4

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE FULL MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2002

The seventh regular meeting of the 2001-2002 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, March 19, 2002, in the Mendenhall Student Center, room 244.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Bob Morrison (Chemistry), Chair of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 29, 2002, and February 26, 2002, were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors L'Esperance and Griffin (Education), Watson and Palumbo (English), Gares (Geography), Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Markowski (Human Environmental Sciences), Toppen (Industry and Technology), Cope (Psychology), and Vice Chancellor Feldbush.

Alternates present were: Professors Rothman for Schumacher (Economics), Tovey for Wilentz (English), Preston for Pravica (Math), Wilson for Engel (Medicine), and Gilliland for Wooden (Medicine).

B. Announcements

- 1. The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the February 26, 2002, Faculty Senate meeting:
 - 02-06 Curriculum matters contained in the January 10, 2002, and January 24, 2002, University Curriculum Committee minutes.
 - 02-07 Nomination Procedures for the Oliver Max Gardner Award.
 - 02-08 Revision to the ECU Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, subsection Grade Replacement Policy.
- 2. Faculty members interested in receiving particular monthly Academic Committee agendas and minutes are asked to notify the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537. All Academic Committee activities are included on the individual committee websites located at: http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/commin.htm.
- 3. Faculty interested in periodically receiving past copies of The Chronicle of Higher Education are asked to call the Faculty Senate office and place their name on a list for distribution.
- 4. The annual Teaching Awards Ceremony is scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2002, (Reading Day) at 11:00 a.m. in the Speight Auditorium. Chancellor Muse will host a reception in the Gray Gallery immediately following the ceremony. Please make plans now to attend.
- 5. There is a one-year term available on the Administrative Parking and Transportation Committee. Please call the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537 if you are interested in serving in this capacity.
- Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by Wednesday, May 1, 2002.
- 7. The Faculty Officers Nominating Committee will meet soon to prepare a slate of candidates for each office of the Faculty Senate. The process is detailed in the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix A, Section VII. This Committee will report to the Faculty Senate on April 30, 2002. Faculty members are encouraged to offer names of any possible candidates to members of the committee listed below:

Mark Taggart, School of Music
Alice Arnold, School of Art

John Cope, Department of Psychology David Pravica, Department of Mathematics

Catherine Rigsby, Department of Geology

8. The Board of Governors has approved the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee report and its recommendations. The Board has charged the Office of the President staff to work with the campuses to implement the recommendations. The final report can be viewed at: http://www.northcarolina.edu/aa/reports/ntt_faculty/

C. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor William Muse began by expressing his appreciation to all who participated in the installation activities. The rocession was impressive. He also expressed his appreciation to the Founder's Day and Installation Day committee. He was especially gratified that 7 of 9 Senate chairs from Auburn came for the ceremonies. Next week is very important: the NCAA certification team and the SACS reaffirmation team will be on campus. Self and peer examination are important parts of academic life, serving to validate what we're doing well and to illuminate what we can do to perform more effectively. He stated that he has been impressed with the academic performance of the university, the care and concern

for students, and the effort in teaching, research and outreach programs. He is confident that we will be successful through this process. Chancellor Muse stated that he is especially grateful for the efforts on assessment. We are trying to put in place a clear identification of what we're trying to accomplish and techniques for determining whether we are accomplishing those goals. This should be a routine part of our future activities. Since we are using the alternate model, we have a real opportunity to use outside experts to see whether our strategies will enable us to achieve our doctoral goals without harming our undergraduate goals. We should be able to plot our future course better. The Chancellor spoke briefly about the tuition issue. Faced with a state shortfall of more than one billion dollars, the Board of Governors approved an 8% tuition increase for in-state students, and a 12% increase for out-of-state students. This is subject to approval by the General Assembly. The state will be able to fund about half of our growth needs. The Board also approved campus-based tuition initiatives, but less than requested because of the across-the-board increases. ECU requested a \$400 increase, but the Board approved \$250. Searches are on going. For the Provost, each finalist will give a brief talk followed by a question-and-answer period, followed by a reception. Finally, Chancellor Muse asked for special cooperation during early registration, which overlaps the NCAA and SACS site visits. Senator Ferrell (History) asked for confirmation that the SACS interviews will be open and that no one will be censured for expressing their opinions. Chancellor Muse confirmed that and added that there will be specific appointments as well as open sessions. Senator Godbold (Computer Science, Communication and Broadcasting) noted that some of the tuition funds are earmarked for additional faculty for high demand courses and asked where those faculty will be assigned. Chancellor Muse stated that there was no decision yet. We need to recognize that there will be increased enrollment next fall that isn't fully funded. We will need to stay aware of student needs. VCAA Thompson added that this poses an interesting problem since high demand can occur for various reasons. These positions will be "floating" positions, assigned where the need is greatest.

D. Vice Chancellor's Report

Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, spoke about the discussions of a School of Pharmacy or Dentistry at ECU. There are significant provider shortages in these fields. In 1999, a consultant came to investigate the possibility of a School of Pharmacy. The price tag will be at least 5 million/year plus a 15-20 million capital investment. The Pharmacy Planning Committee reported to the Board of Trustees in Spring 2002. This has in part been stalled by a growing interest in Dentistry and/or Optometry as well as the administrative turnover in Health Affairs. A feasibility study for a School of Pharmacy at Elizabeth City State identified 3 possible alternatives: 1) a free-standing school at Elizabeth City State, 2) a collaborative effort between ECU and Elizabeth City State, and 3) a collaborative effort between UNC and Elizabeth City State. A planning group for an ECU School is now working; we have the strength to support a Pharmacy program here. Dental health is a significant problem in eastern NC. A School of Dentistry is one possible solution. There are sufficient dentists in urban areas, but not in rural areas. Licensing requirements deter migration of dentists into NC, and there is no structure to help those who can't afford dental services. The projected cost is 43-45 million/year to fund a School of Dentistry. At present, there is no plan to move forward, but if the state does a feasibility study, we want to be a major player. VCHA Horns also spoke about the search for a new VCHS. The search committee has retained a search firm with a proven track record. They are now finalizing position specifications and hope to place an ad within the next two weeks. They will recommend 3-5 candidates.

E. Bob Morrison, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Morrison spoke about the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee report for the UNC system. The percentage of faculty who are non-tenure track has increased dramatically throughout the system. The UNC Committee was appointed by the Office of the President in February 2001. Associate VP Betsy Brown chaired the committee. Focus groups were held across the state. The primary concerns expressed by faculty were job security, salary, and workload. The Committee made 8 recommendations, and as we begin implementing those, we will be required to make changes in the faculty manual. Institutions are being asked to develop plans to implement those changes. Senator Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literature) asked what the timeline for implementation will be. Morrison responded that the university will probably start addressing this issue after the end of this academic year. The Office of the President will provide guidelines.

F. Brenda Killingsworth, ECU's SACS Self-Study Director
Brenda Killingsworth (Business/Past Chair of the Faculty), Self-Study Director, provided the Executive Summary of the SACS reports, including the CD containing the full reports and references. The SACS Team will arrive over the weekend, Sunday evening there is a welcoming banquet, and then they begin work at 9:45 on Monday. They will be all over campus Monday and Tuesday, and then provide an exit report to Chancellor Muse on Wednesday. The "command center" will be 21 Mendenhall. Faculty members are asked to keep their calendars as free as possible. The three interim reports on Assessment, Educational Programs, and Distance Education are now on the website.

G. Spring 2002 Graduation Roster

Senator Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) moved the approval of the Spring 2002 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the completion of degree requirements. **RESOLUTION #02-09**

H. Question Period

Faculty are encouraged to participate in the Question Period of the Faculty Senate meeting. This period allows faculty an opportunity to ask questions of administrators and others present relating to activities of the administration or Faculty Senate committees. There were no questions posed at this time.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time.

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Steve Estes (Health and Human Performance), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the February 14, 2002, and February 28, 2002, University Curriculum Committee minutes. It was noted that action on the granting of Natural Sciences General Education Credit to EHST 2110/2111 (included in the February 28, 2002, Committee minutes) would take place after the vote on the other meeting material. Following a brief discussion, the curriculum matters contained in the February 14, 2002, and February 28, 2002, University Curriculum Committee minutes (excluding action on EHST 2110/2111 for GE credit) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #02-10**

The Faculty Senate then began the debate on the action taken by first the Academic Standards Committee then the University Curriculum Committee to grant Natural Sciences General Education Credit to EHST 2110/2111. Because this proposal came through as a curriculum change, it was sent to the Academic Standards Committee, which passed the motion to grant Natural Sciences credit; a minority report was also presented, and a petition against the proposal was obtained from almost all members of the science faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. Senator Lapicki (Physics) bresented a minority report. Opposition was based on several points related to the way units were to be notified. Environmental Health did not follow this process. Even once a response came from 63 of 65 faculty members in natural sciences who opposed the proposal, their input was ignored. Castin (Sociology) emphasized that the rights of faculty to be notified of matters that concern them has not been respected in the curriculum review process during the last year. In three cases, UCC has passed curricula that are sociological in nature, yet the sociology faculty were never consulted. Only when the Academic Standards Committee reviewed the proposal did Sociology find out that a course was being considered. There do not appear to be criteria to be used to decide whether a course should be approved for GE credit. Faculty Senate Resolution 94-11 speaks to learning outcome goals, but not to criteria for approval. Without criteria, how are decisions made. Should there be an open forum on this? Tilley, (History) chair of the Academic Standards Committee, stated that early in its existence, the committee decided that 1) there is need for a comprehensive review of general education, what it is, how it is defined, criteria, processes, etc., and 2) the year of a SACS visit is not the time to do that. The committee is now working on an outline for such a review. It will probably be a 2-year process and will include opportunity for input from everyone, hearings, and making recommendations to the Senate.

Senator Luczkovich (Coastal and Marine Resources) stated that he teaches Environmental Biology, which is similar in content to and overlaps the proposed course. He objects to approving this course for 3 reasons 1) the course and text do not include any discussion of the scientific method, which is the hallmark of science that sets it apart from other disciplines. Basic sciences classes must cover this. Students will have thus been exposed to the method and will carry it into their lives; 2) the coverage of ecology is not complete: 1 chapter compared to 9 or so in the typical environmental biology text. The proposed text assumes things that students should know that can only be learned in basic science; and 3) the course is not inadequate for training students in environmental health. It might be considered for credit under the "health" requirement in general education, but not science. Sprague (Physics) stated that he teaches physics and the environment, where students also learn about the scientific method, and how it works. The connection of hypothesis and theory with experimental method is critical; hypotheses must be testable, repeatable. Once we've learned the relevant concepts, then we use those to understand real world problems. But we MUST have the fundamental concepts first. No mention of scientific method in the proposed course. The text uses scientific words (such as energy, heat), without efinition. Kane (Environmental Health Sciences) stated that students make decisions about what will empower them when they graduate. Reaching out to the real world, bringing applications to the world are important. It is a matter of emphasis. For example, there was a recent article on Food Safety in Science written by economist. We give social science credit for soil chemistry. Credit shouldn't be driven by the course prefix. Senator Decker (Health and Human Performance) said that it is gratifying to see how vested faculty are with this issue. The essence of the proposal hasn't

been heard yet. The proposal was designed to meet the stated goals articulated by the university. Students struggle to get classes that meet this general education requirement. This course is a good deal for our students. Decker then asked how does this course not meet those stated goals and objectives. Senator Wolfe (Anthropology) asked what the relationship is between 2110 and the major? Do they propose to get general education science credit then later ask for this course to double count toward the major? Davis (EHST) stated that he hadn't heard that, but it is not their intention to use it for general education credit for their majors.

Joyce (Physics) commented on the 94-11 goals. He began by stating that this isn't just a turf battle but would be a fundamental change in general education philosophy that has existed here for years. There has not been widespread exposure or debate. The FS 94-11 resolution refers to the UNC statement of mission which requires broad education in basic sciences, social sciences, etc., and professional disciplines. This course is clearly a public health course and can't be construed as a course in basic sciences. ECU's goals are "substantive general education" and "specialized and multidisciplinary knowledge". With our traditional form of governance at ECU, we delegate the responsibility for assuring the quality of course offerings to the code units. In the units that have traditionally held responsibility for basic sciences, 97% of the faculty members have spoken against the proposed course. The basics of physics will remain the same, even if the applications change. A firm grasp of the basics is essential. Ferrell (History) stated that the process must be followed. Committee agendas are on the web site. The process is open and faculty are on the committees. It can't happen otherwise. Senator Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) stated that we need to define what a "science" is. There are two kinds: pure and applied, and they're not the same thing. How much pure science does a graduate need? The committee's study needs to consider that. To understand applied science, do you need to understand the basic science underlying it? Senator Taggart (Music) stated that he is not a scientist. However, it appears to him that if this course becomes an available natural science credit, and if this is the course someone uses, and in the course there's no discussion of scientific method, then we have contributed to the dumbing down of society. There is a move afoot to teach "intelligent design" (just another word for creationism) in schools. We have leaders whose philosophies approach flat earth. We need to address is whether the prefix system is the best system for general education. Senator Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literature) stated that she is also not a scientist but does have questions. Resolution 94-11 uses the terms "discover" and "basic" – this course doesn't help the discover process because it doesn't teach method. The proposed course is not a basic course. Does this course help "discovery" and does it teach "basic sciences"? Davis (Environmental Health Sciences) stated that they are trying to develop something that would be good for the university. He taught environmental chemistry 10 years ago and thought it was very relevant. Most of that material is incorporated in this new course. Western Carolina counts an EHS course as general education; UNC-CH has courses in the school of public health and in geography. NCSU has many courses outside of the basic sciences, many with Agriculture and Life Sciences. He talks about scientific method in lecture. An additional factor is that this course might enhance their ability to recruit students for the major in EHST. Senator Rigsby (Geology) asked if this is a procedural problem. Is it that the requirement that "overlapping or duplication" must be addressed didn't happen? Does this represent a major change in our general education philosophy? These questions need to be addressed by another body. Science is more than just an organized body of knowledge; it deals with scientific method in every aspect of the discipline. Environmental regulators need to know what the science is. Coastal Resource Management creates policy makers, but they must have a foundation in basic sciences. Applied isn't basic. We don't want our students to miss these basics, so we need to be careful about how we think about those courses.

Ferreira (SOCW) made four comments: 1) students need 8 hours of natural sciences, so this is only 4 hrs; 2) our catalog doesn't require that courses come from 2 or more departments. They could all come from one. 3) How do we know that every professor will or will not include science method? 4) They are not wedded to the book, it can be changed; and 4) many students from community colleges transfer science courses without question. We have no quality control over those courses. VCAA Thompson said that he is grateful for quality of the debate. Wall (Philosophy) stated that it strikes him that we are talking about general education courses as a whole. We have a liberal arts tradition, but the University has a service commitment for the state. This is too important to vote on today. He moved to send the course proposal for EHST 2110 to be granted natural science credit to EPPC for examination of the issue of granting General Education credit. The motion was seconded by Wolfe. VCAA Thompson asked if that comes under charge of EPPC? Morrison read the charge A and C of EPPC and Academic Standards. Senator Gemperline (Chemistry) stated that he is in favor of the motion to send this proposal to EPPC. UCC ignored input of natural sciences faculty, and this needs a systematic and thorough review. VCAA Thompson observed that EPPC deals with programs, not courses. He believes that the proposal would be nore appropriate for ASC. Senator Godbold (Broadcasting and Communications) stated that we need to be careful not to just keep sending issues to different committees until we get the response we want. Senator Wall (Philosophy) stated, in response to VCAA Thompson) that this is a general policy issue. Senator Ferrell (History) stated that it is not the process that's at fault, it's the way the university has dealt with general education requirements for 10 years. Wolfe (Anthropology) stated that she believes EPPC should look at the issue.

Following this lengthy debate, Professor Rigsby (Geology) offered a substitute motion moving to have the Educational Policies and Planning Committee examine the University's general education policy before EHST 2110/2111 or any other non-natural science general education course is approved. Gemperline (Chemistry) called for a roll vote. Chair of the Faculty Morrison, at the chair's discretion, chose to proceed with a regular voice vote. After a standing vote count to verify the voice vote, the motion passed 25-21. **RESOLUTION #02-11**

B. Calendar Committee

Charles Calhoun (History), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed 2003-2004 University Calendar. He stated that the committee worked hard to develop a calendar that would incorporate new scheduling requirements. Lowe (Associate Vice Chancellor) suggested that the Faculty Senate defer action on the proposed 2003-2004 University Calendar until the April meeting. He stated that, as the new Enrollment Manager, his concern was with the Fall semester start-up date. He noted that a change would benefit various auxiliary offices and make new faculty orientation more meaningful. VCAA Thompson stated his support for Lowe's suggestion reminding the Senators of the impact on advising. Professor Thompson stated that as currently drafted, with Faculty Convocation and faculty meetings on Monday and classes actually starting on Tuesday, students would have a hard time seeing their advisors. Senator Niswander (Business) moved to postpone action until the April meeting. Chair Morrison noted that the appropriate action was to send the report back to the Calendar Committee. Niswander stated that his intention was not to do that. Morrison responded that he was hesitant to have the University Calendars revised on the Senate floor due to its complexity and that any revisions should be sent back to the Calendar Committee for consideration. Niswander then revised his motion to have the University Calendar Committee's report returned to the Calendar Committee for further deliberations in light of the meeting's discussion. RESOLUTION #02-12

C. Faculty Governance Committee

James Joyce (Physics), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revision to the ECU Faculty Manual,

Part VI. Section VIII. Frequently Asked Questions About Faculty Personnel Records. There was no discussion and the

proposed revision to the ECU Faculty Manual, Part VI. Section VIII. Frequently Asked Questions About Faculty Personnel

Records was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #02-13

Professor Joyce then presented the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix I. ECU Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment. Senator Nasea (HSL), referring to section VI, asked for a change in gender specific language. Senator Niswander (Business) called attention to section V, second full paragraph. This needs more thought and deliberation. There are ambiguities within the document; if we pass the proposed revision, we set up a standard that we may not be able to meet. What about adding "knowingly"? We need to spend more time on this. Chair Morrison then noted that a quorum had been lost and the meeting was adjourned. Further discussion on this report will be at the April 23, 2002, Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Allred
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Psychology

Faculty Senate office

Disposition: Chancellor

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE MARCH 19, 2002, MEETING

- 02-09 Spring 2002 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the completion of degree requirements.

 Disposition: Chancellor
- O2-10 Curriculum matters contained in the <u>February 14, 2002</u>, and <u>February 28, 2002</u>, (excluding action on EHST 2110/2111 for Natural Sciences General Education Credit) University Curriculum Committee minutes.

 <u>Disposition:</u> Chancellor
- 02-11 Proposed 2003-2004 University Calendar and Revised Guidelines for Scheduling Lecture and Discussion Classes for Fall and Spring Semesters and Summer Sessions was returned to the Calendar Committee for further deliberations.

 <u>Disposition:</u> Calendar Committee
- 02-13 Revised ECU Faculty Manual, Part VI. Section VIII. Frequently Asked Questions About Faculty Personnel Records