

P
A

East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2003

The second regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 7, 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 September 16, 2003, meeting were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senator absent was: Professor Meredith (Medicine).

Alternates present were: Professors Tedesco for Sharp (English), Robinson for Ries (Math), Worthington for Cox (Medicine), and Lowe for Pozzuto (Social Work). Also present for a portion of the meeting was Abrahamson for Tabrizi (Technology and Computer Science).

B. Announcements

1. We would like to ask that all Senators do the following to aid in reporting the minutes correctly:
 - a. To aid in identification, please stand when recognized to speak on issues.
 - b. To aid in clarification of motions, forms have been provided near each Senator. When making a motion or amendment, please fill out the form and forward it to the Chair of the Faculty.
 2. The Interim Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 16, 2003, Faculty Senate meeting:
 - 03-37 Revisions to Parts I. and VI. and Appendices D., J., L., X., and Y of the *ECU Faculty Manual*.
 - 03-38 Resolution requesting ECU faculty to 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.
 - 03-39 Revised College of Education, Health Sciences Library, and Department of Chemistry unit codes of operation.
 3. The next Board of Trustees' meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 24, 2003. Copies of the meeting agenda will be available in the Faculty Senate office.
 4. The Committee on Committees is charged with filling two upcoming alternate vacancies on the UNC Faculty Assembly. Information has been distributed to all faculty via the faculty listserv. Nomination forms are due in the Faculty Senate office by Monday, November 3, 2003.
 5. Candidate's portfolio of evaluative materials (teaching philosophy, nominating letter, list of courses taught, student and peer evaluations, and 3 letters of support from former students) for the University Award for Outstanding Teaching and Robert L. Jones Award for Outstanding Teaching should be submitted to the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee via the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex by Monday, December 1, 2003.
 6. Candidate's portfolio of evaluative materials for the Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Awards and the Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching should be submitted to the Faculty Development Center, 122 Ragsdale by Monday, December 1, 2003.
 7. Nominee's materials (departmental and unit review committee nominating letters, complete CV, and 3 letters from outside referees) for the ECU Awards for Excellence in Research or Creative Activity should be submitted to the Academic Awards Committee via the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex by Monday, December 1, 2003.
 8. February 26, 2004, is the last University Curriculum Committee meeting date for materials to appear in the *2004-2005 University Undergraduate Catalog* so curriculum materials must be submitted to the Committee by 5:00 on February 12, 2004.
- There has been an editorial revision made to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section III.B. Curriculum Development to read as follows (addition noted in bold print):
- "Steps to follow, in order, in seeking campus approval to plan or establish new programs, change a program's name, move programs, or discontinue programs:...."*

10. Jim Talton, Chair of the Board of Trustees, has announced that the following individuals have been named to the Chancellor's Search Committee:
 - Jim Talton, Chair, Board of Trustees
 - Stephen Showfety, Board of Trustees
 - David Brody, Board of Trustees
 - Margaret Ward, President of the Alumni Association and Board of Trustees
 - Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty and associate professor of accounting
 - Janice Daugherty, associate professor of family medicine
 - Martha Engelke, professor of nursing
 - Paul Gemperline, professor of chemistry
 - Ian Baer, student body president
 - Willie Lee, director of University Printing and Graphics
 - Billy Mills, president of the Pirate Club
 - Don Parrott, mayor of Greenville
 - Buster Humphreys, University Health Systems Board of Trustees (appointed 10-27-03)
11. *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix F. Graduate School Organization has been revised and can be viewed at the following web site: <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/FacultyManual2/AppendixF/AppF.htm>.

C. Bill Shelton, Interim Chancellor

Dr. Shelton began his remarks by acknowledging the recent administrative changes and assured the Senate that he was open to questions and would discuss the situation as freely as we wanted. Dr. Smith would address some of the issues. Shelton met with student leaders to help them realize that they were still going to class, sleeping in their dorm rooms and living as they had been before the changes; the point was that the institution is still functioning. While corporate views of the university structure may say, "it will not work," Shelton reminded us that the university structure is different from corporate structures; one or two people don't control it and make all the rules. Instead the university is a loosely coupled system that may not be a nice neat system, but it works. Shelton stressed that he never had a concern that this institution would continue to operate. We now have a challenge to go outside the university system and let people know that the institution is not weakened. The system, including the reorganizations, budget allocations, etc will be reviewed. Shelton stated that a new chancellor will probably not be in place earlier than July 1, but the institution will continue to function. The 4 areas of emphasis (teacher education, health education, cultural enrichment and economic development) are fitting to this institution. ECU must be the economic engine that drives this area. Initiatives have begun and will continue. Our goal will be to take our words and turn them into actual projects. We will continue to serve the students and communities of Eastern North Carolina; they are our primary responsibility. We have national recognition for some of our programs and we need to continue to support them. Shelton stated that ECU will continue to move forward and he will be willing to respond to "tough questions." He has asked Dr. Jim Smith to look at Academic Affairs and get a sense of the organization. Shelton stated that he wanted to reduce administrative costs and suggested that we may have become heavy in administration. Both Richard Brown and Smith will be looking at the division as Shelton continues to work with University Development, with the legislature, and the system leadership.

Niswander stated that he would open the floor for questions following Smith's comments.

D. Jim Smith, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Dr. Smith opened his remarks by reiterating Dr. Shelton's statement that the university was still functioning as it always has with faculty teaching and students attending classes. He further stated that he agreed to Dr. Shelton's request to take on this interim role for several reasons: 1. Dr. Shelton himself; Shelton has "won the support, enthusiasm and affection of so many different groups" more quickly than anyone else. Individuals at all levels have responded to him in a positive way and Smith thanked Shelton for stepping forward at this time. 2. Smith stated the history of achievement, both in Academic Affairs and in the University, as a whole is another reason to assume these responsibilities. During his 30+ years at ECU, he has observed leadership in gaining a medical school, leadership in bringing written standards to the faculty evaluation process, and later, leadership that moved ECU toward greater achievement in research, brought stability to the athletics program, and leadership that continued the advancement of the institution with Doctoral status, and institutional effectiveness that brought regional accreditation. Initiatives begun in the last two years will continue once the financial picture has emerged. Smith stated that he is proud to be a part of the endeavors to supplement and advance the tradition of quality and achievement. 3. Smith stated that the quality of the faculty, including the faculty leaders over the years, was another reason to assume the responsibility for Academic Affairs. And the importance of effective relationship with ECU Trustees, the Office of the President, and the Board of Governors is the 4th reason.

Smith continued by stating the values necessary in any human, especially in a professional setting: veracity, fidelity, autonomy, justice (fairness), beneficence, and non-munificence. He expressed his belief that "we must value effective and caring teaching, . . . successful research and creative activity," and support other avenues of service. "Teaching with no attention to research is eventually empty and research with no concern for teaching is eventually blind." Smith told the Senate to expect 3 things from him: communication, consensus building, and community building.

Smith then reviewed a number of practical matters that must be addressed. These included developing an understanding of current initiatives, reviewing problems and issues such as depletion of the discretionary budget, reviewing searches and the funding for new units, keeping overhead cost receipts in units, reviewing funding formula and proposed management system, allocating positions, evaluating international affairs over the next 18 months, and reviewing the organizational changes. Any additional changes will be subject to the appropriate processes. He apologized to the former ODU employees whose employment must be reviewed and issued an invitation to speak with members of College of Fine Arts and Communication.

Morrison (Chemistry) asked for Shelton's reaction to UNC-Chapel Hill's Carolina Covenant in which a limited number of students at poverty level could attend free of charge. He also noted that U of Virginia was looking at a similar program, and this past year a Senate committee considered the possibility of need-based scholarships. Shelton responded that in order to participate we would have to make certain we have the funds to pay for this kind of program. We would all agree that financial need should not be a barrier to an education, but there are inequities in funding in this state and we need to have discussions so that we should be in a position to invest in these programs. Philosophically, he clearly supports such a program but he also understands the challenges.

Niswander reported that Scholarship Committee was looking at a resolution that would request that Institutional Advancement include in their fund raising for the Centennial event an option for this very purpose. This resolution should come before the Senate in the next few months.

Painter (Allied Health Sciences) asked about the discussion of the possibility of discounted or free tuition for children of employees in order to retain faculty. Smith responded that this issue has been discussed but doesn't know what, if anything has been done. Shelton also responded that consideration of this issue should be a part of an agenda for the new chancellor. He stated that he was looking forward to shared governance that meant actually talking about issues with faculty without relying on a "contract," which was the case at Eastern Michigan, a union shop, where he served as president for 11 years.

Taggart (Music) welcomed Dr. Shelton and his decision to include Dr. Smith in the review of Academic Affairs. He also thanked Dr. Smith for the invitation to speak with members of Fine Arts and Communication and asked about the status of the search for a dean of the College. Smith responded that although we have several choices, he is inclined to suspend the search and then at appropriate time ask how we might move forward. Shelton added that a list of interim positions and vacancies had been compiled in order to indicate to Board those which we should move forward on and those we should hold. The Provost search will not go forward until a chancellor has been selected. Chief academic officer should be chancellor's choice. He will ask the Board to allow us to go forward with other searches at different levels.

Twarog (Art) concurred with Taggart and thanked Shelton and Smith for serving. In Art, there is interim leadership from faculty to the top and asked if the director position could be filled. If we wait until Chancellor position is filled, it could be some time before their leadership is in place. He asked that they consider continuing some searches, such as Director. Smith responded that appointment of the interim director is a possibility. He does want to meet with Art faculty. Shelton added that he agreed that we had too many "interims." Shelton himself is functioning in dual positions, as chancellor and as VC of University Development. He would support short-term contracts, rather than "interim" titles, because filling these administrative positions does affect other searches.

Scott (Academic Library Services) stated that, while he appreciates the support of shared governance, grievance committee members have been frustrated because chancellors seldom take recommendations of the committee. Shelton stated that he would have to have a valid reason to go against the committee's recommendation. He added that he never has assumed the system is efficient even though it may be effective.

Wall (Philosophy) questioned Dr. Smith how teaching and research go together and how does this work in light of Commission on Scholarship. Smith responded that is aware of the process of the Commission's report. Personally, there is room for moving toward applied research to see more immediate affects, but it is not his role as interim to make those decisions. To the critique that this would water down research, he responded that that would happen only if we allow it to.

Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Niswander detailed the process for creating a Chancellor Search Committee. He stated that the UNC Code Appendix 1, on selection of a chancellor reads: "In the event of a vacancy in the chancellorship, the Board of Trustees shall establish a search committee composed of representatives of the Board of Trustees, the faculty, the student body, and the alumni. Upon the establishment of the search committee, the Chair of the Board of Trustees and the President shall jointly establish a budget and identify staff for the committee. The search committee through its chair shall make a preliminary report to the President when the committee is preparing a schedule of interviews of those persons it considers to constitute the final list and from among whom it anticipates the Trustees nominations will be chosen, and the President will be given an opportunity to interview each of those candidates. The Board of Trustees, following receipt of the report of the search committee, shall recommend at least two names for consideration by the President in designating a nominee for the chancellorship for approval of the Board of Governors." Salient points are that the Board of Trustees establishes the search committee; the search committee makes a preliminary report to the Board of Trustees, who, in turn, recommends to the President for the approval of the Board of Governors. In discussions with the Chair of the Board of Trustees, Niswander sought to increase the number of faculty on the search committee and to strike a balance between the faculty and board representation. Those goals were met. Faculty representation is 4 on a 12-member committee compared to 4 on a 15-member committee in the previous search. Board representation is 3 along with the president of the alumni association and student body president who are both board members. He referenced a report he compiled that detailed the breakdown of faculty proportions that may have been a factor in determining the number of faculty members selected to serve on the Chancellor's Search Committee.

Niswander continued that he personally believed that faculty should be able to see and interact with chancellor candidates once the final group has been identified, but such a review is not typical. Regardless of the outcome of resolution before the Senate today, he will express his views about campus visits by finalists. If Senate agrees with his view, a resolution stating such will help his argument.

Martinez (Foreign Language) questioned how faculty members were chosen. Niswander reported that he gave names to the board in a discussion with the chair of the Board of Trustees. Martinez (Foreign Language) asked if Niswander would reveal the names. Niswander replied that it would be inappropriate; it was a private conversation. Individuals were probably not even aware they were on the list.

Martinez (Foreign Language) further expressed concern that Humanities and Social Science professors from the College of Arts and Sciences have not been included in various administrative searches since she has been here. Professors in the Sciences have been chosen from the College. She asked Niswander to express her concerns to the Board of Trustees, since professors that have been left out of the committees do teach a large percentage of the students. Niswander agreed to pass along her concerns to the Board but also reminded the Senators that no search committee will please all people because of the limitations. In the case of search for Chancellor Eakin, there was a social sciences professor, although this was not during Martinez' employment.

Scott (Academic Library Services) asked if the Faculty Senate would ever be able to elect members for a search committee. Niswander stated that would be entirely a decision of the Board; the UNC Code states that the Board of Trustees selects the committee. Scott (Academic Library Services) expressed that an election procedure might be a more sharing and democratic way. Niswander stated that he would report Scott's concerns along with Martinez' to the Board.

Pravica (Mathematics) stated that he is concerned that faculty choices for the search committee lacked in democratic representation and suggested that the faculty have a policy so that we have rotation when administrative change occurs.

Jones (Social Work) reminded Senators that elected officers were elected to relay information to Trustees and the administration. He stated that he would back any recommendations made by the elected officers.

McMillen (Medicine) also spoke against the Senate electing the members of search committees.

F. Question Period

There were no additional questions.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

Resolution on the Selection of the ECU Chancellor

Zach Robinson (Mathematics) spoke briefly to the resolution that had been amended at the last Senate meeting. The discussion began with the motion on the table at the end of the September 16, 2003, Senate meeting to delete the reference to the "AAUP". Sprague (Physics) called the question. The motion to delete the reference to the AAUP was approved as presented. Following this action, Professor Robinson moved to strike and replace the current resolution with the new one noted as attachment 7. in the Senate agenda. The motion to strike and replace was accepted. The resolution read as follows:

Rationale:

- 1) *Previous candidates for high-level administrative positions have come before faculty groups in an open forum;*
- 2) *Professional search companies have shown little evidence of being able to provide quality candidates;*
- 3) *Strong faculty participation in administrative searches would be consistent with past practices, including searches for chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, directors and departmental chairs.*

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that:

- 1) *no less than one-third of the voting members of the search committee for the next ECU Chancellor be faculty members both nominated and elected by the Faculty Senate;*
- 2) *each of the final three candidates, for the position of chancellor, present to the faculty, in open meetings before the search committee reaches its final decision, their views on higher education and how they intend to apply their philosophies to the running of ECU;*
- 3) *the faculty should have the privilege of expressing its opinion on each candidate to the search committee by means of a written questionnaire.*

Tedesco (English) moved to delete the #1 under "Be it resolved". Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) spoke against the amendment because the wording does not retroactively refer to current search, but can apply for future chancellor searches. Christian (Business) also spoke against the amendment to show the Board that we agree with their having 1/3 of the committee as faculty representatives. Martinez (Foreign Language) asked for clarification about the time frame of the resolution and if it refers only to the selection of this search. Niswander responded that a Senate resolution remains in effect until the Senate changes it. Martinez (Foreign Language), with this clarification, spoke against the amendment. Sugar (Education) called the question. Discussion closed. Motion was denied.

Cott (Academic Library Services) moved to reword the title to read "Resolution on the Selection of ECU Chancellors". Twarog (Art) spoke in support of the motion and offered a friendly amendment to rephrase the reference to the Chancellor throughout the document to read "the position of an ECU Chancellor." Cope (Psychology) questioned the need for "ECU." Gares (Geography) questioned the use of the word "position," since we are selecting a person not a position. Following a brief break, the motion to amend the title to read "Resolution on the Selection of ECU Chancellors" and for the #1 Be It Resolved to read "...search committee for the ECU Chancellors...." and to delete the word "three" in the #2 Be It Resolved. The motion to amend was approved as presented.

Morrison (Chemistry) moved to delete #2 under the rationale. Hanrahan (Medicine) questioned if the rationale would remain with the final resolution. Chair Niswander responded yes. The motion to delete #2 was accepted.

Sugar (Education) moved to add a #4 under Be It Resolved to read as follows: "Results of this questionnaire will be distributed to faculty members via the ECU listserv in a timely manner." Abrahamson (Technology and Computer Science) questioned whether or not we should use the listserv as means of distribution since it may or may not exist in the future while the resolution is still valid.

Robinson (Mathematics) suggested that the wording be amended to "Results of this questionnaire will be made available to all faculty members in the Faculty Senate office in a timely manner." Sugar accepted this as a friendly amendment. The motion to add #4 was accepted.

Following a lengthy discussion, the Resolution on the Selection of ECU Chancellors was approved as amended.

RESOLUTION #03-41

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee

Tim Hudson (Mathematics), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the committee minutes of September 25, 2003. There was no discussion and the minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-42**

B. Calendar Committee

Jeff Phipps (Fine Arts and Communication), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the revised Fall 2003 University Calendar to accommodate the days missed due to Hurricane Isabel. He noted that the three semester hour TTh classes could have 15 classes after Fall Break to make up the 75 minutes missed five minutes at a time. The 50-minute MTWTh classes (such as PHYS 1050, BIOL 1060, MATH 2171) would make up the 50 minutes missed five minutes at a time over 10 TTh classes or just meet at their usual time on the Saturday makeup day or on a Friday. The Thursday night classes would make up the 150 minutes missed twenty minutes at a time during the seven Thursday nights after Fall Break.

Gares (Geography) questioned how to add the 5 minutes to the end of classes at the expense of the 15 minutes between classes. Following a brief discussion, the revised Fall 2003 University Calendar was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #03-43

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented for information only the Request for Authorization to Plan a PhD Program in Technology. He noted that this request was approved by voice vote without dissent within the Committee and a letter of support had been forwarded to Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton. Sugar (Education) asked what the particular technology was referenced in the proposal. Brown responded that the term referred to digital communication and related processes and has three concentrations. Proposal comes from College of Technology and Computer Science. Niswander reminded the Faculty Senate that the Permission to Plan was the initial step in the process.

D. Faculty Governance Committee

Dee Dee Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section I. adding "*demonstrable, bona fide institutional financial exigency or major curtailment or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program.*" She noted that in light of the discussion at the last Senate meeting, the phrase "*demonstrable, bona fide institutional financial exigency or major curtailment or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program*" reflected the exact wording found in another section of Appendix D. under Section VII. Termination of Faculty Employment. Also included in this section is an explanation for the wording and process by which the employment decision is made. Addition of these words addresses consistency in the code. Link to Appendix D. Section VII.: <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/FacultyManual2/AppendixD/d7.htm>

Wall (Philosophy) questioned if curtailing a major was a reason to terminate a tenured faculty member. Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) responded that Appendix D clearly outlines the process.

Hanrahan (Medicine) also questioned terminating a tenured faculty member in the case of elimination of a teaching, research, or public grant or program. Tenure shouldn't be granted on the basis of receiving such a grant.

Robinson (Mathematics) expressed concern with the use of the word "or" in the statement and believes the AAUP position would be that the tenure of a faculty member should not be contingent on the number of majors in a program. If the word were "and," the relationship would be clear between the financial exigency and curtailing a degree track and the employment of people in that track. Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) responded that Appendix D, section 7, explains what happens to faculty if a major program is curtailed. It does not say that a faculty member will lose his/her position, but refers to a report to the Chancellor that must include options. Faculty member could be assigned other duties.

Morrison (Chemistry) stated that the wording comes straight from the UNC code. Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) asked the Senate members to remember that the motion before them is to make code consistent.

Jones (Social Work) expressed that all programs and degree tracks have peaks and valleys and these programs are not eliminated simply because enrollment is down and program is unpopular.

Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) stated her belief that the purpose of tenure is to guard against the unpopular, whether the unpopular discipline or view. She also commented that, in her personal view, we, as a faculty, are much better protected to have this process spelled out in the code.

Preston (Education) questioned whether a faculty member held tenure with a department or with the University and asked if a department ceased to exist, could a faculty member lose tenure. Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) could not definitively answer his question.

Wall (Philosophy) questioned the difference between financial exigency and financial emergency and does not understand why it needs to be added. Glascoff (Health & Human Performance) could not explain why it was not included originally,

but it does need to be added for consistency and balance and to avoid contradiction. Professor Ferrell informed her that any elimination is considered a due process issue.

Sprague (Physics) expressed concern at the ambiguity of the word "major." He read it to mean "large scale" curtailment rather than a reference to a degree track and suggested perhaps the wording should be changed.

Scott (Academic Library Services) reminded the Senators that the proposed wording was currently in the Board of Governors Code and that the proposed wording was not a new policy. Link to the UNC Code, Chapter VI:
http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/policies/CHAPTER_VI_only_web.htm#chapterVI

Rigsby (Geology) agreed with Professor Scott and referred to the middle part of the Section 7 as a sufficient statement. She spoke against the amendment as being redundant.

Finley (Human Ecology) stated that it was better to repeat the phrasing as in other sections for those faculty members who don't look in other sections. The terminology needs to be consistent with the UNC code and throughout our own code.

Robinson (Mathematics) stated that, although he understood why the wording is necessary, he requested that the Faculty Assembly delegates consider discussing the issue of "major curtailment" with the UNC Faculty Assembly body at their next meeting.

Scott (Academic Library Services) reiterated the point that this wording appears elsewhere in Appendix D and serves as additional clarification. The policy has been in effect for a number of years.

Following a lengthy discussion, the revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section I. was approved as presented.
RESOLUTION #03-44

Professor Glascoff then requested that the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L. Section C.2. revising the text to include "school or college" be withdrawn from Senate consideration at this time. She requested that the Faculty Governance Committee have more time to discuss the various issues relating to this revision.

E. Faculty Grievance Committee

Gene Hughes (Business), Chair of the Committee, presented the annual report of the Faculty Grievance Committee that included a report from the Chair of the Faculty on past grievances. Hughes gave a brief overview of how the report is compiled. Scott (Academic Library Services) asked how many grievances within the past 5 years had been forwarded to the Chancellor. Hughes responded that the Committee averaged 1 hearing a year and estimated about 5-6 reports within the past 5 years. Scott then asked how many of those had the Chancellor accepted the recommendations of the Committee. Hughes responded that some committee reports are rejected at the Chancellor level and that the Chancellor can reject committee recommendations whenever he/she agrees with an administrative decision. Following a brief discussion of the report, the annual report of the Faculty Grievance Committee was accepted as presented.

F. University Budget Committee

Henry Ferrell (History), Chair of the Committee, discussed the overall University Budget Situation and introduced Chuck Hawkins, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, to address specific questions about the budget. Mr. Hawkins discussed in details the budget figures presented to the Senate detailing the current budget situation State appropriations, enrollment increases, and expenditures.

Scott (Academic Library Services) questioned how the cap on out-of-state enrollment would affect the budget. Hawkins responded that he was not certain. Niswander reported that sometimes appropriations are adjusted downward when tuition has been increased.

Ferrell requested that Senators discuss this with their colleagues and forward any budgetary concerns or suggestions to the University Budget Committee.

Agenda Item VI. New Business

Niswander stated that the Senate needed to vote on whether or not to accept this item of new business since it was not included in the agenda approved by the Agenda Committee. Varner (Academic Library Services) asked if this was a time sensitive issue. Wuensch (Psychology) replied that the action is scheduled to take place at the end of October.

With no further objection to accept new business, Karl Wuensch (Psychology), Chair of the Faculty Information Technology Review Committee, presented a report on the critical update push being proposed by ITCS. He stated that the Committee had voted its approval of a proposed script that would assure that all networked Windows computers on campus have installed the critical updates that are necessary for security purposes. Once implemented, which could be as soon as the end of October 2003, the script would run every time a Windows computer logs into the network. The script would check the current patch level of the machine. If there was a critical security update that had not yet been applied to the machine, the update would automatically be downloaded and installed. If a reboot was necessary, a message would pop up that stated that the user would need to reboot the machine for the update to be in effect.

Professor Wuensch stated that when there were infected Windows computers on the campus network, the potential for disruption of network traffic was great. For example, on Friday afternoon, the 3rd of October 2003, the University's network was seriously disrupted by computers infected by the Welchia worm. Over 800 networked computers were infected by this worm, nearly 200 of them being computers in faculty/staff offices or campus labs. This network disruption made it impossible to connect to the Windows Update site to download critical patches, interfered with off-campus access to servers and email system, and so on. The patch that could have prevented these computers from being infected by this worm had been available since July of 2003. Clearly, the University's efforts to teach campus users to update their machines had failed. He stated that the Committee had asked ITCS to provide a "sandbox," an area where users who wish not to be required to keep their machines updated can be networked in such a way that infection of their machines will not have serious impact on the rest of the main network. It would, however, take several months to construct such a sandbox, and it was likely that persons who elect to enter the sandbox would not be happy with it – their computers would likely become compromised or experience network difficulties whenever any of the other computers in the sandbox were infected.

Following a brief discussion, the Senate accepted the Committee's report as presented.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Tovey
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate office

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 7, 2003, MEETING

03-41 Selection of ECU Chancellors as follows:

Rationale:

- 1) Previous candidates for high-level administrative positions have come before faculty groups in an open forum;
- 2) Strong faculty participation in administrative searches would be consistent with past practices, including searches for chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, directors and departmental chairs.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that:

- 1) No less than one-third of the voting members of the search committee for the ECU Chancellors be faculty members both nominated and elected by the Faculty Senate; and
- 2) Each of the final candidates, for the position of chancellor, present to the faculty, in open meetings before the search committee reaches its final decision, their views on higher education and how they intend to apply their philosophies to the running of ECU; and
- 3) The faculty should have the privilege of expressing its opinion on each candidate to the search committee by means of a written questionnaire; and
- 4) Results of this questionnaire will be made available to faculty members in the Faculty Senate office in a timely manner.

Disposition: Chancellor

03-42 Curriculum matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee minutes of September 25, 2003.

Disposition: Chancellor

03-43 Revised Fall 2003 University Calendar to accommodate the days missed due to Hurricane Isabel.

Disposition: Chancellor

3-44 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section I.

Disposition: Chancellor, Board of Trustees, Board of Governors