

P
S
Q

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

The first regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, September 16, 2003, in the Mendenhall Student Center, Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 22, 2003, and April 29, 2003, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Dobbs (Medicine), Vice Chancellor Feldbush, and Chancellor Muse.

Alternates present were: Professors Coonin for Scott (Academic Library Services), Knickerbocker for Martinez (Foreign Languages), Glascoff for McGhee (Health and Human Performance), Stone for Toppen (Industry and Computer Science), Robinson for Ries (Mathematics), Hodson for Meredith (Medicine), and Pokorny for Cox (Nursing).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from April 22, 2003, Faculty Senate meeting:

- 03-25 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the March 27, 2003, University Curriculum Committee meeting.
- 03-26 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the April 10, 2003, University Curriculum Committee meeting.
- 03-27 Revision to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, Subsection: Double or Second Major to add the following: "The number of hours applicable toward a second major should not be limited."
- 03-28 Discontinuation of the advising survey until the reorganization of the Advising Center is complete. The development and use of an advising survey should be reevaluated on an annual basis.
- 03-29 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section III. Curriculum Development.
- 03-30 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section IV.
- 03-31 New section VI. to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. entitled "Guidelines for Organizing into Code Units".
- 03-33 Interpretation #103-18 to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section IV.A.3. Personnel Committee stating: "*The unit personnel committee recommends the initial rank of faculty appointments.*"
- 03-35 Revised College of Business Unit Code of Operation.

Faculty members are reminded of the teaching grant proposal deadline Tuesday, October 1, 2003, in the Faculty Senate office (140 Rawl Annex). <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/tg/teachinggrants.htm>

Faculty members are reminded of the teaching award nomination deadline of Monday, September 15, 2003, and portfolios of nominated faculty members are due December 1, 2003. Materials pertinent to creating the portfolio and a reminder of its deadline will be sent to each of the nominees. The winners of these awards will be recognized in the spring. If you have any questions about the award categories, please contact Dorothy Clayton, Center for Faculty Development (328-6470). A description of each award is available at: <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/aa/academicawards.htm>

Faculty members not located on main campus (Allied Health Sciences, Medicine, Health and Human Performance) and who serve on various academic standing committees are reminded of special courtesy parking permits available from the office of Parking and Transportation Services. Special Courtesy Permits allow faculty members attending meetings, etc. to park in "A1/B1" lots on main campus. These permits are issued to unit heads at no charge and are to be used in conjunction with a paid parking permit. Information about these parking permits was distributed to unit heads over the Summer. Additional information is available from Mike Vanderven, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, at ext. 328-1961.

All Faculty Senate materials (agendas, minutes, announcements) will be distributed via a Faculty

Listserv that has been established and used in conjunction with the Microsoft Exchange mail system. Faculty choosing to opt out of the Faculty Listserv will continue to be able to access the materials via the Faculty Senate website. Paper copies of documents will always be available in the Faculty Senate office (140 Rawl Annex).

Faculty interested in periodically receiving past copies of "*The Chronicle of Higher Education*" are asked to call the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537 to have their name placed on a distribution list.

Weekly reports on undergraduate admissions are available on the Admission and Retention Policies Committee web site <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/ad/reports.htm>.

Make Library Resources Work Harder for You -- Brought to you by the University libraries, SFX is a unique linking tool allowing students and researchers to connect seamlessly from a database to an online resource, provided that the library holds a current subscription to that resource. Users also can search for particular electronic journals through the SFX Citation Linker, which will eventually replace the current E-Journal Locator. At the click of a button, SFX takes you from an article citation in one database to a full-text electronic copy of that article in another. Just as easily, SFX links to print copies listed in library catalogs and other library services. For more information contact either the Joyner Library at 328-6677 or the Health Sciences Library at 744-2230.

The April 25, 2003, UNC Faculty Assembly meeting minutes are available at:
<http://www.uncwil.edu/facassembly/minutes/apr03.htm>

A new committee has been formed by Provost Swart to conduct a feasibility study on a Faculty/Staff Club. The purpose is to investigate how ECU might develop a professional environment through a Faculty/Staff Club where social interaction is enhanced with staff, faculty, and administrators while also providing an intellectually stimulating environment. This differs from other options in the community, which are geared primarily for social entertainment. A faculty survey will be developed to inquire of needs and wants after the parameters have been identified. Please feel free to contact any of the following members to discuss this study.

- Lou Everett (Nursing) Chair
- Glen Gilbert (Health and Human Performance)
- Karla Hughes (Human Ecology)
- Nancy Mize (Student Recreation Center)
- Greg Miller (Human Resources)
- Garrie Moore (University Life)
- Rick Niswander (Chair of the Faculty)
- Elmer Poe (Technology and Computer Science)
- Clayton Sessoms (Continuing Studies)

C. William Muse, Chancellor

Chancellor Muse was not in attendance at the meeting. Pravica (Mathematics) moved to have the Senate consider a proposed resolution in relation to the appointment of an interim chancellor. Morrison (Chemistry) stated that this was new business. Chair Niswander ruled that the resolution would be considered as new business at the end of the meeting. Pravica then made a motion to appeal the Chair's ruling. Robinson (Mathematics) spoke in favor of the appeal and expressed desire for discussion on the issues. Warren (Education) spoke against the appeal stating that that resolution should be presented as new business. Following a voice vote by the Senate, the ruling stood.

D. William Swart, Provost

Provost Swart began with a review of his year as Provost. He recognized the excellence already achieved at ECU with the goal of continuing "that never ending journey of excellence." Following his review of ECU's strategic plan and the Chancellor's four areas of emphasis and working within the processes spelled out in the faculty manual, the academic units have been reorganized and academic and student affairs integrated. New engineering and homeland security programs are being finalized by faculty committees working with Deans Sparrow and Rogers and will be sent to the appropriate Faculty Senate committees for review and approval soon. A new vision for the use of technology, referred to as VCE@ECU, incorporates Distance Learning capabilities with virtual collaboration and virtual performance support, allowing ECU to serve students and alumni in life-long learning. Provost Swart also stated that with the support of NC Community College's President Martin Lancaster, ECU was continuing to explore establishing ECU's physical presence on community college campuses in order to deliver programs and

services within 50 miles of every citizen in Eastern NC. Called ECU-X, this will allow ECU to grow without taxing the campus infrastructure.

Provost noted that he created the office of Student Professional Development to work with faculty through deans and chairs and VC Feldbush's office "to provide students with meaningful hands-on educational experiences as volunteers, interns, co-ops" or part-time employees. He stated that the students will be better prepared as citizens and employees, and the student and community with benefit.

Provost Swart stated that ECU had received 80 new faculty positions last year, and that ECU needed to continue to aggressively recruit and obtain the very best and highly qualified candidates. He stated that ECU has a contingent of junior and senior faculty and administrators from renowned institutions with impressive credentials. 45 of these new positions are held by members of underrepresented groups on campus, including 22 African Americans.

Provost Swart noted that some adversity has also marked this year. Media reported of the unhappiness of the president of ODU, "who alleged that several ODU employees were somehow 'stolen.'" Swart stated that just as he had encourage the faculty search committees to find the best candidates, he did also. These candidates were reviewed by the appropriate committees and signed off by EEO. They were selected because they had exceptional performance records.

To further explain, Swart discussed the hiring of two individuals from ODU. Dr. Steve Duncan was an adjunct professor and employed by the US Army Training Support Center. He is now the Director of Military Programs. Dr. JD Selby-Lucas was the assistant director of Engineering Fundamentals Division at ODU and recently completed her PhD. She was not in a faculty position and ODU has a policy of not hiring its own graduates. Both were processed under an EEO exception and hired as tenure-track faculty with EEO approval.

Salaries were determined in consultations the Academic Affairs' administration and finance group using CUPA averages and market information consistent with regular practices. In addition, Swart explained, the salaries of individuals holding faculty rank but assigned to administrative duties are converted to a 12-month equivalent and assigned a stipend when appropriate. The reorganization that integrated academic and student affairs included redefinition and expansion of responsibilities resulting in salary adjustments, expanded roles, and heightened performance expectations. Swart stated that with a new administrative team in place, he looked to implement the Integrated Performance-Based Management System in order to allocate resources in a fair and equitable manner. The Board of Governors of UNC has committed to work for increasing faculty salaries and he was committed to working with them. Swart concluded his comments by stating that he looked forward to continuing contact with faculty through emails, town meetings, information and formal meetings and thanked the Faculty Senate for their work in bringing about the reorganization, and reaffirmed his commitment to shared governance.

Professor Morrison (Chemistry) asked what the Provost knew about the salaries of the ODU employees and if the monies for these positions could have been used for new faculty. Swart responded that ECU had 80 new faculty positions and the new administrative positions came out of savings from the reorganization.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) asked how many of the administrators hired from outside ECU did not come from ODU. Swart indicated that at least 12 positions, including a number of chairs, were filled by outside candidates.

Robinson (Math) expressed that a distinction should be made between administrators hired as chairs and those in higher level positions. He questioned the need to bring in so many new people and replace those already in the positions and, since the state legislature had funded no raises, asked how Swart justified his own raise of \$25,000? Swart reported that President Broad had authorized 12% bonuses for chancellors. The new positions were necessary; the military post had been vacant and the University's appeal to the military market was significant and should be pursued.

Eribo (Communication) asked if it were the usual practice for universities to "attract star professors." Swart maintained that resources were wasted if we do not attract the best. As an example, Dr. Chitwood's team, which was recruited by Harvard Medical School, received a counter offer from ECU and stayed. Finding and recruiting the best qualified was the key to the future.

Pravica (Math) asked what it says about ECU if we are constantly looking outside the university. Do we not have excellence? Swart affirmed his and others' admiration for the excellence of ECU but he was looking forward to improving on that excellence. Provost Swart stated, "Our research performance, in terms of grants, is not good. As a matter of fact, it is very poor." The ECU Research Institute has been established to "kickstart" the University's research with highly-qualified faculty with proven grant records who can "take faculty with them."

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) expressed the need to make a distinction between "top flight" researchers hired for faculty positions, which no one would object to, and hiring them as administrators. The impression is that of a power play to bring in cronies. Although faculty voted to approve hires in various departments, two individuals have claimed that they were pressured into accepting new hires into faculty positions in their departments. Swart reiterated that we should bring in and hire the best person at any level. He further denied emphatically that any pressure was put on faculty. Allegations of improper hiring are baseless accusations and have been refuted in letters by the Board of Trustees, President Broad and the Chancellor.

Gares (Geography) expressed appreciation for the efforts to hire the best candidates and asked how many new appointments were made at associate or full professor levels. Swart reminded the Senate that he had challenged the Deans to work with faculty to find the best people who can make an immediate impact and has supported the Deans in this effort.

Rothman (Economics) questioned the probability that so many individual hires would come from the same institution—ODU. Swart responded that these were not independent events. In the case of the Military Affairs position, for example, few schools have declared themselves a "service-friendly" institution and ODU is one, so it is no surprise that few people were available, and one of them was from ODU.

Morrison (Chemistry) asked, in light of the tight budget, how many people in the Provost's office received raises. Swart replied that salaries were consistent with rank and adjusted to 12-month contracts. The massive reorganization in the Provost's office resulted in consolidating responsibilities to increase efficiency. Salaries were adjusted in consideration of revised job descriptions and increased responsibilities.

Holloway (Business) asked if these new hires would have left ODU for positions at institutions other than ECU. Swart reported that other faculty members have left ODU for institutions other than ECU, and ODU has not made counter offers.

Sugar (Education) asked for a statement from Swart about his advocacy of salary increases across the board. Swart read from his prepared statement that he will work with the Board of Governors in their commitment to raising faculty salaries.

Gares (Geography) questioned the lack of salary increase when a faculty member is promoted. Faculty members could potentially receive two promotions with no salary increase and that is a "slap in the face" to faculty. Swart stated that he would take that issue under advisement. It was unfortunate that he cannot guarantee salary increases but the university has found ways to provide some non-salary compensation for faculty and staff through increased access to the Student Health Center and Recreation Center, and support of a new Faculty Club.

McPherson (Technology & Computer Science), speaking as a faculty member on search committees, expressed frustration at the continuing criticism of the two search committees in Technology and Computer Science that chose the Dean and a department chair. Provost Swart did not exert pressure at any time on either committee. The Dean's search followed all proper procedures: narrowed applications to 5, interviewed these 5 in via telephone conference calls, and brought 2 candidates to campus. The same procedure was used for the Chair's search. The continuing criticism of these two searches questions the integrity of the members of those committees and the candidates.

Pravica (Mathematics) stated that comments about the new Science and Technology building indicate problems and that it is not up to standards in Chemistry. Swart had no comment since this area was not his responsibility, but he expressed concern.

Twarog (Art) questioned why, if aggressive recruiting and identifying the best candidate is encouraged, was the candidate selected for Director of the school turned down by the Provost based on salary requirements while

another candidate at that salary level was hired. Swart indicated that the school should present several qualified candidates to the Provost. That particular candidate did not meet his requirements.

Eribo (Communication) asked about the future, new initiatives, and town meetings. Swart reported that 12 new PhD programs, 7 MA, and 5 BA were targeting the strengths of ECU and its students and faculty. He looked forward to more town meeting and advice from the faculty.

Twarog (Art) asked that Swart put the criteria for specific positions in writing so that the Art school can make certain any future candidate meets his requirements. Swart said the key was that the candidate was satisfactory to the committee and well as the Provost. He had decided that it would be better to first hire a Dean for the college who then will conduct a Director search, avoiding a leadership gap.

Rothman (Economics) referred to a point on the evaluation mechanism that cites one unit of research as a book, or an article, etc. and questioned how these could be equal. Swart denied that this is the case and reiterated that the Integrated Performance-Based Management System was a work in progress and he had asked the Deans to engage the chairs and departments to determine the appropriate measures.

Robinson (Math) expressed concern about the future of our faculty in being able to get grants due to the problems found during audits of grant monies. Swart, too, expressed concern for these unfortunate occurrences but agencies monitor their monies and qualified proposals will be funded.

Sharp (English) indicated the difficulty of conducting abbreviated searches to fill senior positions. She asked the Provost to provide an appropriate timeframe and resources. Swart maintained that the timeframe was determined by the search committee and resources should be used to recruit aggressively, and bring our openings to the widest audience, also keeping in mind that some people are happy in their present positions. He also emphasized the need to invest wisely in senior level personnel; experienced researchers in senior faculty positions bring their own funding with them and can become self-supporting within 5 years.

Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) commented on the vacuum of information. Faculty and staff morale is low partly because we aren't getting information from the university, but instead from local media. Faculty seem to be relying on the *News and Observer* and the *Daily Reflector*, before hearing officially from the university. Swart again emphasized that we have a bright future and he had invested in trying to improve the internal communication. In reference to the letter from ODU's president, he responded in writing to the appropriate people when the letter was received. The letter was already "old news" and situation resolved before it broke in the media. Again, he stated that he welcomed communication with faculty members, that there are no secrets, and if you think there are, please ask before you assume the worst.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) asked if faculty for the ECU research Institute had already been hired. Swart replied that no faculty will be hired. The Institute will be staffed by Vice Chancellor Feldbush's office and Institute faculty would come from current faculty members.

E. Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Niswander stated that the Faculty Senate officers met with President Broad who asked for their input in regards to her decision to appoint an interim chancellor. The conversation was a private one and concerned a personnel matter so he could not disclose the content. However, he did state that they had an open and frank discussion that lasted close to one hour. President Broad was very receptive to their comments and listened with an open mind. She stressed her commitment to the core components of the University – specifically academic integrity and a firm commitment to shared governance – and said that these were very important to her as she made this decision.

Professor Niswander then discussed the specifics on Hurricane Isabel and the University's Emergency Response Team's plan of action. He reminded Senators that the University had added a number of new faculty and staff in the last few years who had never experienced a hurricane. He stated that they may not understand that a hurricane was not just a big thunderstorm. He asked that Senators seek out new faculty and staff, in particular, and help them understand what they might want to do in order to be prepared for the next 3-5 days.

Professor Niswander then stated that the institution has had a challenging week and that we continue to have challenges. It was important, in his view, to keep a few things in mind. One was that ECU was not broken. We have challenges ahead, but collectively we can address and solve them. And second, ECU was a strong and resilient institution populated by strong and resilient individuals. Professor Niswander reminded everyone that there were hundreds and hundreds of dedicated, hardworking, and loyal faculty and staff who come to work every day and do their jobs with integrity and diligence. He expressed his tremendous confidence in the individuals who are ECU, stating that he was proud of the faculty and staff at ECU and was proud to be a member of the ECU community.

Wall (Philosophy) commented that he hoped in the meeting with President Broad the officers had mentioned the need for the chancellor to have a bona fide PhD and a record of academic excellence. Interim Chancellor will have many important issues to deal with. Niswander replied that the question of academic qualifications specifically did not arise.

Pravica (Math) expressed concern about having respect for the faculty and a sense of importance for academics and reiterated the significance that the Chancellor have a PhD and academic credentials. Niswander reported that President Broad was clear in her commitment to academic integrity and shared governance.

F. David Dosser, Chair of the University Athletics Committee and Academic Integrity Subcommittee
Dr. Dosser gave an overview of the NCAA academic reform and it is linked here for your convenience: [NCAA Report](#).

Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) expressed concern about parking for the students and faculty for evening classes at Minges on Tuesday evening, September 30, when we have a home football game. In the past cars have been towed with no regard for the students and faculty involved. She emphasized that this continues to occur. The problem is exacerbated this year since parking area around the stadium are now primary student lots. Dosser asked Glascoff to email him so he can communicate this to the athletic department.

G. 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.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) expressed concerns about the proposed funding formula, comments by Muse about "other equally important areas of scholarship," and the Research Institute. He asked if reassigned time will be taken away from departments or if particular units or faculty will be singled out because of the Research Institute and the focus on different kinds of scholarship. Swart responded that no, the Research Institute was intended to provide a mechanism for teams of faculty to develop larger proposals of external funding. This will not impact what an individual researcher does. He suggested that the Chair ask Vice Chancellor Feldbush to speak about the Research Institute at a future meeting.

Wilson (Medicine) asked VC Lewis to discuss the efforts to keep Dr. Chitwood's team here, and if that effort indicates a movement away from our mission to educate primary care physicians. Lewis assured the Senate that it did not. In fact, Dr. Chitwood's work is extremely important to and complements the work of primary care physicians in Eastern North Carolina since heart disease is our #1 killer. He further explained that the hospital and medical school worked together to keep Dr. Chitwood's team here in Greenville. While these efforts take resources, we must continue to find ways to fund them to offer increased access to cardio-vascular service.

Gares (Geography) asked Swart about the performance-based evaluation and if he has a timetable for completion and implementation. Swart said this the year was the construction year, and he would like to test it with a pilot program in place next year, with full implementation the following year. Rigsby (Geology) asked Swart about continuing assessment of the evaluation system once the system has been implemented. Swart stated that he plans an evaluation each year but has not worked out any details. He stated that ECU needs to make certain to do an assessment each year to see what needs to be changed and improved.

Pravica (Mathematics) asked for more details about the meeting with President Broad and thought that information would be appropriate in the discussion of the resolution in regards to choosing an interim chancellor. He again

moved to have the Senate consider a proposed resolution in relation to the appointment of an interim chancellor. Chair Niswander ruled that the resolution would be considered as new business at the end of the meeting. Pravica then made a motion to appeal the Chair's ruling. Following a voice vote by the Senate, the ruling stood.

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. Faculty Governance Committee

Dee Dee Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented several revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*. She requested to have all revisions considered as a whole. Professor Glascoff then noted three editorial revisions to the documents. The word "sex" should be replaced with the word "gender" throughout the documents, the word "creed" should not be added as originally proposed, and the word "handicap" and "creed" should be deleted from the documents.

Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Part I., by adding "*political affiliation*". There was no discussion on the proposed revision.

Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revisions to Part VI. Sections I. and VI. by adding "*political affiliation*". There was no discussion on the proposed revisions.

Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Appendix C. Section I.D. by deleting the phrase "*Evidence of character traits which contribute decidedly to the professional advancement of the well-trained person;*". Twarog (Art) questioned how the phrase "...including as a minimum the master's degree" relates to a terminal degree in Art. Following discussion the proposed revision to Appendix C. of the *ECU Faculty Manual* was withdrawn pending further discussion by the Committee.

Professor Glascoff then presented several proposed revisions to Appendix D., beginning with Section I. by adding "*demonstrable, bona fide institutional financial exigency or major curtailment or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program*". Robinson (Mathematics) questioned whether "*major curtailment*" included disciplines with low enrollment and asked where this statement was included in other sections of the manual. McMillen (Medicine) questioned if a shift in enrollment patterns would result in faculty being laid off. Rigsby (Geology) asked where else the phrasing "major curtailment" occurs. Following discussion, the proposed revision to Appendix D., Section I. was withdrawn pending further discussion by the Committee.

Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Appendix D., Section II.A.3. by adding "*or disability*" and deleting "*creed*". There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revisions to Section V.D.2. first by deleting the sentence that reads "*An audio recording of a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.*" and by adding the sentence "*For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.*" There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section V.E. to delete "*audio recording or*". There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section VI.F.2. first by deleting the sentence that reads "*An audio recording of a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.*" then by adding the sentence "*For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.*" There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section VI.G. to delete "*audio recording or*". There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section VII.B.7.b. first by deleting the sentence that read "*An audio recording of a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.*" then by adding the sentence "*For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.*" Professor Uiffers (Music) questioned whether or not the 10 day turnaround time for court transcriptions was feasible. Professor Long (History) reported that the time was actually shorter. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section VII.8. to delete "*audio recording or*". There was no discussion.

Professor Glascoff then presented a proposed revision to Appendix J. Sections I. and II. to add "*or disability*". There was no discussion.

Professor Glascoff then presented two proposed revisions to Appendix L., beginning with Section C.3.g. to read as follows: "*g. procedures for the unit's faculty members to indicate in a timely fashion and by vote their approval or disapproval of the unit's major planning documents, assessment documents, and other major reports prior to their submission in final form to person(s) outside the unit.*" There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented the proposed revision to Section D.3.c. to include "*The unit administrator will not participate in this vote.*" There was no discussion.

Professor Glascoff then presented two proposed revisions to Appendix X., beginning with Section VII.D. by adding the sentence "*For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court report must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.*" There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented a proposed revision to Section VII.E. to add the sentence "*The Board shall provide the faculty member and the chancellor with a copy of the court reporter's transcript of the hearing.*" There was no discussion.

Professor Glascoff then presented two proposed revisions to Appendix Y, beginning with Section III.E.1. by adding the sentence "*For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court report must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.*" There was no discussion. Professor Glascoff then presented a proposed revision to Section III.F. by adding "*along with a copy of the court reporter's transcript of the hearing*" and "*of the materials*". There was no discussion.

Following Professor Glascoff's presentations, the proposed revisions to Parts I. and VI. and Appendices D., J., L., X., and Y of the *ECU Faculty Manual* were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-37**

B. Faculty Information Technology Committee

Karl Wuensch (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented a resolution requesting an alternative identification system. He noted that progress had made in the effort to reduce our reliance on the Social Security Number and to reduce the threat of identity theft. Adopting Banner software (a software package that integrates the information management system across the campus) would eliminate the use of the SSN entirely, but its implementation will not be complete for 4 years, at the cost of \$14 million. For \$30 million ECU could complete the change in one year, or we could spend \$15-20 million and change the numbering system without Banner. In the interim 4 years, we would be reducing the probability that a number could be "stolen" and misused. Now, new student IDs no longer list the SSN and new cards without SSN are being offered to all students. He further stated that the university continues to make changes to reduce the use of the SSN as an identifier and that faculty, staff, and students also to be sensitive to potential problems. Wall (Philosophy) asked what would the replace SSN as identifier. Wuensch reported that Banner would generate unique identification numbers for each student. Twarog (Art) asked if this issue concerned faculty members as well as students since, for example, faculty may be asked to give their SSN at Recreation Center where others could overhear. Wuensch replied that situations such as that need to be addressed.

Following discussion, the proposed resolution stating that ECU faculty support the implementation of a system that will eliminate the use of social security numbers as identifiers and that the faculty urge the University administration to use its best efforts to prevent unauthorized disclosure of social security numbers, even prior to the implementation of a new system, by avoiding the use of social security numbers whenever possible and by educating students, faculty, and staff regarding the security risks associated with social security numbers and the best practices for their safe use was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-38**

C. Unit Code Screening Committee

Garris Conner (Allied Health Sciences), Chair of the Committee, presented three revised unit codes of operation, the College of Education, Health Sciences Library, and Department of Chemistry. There was no discussion and the revised unit codes of operation were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-39**

D. Commission on Scholarship

Bob Morrison (Chemistry) Past Chair of the Faculty and Co-Chair of the Commission, presented the Commission's report on Scholarship. The report included 5 recommendations: recognize various types of scholarship at ECU, clarify advancement standards, organize annual workshops, disseminate information regarding alternative means of assessing scholarship, and enhance the ECU Community of Scholars. Chair Niswander stated his intention to send document to appropriate Senate committees for review.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) expressed his opposition to the report and his objections included 1. that this model, according to Glassick, was not appropriate to a university that aspires to be research intensive such as ECU; and 2. absolute requirements of peer review and publication must apply to all scholarship. He further asked how various items such as accreditation reports, peer assessments, and peer evaluations meet the qualification of scholarship. Estes (Health & Human Performance) stated that he felt that the Senate should follow the Chair's recommendation and send the report to committee. He further responded that, in response to Knickerbocker's comment, Glassick did not believe this model was appropriate for Research Extensive Institutions (a larger, more prestigious research university) so this would be consistent with the Research Intensive University such as ECU. Two main characteristics of scholarship—creation of new knowledge and dissemination of that knowledge—are included in each model presented in this document. This report should be directed to committees who should then come back to the Senate with specific recommendations, and final criteria would reside with the faculty in the units.

Wall (Philosophy) questioned the scholarship of discovery, suggesting that faculty already have ample flexibility with their research and creative activity. If ECU redefines scholarship as the report suggests the University is opening the door to watered-down research and won't be able to return to a demand for more rigorous research. He moved to reject the report. Rothman (Economics) spoke in favor of the motion to reject saying this was a harmful document and a source of trouble and embarrassment. The opportunity already exists for faculty to be evaluated for teaching and service and these should not be classified as research. Morrison (chemistry) responded that he felt that there was misunderstanding of the document. Peer review and publication are included in each of the areas of Scholarship.

Long (History) pointed out that in an interview published in the Auburn Horizon, Glassick said he hoped that institutions would define their own mission and that state colleges would fulfill their roles and not try to become research institutions. Engelke (Nursing) spoke against the motion saying the document provided an opportunity to practice-oriented disciplines to serve the mission of ECU.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) responded that he realized the peer review and publication were listed in all areas and did not object to that, but he did object to the other bulleted items. While practice-oriented units should be allowed to continue to define their own mission, this document is for the entire university. Killingsworth (Decision Sciences) spoke against the motion, also, saying that the Senate committees need to look at the document and report to the Senate. Decker (Health & Human Performance) spoke against the motion because the Senate was not being asked to adopt the report at this time, and since some parts are acceptable, the entire document needs to be discussed.

Rigsby (Geology) asked for clarification on how many and which committees would review the document. Niswander responded that various committees might review the report. Recommendations that would affect the Faculty Manual would go to the Faculty Governance Committee, and recommendations that would be determined by units would eventually go to the Unit Code Screening Committee, but other recommendations are not clearly the purview of any committee. He reminded the Senate that we are not being asked to approve the document today, but Governance would be asked to review and determine if it makes sense for us to continue to explore this option. Then it might come before this body for approval or disapproval, and, if approved, units would determine how these changes might affect their activities and evaluations.

Allen (Chemistry) asked what other schools had adopted this model and what the results have been. Morrison responded that Portland State, Akron, Oregon State, and IUPUI, are reviewing the model, as well as others, but he had no knowledge of their progress. Rigsby (Geology) responded that the committee investigated the California system. Berkley and Davis implemented something similar to the Commission's report but it had no effective change. Publication, peer review, and grants funded remain the benchmarks. Also, she noted that she hoped the faculty would review and respond to the report and that the Senate could have an opportunity to make appropriate decisions.

Gares (Geography) recognized several different paths to assess performance and suggested that the Senate consider carefully how this report dovetailed with what the Provost wanted to do with evaluation. Wall (Philosophy) commented that the necessary categories are already in place and that the Senate did not need something else. He stated that ECU should maintain their standards and again urged the Senators to reject the report.

Hanrahan (Medicine) spoke against the motion stating that since the schools have different kinds of activities and the University needs to recognize the value of what all faculty members are doing. Estes (Health & Human Performance) also spoke against the motion and supported the report going to the various committees so the Senate could then vote on it.

Robinson (Mathematics) expressed concern about the model's effect on the institution and how the document would be used especially, in light of the way some departments have been treated by the current administration.

Varnier (Library Services) called the question. The motion to reject entirely the Committee on Scholarship Report was not approved.

Following discussion, the Commission on Scholarships' report was accepted as a document to be forwarded to the Chair of the Faculty to disseminate to the Faculty Governance Committee to discuss in light of the University as a whole and, if appropriate, to bring proposed revised documents to the Faculty Senate for consideration at a later date. **RESOLUTION #03-40**

Agenda Item VI. New Business

Chair Niswander stated that a resolution not on the agenda would be considered under new business unless there was objection. Following no objections, Zack Robinson (Mathematics) offered a resolution that read as follows: Whereas an unexpected vacancy has occurred in the post of ECU chancellor, and whereas, the brevity of Dr. Muse's tenure in office and a number of other ad hoc changes leave the university in a continuing state of transition, and whereas, the faculty represent the continuity of the university, and whereas the faculty seeks to maintain healthy and cooperative relationships with other colleges and universities, and with granting agencies, and whereas, there have been public allegations of administrative improprieties, and whereas, to maintain public trust, the interim chancellor must clearly be dissociated from the reported improprieties. Be it therefore resolved that the following requests be communicated directly to President Molly Broad and to the ECU Board of Trustees:

1. The interim chancellor be appointed either from among candidates external to ECU or from among ECU faculty who do not currently hold an administrative position, who are ready to work closely with President Broad and the faculty to restore the integrity of this institution.
2. The interim chancellor demonstrate a commitment to shared governance, to working with the faculty at all levels and to affirming the role of the Faculty Senate.
3. One-third of the voting members of the search committee for the next ECU chancellor be faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate.
4. Candidates for the position of chancellor meet with the full Faculty Senate before the search committee reaches its decisions.
5. In cooperation with the new administration, the Faculty Senate conduct a discussion on a new mission statement for the university.

Cope (Psychology) expressed agreement with the spirit of the resolution but asked how we would proceed with the discussion. Cope suggested that we consider these points one at a time. Professor Hanrahan (Medicine) moved to have the fifth and sixth "whereas" deleted, as well as, the first resolve relating to the appointment of an interim chancellor.

Robinson (Mathematics) spoke against the amendment stating the purpose of the motion was to address the current situation and the difficulties facing ECU. Whoever was appointed should be disconnected from issues raised. The Senate must communicate to President Broad the faculty's desires concerning the interim chancellor. Faculty should be expressing their views about their top administrators.

Warren (Education) spoke in favor of the motion stating that if the Senate accepted the resolution as it was written, the Senate may be eliminating people who could serve ECU best. Long (History) supported the motion on the basis that the current administrators have the constitutional right to be considered. Varnier (Library Services) spoke in support of the amendment and the importance of academic credentials for a chancellor.

Knickerbocker (Foreign Language) agreed that the Senate does not have the right to deprive anyone of their constitutional rights, but this resolution was a recommendation. Eribo (Communication) spoke in support of motion.

Allegations raised in public have been answered and to approve a document with these accusations is inappropriate.

Ciesielski (Industry & Technology) spoke in favor of the motion since getting the best person, either inside or outside the university, was the most important thing. Rigsby (Geology) spoke in favor of the resolution and supported the statement that acknowledges the public allegation of improprieties; the resolution does not make an accusation. She supported the amendment to delete the final "Whereas." But the 1st resolve was important because it made a statement about restoring the integrity of this institution and that's what faculty members want an interim chancellor to do.

Sprague (Physics) called the question. The motion to delete "*whereas, there have been public allegations of administrative improprieties, and whereas, to maintain public trust, the interim chancellor must clearly be dissociated from the reported improprieties.*" And 1. "*The interim chancellor be appointed either from among candidates external to ECU or from among ECU faculty who do not currently hold an administrative position, who are ready to work closely with President Broad and the faculty to restore the integrity of this institution.*" was approved. The motion to amend was approved.

Hall (Psychology), referring to Resolution #5, asked if the term "new administration" referred to interim chancellor or permanent chancellor? Robinson (Mathematics) stated that he believed that any discussion with the Senate should begin with interim chancellor.

Gares (Geography) asked who appointed the search committee: the President or the Board of Trustees and stated that the resolution should be addressed to the Board. Chair Niswander responded that the Board appoints the search committee and stated that the Board was included in the resolution.

Morrison (Chemistry) reported that in the previous search, committee members were appointed by the Board of Trustees. The last committee included 4 faculty (Present and Past Chairs of Faculty), 1 staff member, representatives from ECU Foundation and Pirate Club. Sometimes committees include 5 or more faculty members, sometimes they are recommended by the Senate, and the Board would probably be open to suggestions if the Senate desired to make recommendations.

Professor Eribo (Communication) moved to have the reference to "ECU AAUP" deleted. Professor Sprague (Physics) moved adjournment. Following a vote of 23 to 22, the Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Tovey
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate office

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE SEPTEMBER 16, 2003, MEETING

- 03-37 Revisions to Parts I. and VI. and Appendices D., J., L., X., and Y of the *ECU Faculty Manual*.
Disposition: Chancellor (all sections), Board of Trustees (Appendices D, L, Y),
UNC Board of Governors (Appendix D)
- 03-38 ECU faculty support the implementation of a system that will eliminate the use of social security numbers as identifiers and that the faculty urge the University administration to use its best efforts to prevent unauthorized disclosure of social security numbers, even prior to the implementation of a new system, by avoiding the use of social security numbers whenever possible and by educating students, faculty, and staff regarding the security risks associated with social security numbers and the best practices for their safe use
Disposition: Chancellor

03-39 Revised College of Education, Health Sciences Library, and Department of Chemistry unit codes of operation.
Disposition: Chancellor

03-40 The Commission on Scholarships' report was accepted as a document to be forwarded to the Chair of the Faculty to disseminate to the Faculty Governance Committee to discuss in light of the University as a whole and, if appropriate, to bring proposed revised documents to the Faculty Senate for consideration at a later date.
Disposition: Chair of the Faculty