

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty and Unit Code Administrators

FROM: Richard D. Ringeisen
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

DATE: April 14, 2000

SUBJECT: Spring Commencement

Spring Commencement is scheduled for **Saturday, May 13, 2000.** In recent University ceremonies, it has been wonderful to see the large number of faculty taking part in the activities. It is our hope that faculty will again be encouraged to attend the Spring Commencement ceremonies at 9:30 a.m.

Toward this effort, I am sponsoring the following for all faculty members attending Spring Commencement:

- special parking passes
- social room in 118 Scales Field House (*note change of location) set aside for faculty members to robe and meet with colleagues prior to the ceremony, and
- light food and beverages in the social room prior to the ceremony.

To aid the Vice Chancellor's staff in organizing these amenities, each faculty member is asked to notify the unit administrator of the intention to attend Spring Commencement. Unit administrators are then asked to notify Faye Jackson in the Division of Academic Affairs at ext. 328-6242 or (jacksona@mail.ecu.edu) no later than Wednesday, May 3, 2000 with the number of faculty from their unit planning to attend. This will allow sufficient time to mail parking passes and notify the caterer.

Thank you.

afj

C: Chancellor, Richard Eakin
Chair of the Faculty, Brenda Killingsworth
Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, James Hallock
Commencement Coordinator, C. C. Rowe

In the event of unfavorable weather, there will be two ceremonies, at 9:30 a.m. and noon, and the social room will be in room 100 Minges Coliseum. More info: www.news.ecu.edu/announcements.htm/

PLEASE POST FOR ALL FACULTY TO READ!

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
1999-2000 FACULTY SENATE

The eighth regular meeting of the 1999/2000 Faculty Senate will be held on **Tuesday, 18 April 2000**, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

21 March 2000

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

B. Announcements

C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor

D. Vice Chancellor's Report

E. Ernie Schwarz, Chair of University Athletic Committee
Report on the Academic Integrity Subcommittee

F. Bob Morrison, Faculty Assembly Delegate
UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting of 7 April 2000.

G. Brenda Killingsworth, East Carolina University's SACS Self Study Director

IV. Unfinished Business

V. Report of Committees

A. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, George Bailey
Approval of a request to establish a new professional school within the Division of Academic Affairs (attachment 1).
(A copy of the two vestigial codes may be reviewed in the Faculty Senate Office or via the Faculty Senate website at: www.ecu.edu/fsonline/vestigial.txt)

B. Faculty Governance Committee, Henry Ferrell
1. Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, By-Laws (attachment 2).
2. Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L. (attachment 3).
3. Interpretation of *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D. Section IV. (attachment 4).

C. Faculty Information Technology Committee, Wayne Godwin
Technological issues including the termination of EastNet (attachment 5).

over

- D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Michael Felts
Recommendation related to Hurricane Floyd (attachment 6).
- E. Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee, Randy Parker
Proposed Revisions to the Guidelines for Research Grants To Be Awarded in
2001-2002 (attachment 7).
- F. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Rose Allen
 - 1. Proposed Policy Statement Regarding Commercial Exploitation of Classroom
Materials (attachment 8).
 - 2. Report on the Undergraduate Distance Education-Student Opinion of Instruction
Survey (attachment 9).
- G. Unit Code Screening Committee, Ralph Scott
Revisions to the following Unit Codes of Operation:
 - 1. Department of Biology
 - 2. Department of Theatre and Dance(Copies are available for review in the Faculty Senate office.)

VI. New Business

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT
Request to establish a new professional school within the Division of Academic Affairs

Original proposal initiated, Fall, 1999-2000 and submitted to communication faculty, February, 2000:
Prepared by Gary R. Lowe, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs following consultation with Dr. Michael Poteat, Acting Chair, Department of Communication; the faculties of the Department of Communication and Broadcasting in the Department of Broadcasting, Librarianship, and Educational Technology.

Introduction/Proposal

A new professional school is proposed combining the computer science faculty currently in the Department of Mathematics with a reconstituted Department of Communication to be formed from the two current communication programs housed in the School of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences.

Proposed name(s) for the new school:

The School of Computer Science and Communication Or The School of Information Technology and Communication.

The new school will exist in the Division of Academic Affairs and consist of two departments:
Computer Science and Communication and Broadcasting.

The two communication programs and faculties will be separated from their current units, the College of Arts and Sciences and School of Education and incorporated in a new School effective August 14, 2000. The vestigial codes for the new departments will go into effect on August 14, 2000 pending the approval by the respective faculty and university committees. The current Codes for each unit will be dissolved effective August 13, 2000.

All tenured faculty in the units affected will continue to hold the same rank and tenure status held prior to the formation of the new school. Probationary and fixed term faculty will continue to hold the same appointments under identical terms as they held in their former units.

On or before July 1, 2000, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will appoint an Interim Dean for the new school. The Interim Dean (with the approval of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs) will appoint Interim Chairs for the Department of Computer Science and the Department of Communication and Broadcasting. The Interim Chairs will assume their administrative duties on or before August 14, 2000. The school will initiate a search for a Dean during the 2000-2001 academic year.

Except for course prefixes, no curriculum changes will be made for the 2000-2001 academic year. The Department of Computer Science will be charged with reviewing their academic curriculum during the 2000-2001 academic year and initiating recommended changes as soon as feasible. The Department of Communication and Broadcasting will be charged with reviewing the unit's curriculum during the 2000-2001 academic year. This process of revising the respective curriculums may include proposals for new degrees and/or academic concentrations.

The Department of Communication and Broadcasting will identify current courses that can be combined, cross-listed, or eliminated. Each academic concentration will be evaluated with the expectation that a revised curriculum will be developed with a target of implementation by the 2002-2001 academic year. The new curriculum may include proposals for new degrees and/or academic concentrations.

The Interim Dean, together with the Interim Chairs will appoint an ad hoc committee to develop a constitution for the School. The constitution will include, but not be limited to, a mission statement, criteria for promotion and tenure, and a procedure for strategic planning.

This proposed plan will follow Appendix L (Section D) of the ECU Faculty Manual. The relevant procedures are summarized below and placed within a current time frame.

Overview of Procedures required to Establish a New School/Code Unit-Appendix L of the ECU Faculty Manual

The procedures for proposed code unit changes contained in the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L stipulated certain steps to be undertaken and these steps are reviewed below. In addition, proposed action dates are provided for the required actions.

Appendix L indicates that, "Changes will not occur until the faculty members in the units affected and the Faculty Senate have the opportunity to recommend to the Chancellor approval or disapproval of the proposed changes as originally presented or as amended by the affected units of the Faculty Senate" (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L-4, D.1).

Attachment 1.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

Proposed changes in code units may be initiated by:

- "a. at least one-fourth of a code unit's faculty members or
- b. by administrators holding faculty status.

Proposals must include at least a vestigial code of operations reflecting the changes and detailed plans for any faculty who might be displaced by the change" (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L-4, D.2.a.b.).

On February 21, 2000, the computer science faculty voted to accept a "vestigial" code creating a new Department of Computer Science.

By Monday February 28, 2000, a draft of a vestigial code will be provided to the two current communication faculties for their review. As called for in Appendix L, within 15 working days from the 28th, that is, no later than Monday, March 20th, a meeting of the two communication faculties and the computer science faculty will be convened to discuss the proposed code unit changes and the new school.

The affected faculties will have ten working days following the meeting on the 20th to review the proposed new school and related aspects. That is, no later than Friday, March 31, 2000 they "will meet and vote their approval or disapproval of the proposal in its original form or as amended and then will communicate in writing the results of their action to their unit administrator [Department Chair Poteat and Kester] (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L, p. L-5, D.3.c.).

No later than April 14, 2000, the respective unit administrators "will forward to the next higher administrator [Deans Sparrow and Sheerer] the results of the unit's action and his or her concurrence or non-concurrence with the unit's action" (Appendix L, p.1-5, D.3.d).

No later than April 28, 2000, "...the next higher administrator will communicate in writing to the initiator(s) and to the appropriate vice-chancellor(s) the following: the unit faculty's action, the unit administrator's concurrence or non-concurrence with that action, and his or her concurrence or non-concurrence with that action" (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L, p. 1-5, D .3 .e).

Following the above actions, "The initiator(s) shall present copies of the proposal, the affected units' faculty recommendations, and the relevant administrators' concurrence or non-concurrence to the chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee. The committee shall consult with appropriate deans and vice-chancellors, and, if it deems necessary, with other faculty members and administrators. Within 40 working days (during the regular academic year), the committee will report its recommendations to the Faculty Senate" (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L, p. L-5, D.3.f.).

ACTION STEPS TO BE TAKEN

The following section contains dates that reflect the maximum allowable time for action to be taken according to the ECU Faculty Manual and as they would apply to this proposal. However, hopefully this timetable can be shortened in order to expedite subsequent review and action.

Vestigial code for the new Department of Communication and Broadcasting. A draft of a code is proposed as the requisite initial vestigial code to meet the minimum requirements called for in Appendix L and as a means to initiate the action process of forming the proposed new department. Basic proposal and draft of vestigial code to be submitted to the faculties no later than Monday, February 28, 2000.

Communication and Broadcasting faculty meet to review the proposed changes followed by vote to change/alter current code status. The meeting to vote on the changes can take place at any time after distribution of the proposal, but such a meeting must take place no later than March 31, 2000 and for Communication reported to Dr. Michael Poteat, Acting Department Chair of Communication in the College of Arts and Sciences; for Broadcasting, to Dr. Diane Kester, Department Chair of BLET in the School of Education.

Action submitted to the next highest administrator [Dean]. No later than April 14, 2000, the Department Chairs will report to Dean Sparrow and Sheerer their concurrence or non-concurrence.

Unit Administrator's Concurrence or Non-Concurrence with actions taken by the respective faculties and department chairs. No later than April 28, 2000 the respective Deans will report in writing to the initiators and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs his/her concurrence or non-concurrence with the preceding actions/recommendations.

Sum of Above Actions Reported and submitted to the Chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC). Subsequent steps to be taken as delineated in the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A and By-Laws

Editorial revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A as follows:

Appendix A. Title page:

- V. ~~Graduate Council Representatives~~
Administrative Board of the Graduate School

Proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, By-Laws, Section V. as follows:

- "V. ~~Graduate Council Representatives~~
Administrative Board of the Graduate School

~~The Chair of the Faculty or his/her designee shall serve as an ex-officio member without vote of the Graduate Council Administrative Board of the Graduate School. if a member of the Graduate Faculty; if not, the Vice Chair of the Faculty, if a member of the Graduate Faculty; if not, the Secretary of the Faculty, if a member of the Graduate Faculty; if not, a duly-elected member of the Faculty Senate who is a member of the Graduate Faculty, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty for a term of one year."~~

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L.

Revise the first paragraph to read as follows:

Section A. Voting Faculty Member

"As pertains to faculty voting for the unit's nominating committee for appointment of administrative officials, for making recommendations on code content to the permanently tenured unit faculty members, in quadrennial evaluations of the effectiveness of unit programs, and in quadrennial evaluations of the effectiveness of unit administrators, a voting faculty member is someone who is appointed to a full-time faculty position; **who is a permanently tenured or probationary term faculty person; who has been employed in any faculty position for at least 12 consecutive months at East Carolina University;** who has regular academic faculty rank (*ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, *Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures of ECU*); ~~and who is in at least the twelfth consecutive calendar month of appointment (counting all intervening summer months, if any) to the faculty of the unit in which the voting is to occur~~ and who must, except as noted below for faculty on leaves of absence, be carrying at East Carolina University, at the time of the voting, not less than half the normal teaching/research program as practiced in the unit of appointment."

Revise the section to read as follows:

Section D.3.c.

"Within ten working days after this meeting, the **permanently tenured** faculty members of each affected unit will meet and vote their approval or disapproval of the proposal in its original form or as amended and then will communicate in writing the results of their action to their unit administrator."

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Interpretation of *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D., Section IV.

The following interpretation was approved by the Faculty Governance Committee on March 29, 2000. Following action by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor, this interpretation, if approved, will be noted on the *ECU Faculty Manual* website (<http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/contents.htm>).

This interpretation applies to the second paragraph in this section that reads:

"For the purposes of Section IV. a voting faculty member of a unit is someone who:"

Faculty in academic departments may not evaluate related faculty.

Related faculty within the same academic department (or other comparable institutional subdivision of employment) shall not participate, either individually or as a member of a committee, in the evaluation of related persons for appointment, reappointment, promotion, the conferral of permanent tenure, cumulative review, salary recommendations, or any other personnel action. A faculty member made ineligible for participation in the evaluation of a related person does not count for quorum purposes and his/her ineligibility does not constitute a recommendation against the proposed personnel action.

FACULTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT
Technological issues including the termination of EastNet

Termination of EastNet

EastNet will not operate as an ISP as of June 30, 2000. It will continue to provide a web-based portal into ECU through the Center for Science, Math and Technology Education, under the direction of Dr. Helen Parke. CIS has made the decision several years ago to get out of the ISP business. It has been determined that ECU can not provide ISP service due to the large expense.

Remarks from Jeff Huskamp, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration - Information Technology
CIS made the decision several years ago to get out of the ISP business. The reasons are:

1. Cost of maintaining servers and modems at the current state-of-the-art
2. Personnel support costs are large
3. Telephone lines are a scarce commodity and it is expensive to add more capacity to our local telephone switch.
4. The limited CIS budget can be more effectively employed toward more strategic initiatives for the university.

The only way for a dial-in operation to be successful is to have a very large paying user base. A ECU dial-in service can not achieve the economies of scale necessary for a break-even operation.

Copy of letter sent to EastNet Users on December 1, 1999

This letter is to inform you of the current status of EastNet. EastNet began in 1995 as an ISP to connect public schools in eastern North Carolina with East Carolina University because such connectivity was not available. Since that time the user base has grown to over 6,000 mail accounts. The effort was funded through ENNCARE, an organization funded by the North Carolina General Assembly, and by contributions from school systems. Since the origin of EastNet, a variety of events have occurred which has resulted in EastNet becoming a content site rather than an ISP.

- The General Assembly is no longer funding ENNCARE.
- The IRCC has for two years determined that EastNet should not be supported as an ISP.
- Today in eastern North Carolina there are over 20 ISP's able to operate in a much more efficient manner and at a much lower cost than EastNet would require.

For these reasons, EastNet will not operate as an ISP as of June 30, 2000. Therefore, this notice serves as a notice that EastNet mail account holders should make personal arrangements to secure the services of an ISP prior to June 30, 2000. Those areas served by EastNet Jr. Sites (Craven, Beaufort, Wilson) will be meeting with Dr. Parke to discuss mail accounts; however, East Carolina University will continue to allow the Jr. sites to have access to the Internet.

Full Faculty Senate Agenda
18 April 2000
Attachment 6.

**FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT
Recommendation Related to Hurricane Floyd**

Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee, after receiving the support of the Faculty Governance Committee, kindly requests that the Chancellor endorse the concept that faculty members affected by Hurricane Floyd be given due consideration with respect to performance evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

Full Faculty Senate Agenda
18 April 2000
Attachment 7.

**RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY GRANTS COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the Guidelines for Research Grants To Be Awarded in 2001-2002.**

Increase in cap:

Stipends for Research/Creative Activity are available at the rate of 15.2% of the applicant's salary, up to a cap of \$8,000.

New request from applicants:

List of prior grants received from committee.

List all previous research/creative activity grants received from this committee and describe the publications, presentations, performances, external funding proposals, or related activities, including citations or publications directly resulting from each grant. Applicants should provide the committee with some indication of the ranking/prestige of specific journals, shows, or performances in which these grant funded work was published, performed, or displayed.

Reference letters now optional:

Two reference letters are optional, either from East Carolina University faculty and/or external reviewers. Please also feel free to include supporting documentation such as contracts from publishers, letters of invitation, award notices, duplicates in whole or in part of articles, graphic materials - photos, drawings, diagrams, and maps that might help the committee evaluate your proposal. (Please provide English translations of foreign documents.)

Full Faculty Senate Agenda
18 April 2000
Attachment 8.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

**Proposed Policy Statement
Regarding Commercial Exploitation of Classroom Materials**

This policy statement has been prepared by a Joint Subcommittee consisting of members from the Intellectual Property Committee's Copyright Subcommittee, Academic Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the Division of Student Life.

It is a violation of University policy to sell or make commercial use of faculty lectures, notes taken from faculty lectures, syllabi and all other course materials without the express written permission of the instructor. These materials may represent intellectual property of the faculty, which may be protected by federal copyright law.

Disciplinary action for commercial exploitation of classroom materials may be taken pursuant to applicable University policies.

In addition to this policy statement being proposed, a revised copy of the University's Operational Procedures for Implementation of Part VII. Section II. Patent and Copyright Procedures of ECU will be available for faculty via the Faculty Senate website www.ecu.edu/fsonline/part7b.htm or by contacting Marti Van Scott at 816-2546.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT
Undergraduate Distance Education-Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Charge:

Upon recommendations from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (April 27, 1999; Informal Report to Faculty Senate), the Chair of the Faculty asked the Teaching Effectiveness Committee to address the following issue:

"The Faculty Senate should develop an evaluation form for use by students enrolled in on-line courses. Results of this form will be used in instructor's annual evaluations....."

In the Fall of 1999, the Chair of the Faculty directed the Committee to develop such a survey.

Recommendations:

The Teaching Effectiveness Committee is making the following recommendations:

- (1) The survey for graduate level Distance Education (DE) courses be adopted for use with undergraduate DE courses.
- (2) Based upon the following report on the Development and Testing of the Distance Education SOIS Instrument, the Distance Education Survey results should be treated in a comparable manner as the SOIS results.
- (3) In making personnel decisions, unit administrators should be aware of differences in the patterns of results between on-campus and distance education courses, and graduate and undergraduate courses.

**Teaching Effectiveness Committee's Report on the
Development and Testing of the Distance Education SOIS Instrument
For Information Only**

Over three years ago, work began on the development of a SOIS-type instrument that could be administered in courses utilizing a significant distance education component, especially the internet and other information technology based methods of instruction. A number of factors converged to make the development of such an instrument a priority. In order to ensure the quality of the graduate courses being offered via the internet, the Graduate School developed a set of quality assurance standards. At about the same time, the General Administration began to raise questions about the comparability of student responses to distance education and on-campus courses. Questions were also raised about the SACS criteria for assessment and the provision of comparable services to our distance education. The Faculty Senate also became concerned about ensuring the quality of the undergraduate courses being offered via the internet and adopted a set of quality assurance standards that are very comparable to those adopted by the Graduate Council.

Planning and Institutional Research convened a small group of faculty and administrators from the programs heavily involved in the offering of graduate level distance education courses. This included Max Poole, Diane Kester, David Hillis, Karen Krupa, John Swope, Dave Cartwright, and Bob Thompson. The purpose of the group was to see if questions relating to the quality assurance standards could be merged with questions on the current SOIS instrument. This would accomplish three primary goals. First, this would prevent students in these classes from having to complete two separate surveys. Second, it would enable the faculty member and the faculty member's department chair/dean, who is charged with ensuring the implementation of the quality assurance standards, to receive the results of both efforts. It is important to note that the SOIS instrument is the only approved university teaching evaluation instrument. Unless the quality assurance dimension was merged with the SOIS instrument, the results of a quality assurance survey could only go to the faculty member and could not be included in the annual evaluation of the faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness or subsequent personnel actions. Thirdly, PIR could combine the results of both instruments into a single report for distance education courses that would be comparable to those already received for on-campus courses.

The group was able to draft an instrument that incorporated both the quality assurance questions and the SOIS questions. The order of the SOIS questions was shifted a bit as was the language and grammar. This latter change was done in a manner that retained the same focus, but made the instrument more applicable to distance education. It was decided that the instrument would be applicable for graduate courses utilizing distance education (primarily the internet) for 25 % or more of their instructional activities. The faculty member and department or program offering the course would make the determination of whether a course meets that threshold. PIR agreed to produce two reports for each course - a standard

Attachment 9.

Teaching Effectiveness Committee's Report (continued)

SOIS report that summarized all of the SOIS questions, and a Quality Assurance Report that summarized all of the other questions on the instrument. Only the faculty member and their academic unit head would receive the SOIS report. Only the faculty member and the Graduate School Associate Dean Max Poole would receive the results of the Quality Assurance Report. The Graduate Council accepted the instrument and guidelines for a pilot test of the instrument during the 1998-99 academic year. The Faculty Senate's Teaching Effectiveness Committee and the Chair of the Faculty were informed of the pilot.

The instrument and results of the graduate distance education pilot were assessed after its administration. The faculty members and the students viewed the instrument itself positively. The method of delivery of the survey was questioned and was subsequently changed. The changes have addressed the primary concerns. The Graduate Council endorsed the use of the instrument.

While this test was progressing, similar pressures to develop quality assurance standards and an SOIS instrument for undergraduate education were manifesting themselves. The Faculty Senate responded by adopting quality assurance standards like those adopted by the Graduate Council. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee was charged with developing an instrument. It examined the instrument developed for graduate courses and decided it could be used for undergraduate courses as well. A decision was made to pilot the instrument during the Fall 1999 semester. Using the same 25 % threshold, faculty members teaching undergraduate distance education courses were asked if they would participate in the pilot. Mr. David Cartwright's report to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee along with examples of the report provided faculty members and the results are attached.

In general, the instrument works well. It provides faculty members and students with an opportunity to evaluate distance education instructional methods and it does it in a manner that permits faculty members to compare the results with their traditional on-campus courses. It also accomplishes this in an efficient manner. One instrument can be used for both undergraduate and graduate level distance education courses and student enrolled in these courses are asked to respond to only one university administered instrument. The instrument also meets the SACS guidelines for comparable treatment of on-campus and distance education courses.

The Office of Planning and Institutional Research concurs with the recommendation of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee concerning the adoption of this instrument for use for courses with a distance education component that comprises 25% or more of the total contact hours.