, 2011)

Credit hours are determined based on the amount of instructional time devoted to coursework and are developed and reviewed in consultation with the [ECU Credit to Contact hour Guidelines](#); a companion document to [REG02.07.01](#).

### 3. UNC Policy Manual 400.1.6

UNC policy manual 400.1.6 (adopted 07/12/96; amended 07/01/07) requires that all UNC system campuses must ensure that every course offered for academic credit adheres to the standard of a minimum of 750 scheduled minutes of instructional time or the equivalent per credit hour. The time may include required examination periods but may not include study days.

### 4. Guidelines for Making Up Classes After a Closure or Multiple Closures of the University

The University's goal is to plan for unanticipated interruptions to the delivery of education and services. The following procedure is intended to guide faculty, departments, and colleges when schedule interruptions occur.

#### 4.1 Definitions

For the purpose of this document:

- **One Contact Hour** – equals 50 instructional minutes.
- **Academic calendar** – The official list of dates and deadlines found at the beginning of the undergraduate and graduate catalogs and on the [Faculty Senate website](#). The academic

calendar specifies the dates for semesters and terms, enrollment periods, examination periods, holidays, periods classes are not in session, and commencement.

#### 4.2 Closures of 14 days or less

When a closure of up to 14 days at any time or multiple closures totaling up to 14 days of due to inclement weather or other emergencies occurs, individual faculty will determine how the subject matter will be covered and how the students will satisfy the requirements of the course, as stated in [Faculty Senate Resolution #14-59](#). Suggestions for alternative assignments and activities that can be used to make up instructional time for class periods are detailed in the University's [Contingency Plan and Continuity of Instruction: During a Catastrophic Event](#). Faculty will submit documentation of how missed instructional time is recovered to IPAR for archiving. Documentation is necessary for Department of Education financial auditing and SACSCOC regional accreditation purposes. For a partial closure during the week of final exams of any semester, the exam period will be extended by the appropriate number of days.

#### 4.3 Closures of longer than 14 days

A closure of more than 14 days at any time or multiple closures totaling more than 14 days of requires a more structured approach to recovering lost instructional time. To maintain course continuity, make up instructional time for missed class periods, make progress in course content, and meet the state and federal credit hour requirements, executive leadership in consultation with faculty senate leadership may elect to use one or more of the following strategies to amend the academic calendar:

1. Hold classes on fall break, spring break, reading day(s), or other academic breaks
2. Classes may be held on weekends
3. Extension of the semester for the amount of time missed
  - a. For fall semester
    - i. final exams may extend into or be held after winter break
    - ii. spring semester may begin late to accommodate the shift in fall schedule
    - iii. commencement dates may be adjusted as needed
  - b. For spring semester
    - i. the summer school schedule may be altered to extend spring final exams
    - ii. the first half of summer session may be cancelled, summer school to resume with the late summer session
    - iii. commencement dates may be adjusted as needed
  - c. For summer session
    - i. Courses taken the first half of summer may be extended into the second half of summer and second summer session may be cancelled
    - ii. If the closure occurs during course taken during the second half of summer session, the session may be extended or cancelled
    - iii. For 12-week sessions, the session may be extended
4. Closure during Exam Week: for a partial closure during the week of final exams of any semester, the exam period will be extended by the appropriate number of days.



5. Emergency Temporary Relocation: In the event of natural disasters, fires, or other extraordinary circumstances that may impact the University's ability to provide services on-campus for an extended period of time, ECU will follow the guidelines detailed in the University's [Contingency Plan and Continuity of Instruction: During a Catastrophic Event](#) and SACSCOC Emergency Temporary Relocation of Instruction Policy.

#### 4.4 Distance Education Instruction

Unless an exception is indicated by the Office of Academic Affairs, all technology-delivered courses will follow the University's above procedures on holding classes. Under adverse circumstances, the assumption should be made that students do not have access to necessary materials or technology. In the event that inclement weather prohibits students from participating in technology-delivered instruction, class activities, or testing, students will be permitted to make up missed class requirements.