

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

FULL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 9, 2003

The fourth regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, December 9, 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 November 11, 2003, were approved as distributed with one addition.

"Dr. Lewis announced that a grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) named ECU as one of six Bariatric Surgery Centers of Excellence in the US. The principal investigator is Dr. Walter Pories (Medicine), with several other important co-principal investigators, including Dr. Mohammad Tabrizi (Computer Science).

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Twarog (Art) and Meredith and Willson (Medicine).

Alternates present were: Professors Lawrence for Rigsby (Geology), Estes for McGhee (Health and Human Performance), Robinson for Ries (Mathematics), Gilliland for Dobbs (Medicine), Moll for Taggart (Music), and Lowe for Pozzuto (Social Work).

B. Announcements

1. The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the November 11, 2003, Faculty Senate meeting:
 - 03-45 Approval of the Fall 2003 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the completion of degree requirements.
 - 03-46 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the October 9, 2003, and October 23, 2003, Committee meetings.
 - 03-47 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.R. relating to reporting of grades.
 - 03-48 Resolution on the Role of the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
 - 03-49 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D. Section V. relating to appeals.
 - 03-50 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. Section VI. relating to acceptable models for code units.
 - 03-51 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L. Section C.2. relating to organizing into self-governing autonomous units.
 - 03-52 Student Computer and Technology Fee Innovative Project Proposal.
 - 03-53 Revised Academic Library Services' Unit Code of Operation.
2. The Committee on Committees has been charged to seek volunteers to serve on the various academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. Faculty are strongly encouraged to participate in this component of shared faculty governance and return the volunteer form by February 15, 2004. Faculty members have two ways to note their preference for service on the various standing University committees.
 - 1) At One Stop <https://onestop4.ecu.edu/onestop/> a faculty member signs in using his or her user name and password and after submitting that information, he or she clicks on "Faculty Committee Volunteer Form" under the Employee Section and completes the

committee volunteer preference form. This information is then submitted directly to the Committee on Committees via the Faculty Senate office.

2) A faculty member may complete the volunteer preference form that is available on the Faculty Senate web site at <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/MiscDocuments/EmailCall.htm> and forward the completed form via email to the Faculty Senate office at faculty senate@mail.ecu.edu.

3. Letters concerning unit elections for the 2004-2005 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.
4. Faculty interested in periodically receiving past copies of "*The Chronicle of Higher Education*" are asked to call the Faculty Senate office at ext. 328-6537 and place their name on a list for distribution.
5. A special thanks is extended to Interim Chancellor Bill Shelton for providing the additional food and wine for today's meeting.
6. Mike Vanderven, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, apologizes to those faculty members who received parking tickets following the last Faculty Senate meeting. Faculty Senators are reminded that parking on main campus (even in special held parking spaces) requires either an ECU parking decal or a \$1.00 special use one-day parking pass. The only other option for faculty members parking on campus without an ECU parking decal is to use one of the many parking meters across campus.

C. Bill Shelton, Interim Chancellor

Interim Chancellor Shelton referred the Senators to the Critical Issues - General Themes report at their desks. These issues were defined by members of the university community, including faculty, students, and administrators. These items will be the focal points for meetings next semester. Some of this information has been woven into our strategic plan that will be released for discussion soon.

Division of Research has been split from Economic Development and Community Engagement. John Lehman will head the research division along with Paul Gemperline. Shelton provided two reasons for this split. 1. With a move toward a research institution and several new PhD programs, we need to create a research support mechanism to help from the beginning—including identifying funding sources—to completion. He has put Research and Graduate Studies together once again. This was an internal priority. 2. Economic Development of the region is an external priority and we need to determine how this outreach will coordinate with the institution. Temporarily this division will report to Shelton's office. He will not be creating a new division at this time but wants to focus on the activities. Bob Thompson has been named to help define all of the activities with implications for economic development and community engagement throughout the campus. The Senate can expect a status report early next semester.

Finally, he has asked the Executive council and the Cabinet to identify the specific activities that we will complete over the next 6 months and he will report these to the Senate. He is still working on the leadership program.

D. Jim Smith, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Professor Smith provided the Faculty Senate with written comments detailing budget matters, deans' searches, undergraduate engineering degree, review of Academic Affairs salary increases and searches, and the University Spring planning process. His written comments also included copies of the old and new Division of Academic Affairs' Organizational Charts (old chart and draft of new chart).

Smith briefly reviewed his written comments. He wanted Senators to know that is pleased to be working with Dr. Shelton and asked for the Senators' support. He also welcomed John Lehman to the senior administrative team. In the organization chart, he identified a service learning "box" and stated that we need to catch up with other institutions and added that this does not contradict the importance of the research component.

He then reviewed some of the changes to the organization chart; it has been approved by the Chancellor and will be presented to the Board of Trustees. Selby-Lucas will be joining the faculty in the spring in the College of Business. Student Life is a separate division again. Taffy Clayton will be reporting to the Chancellor as the EEO officer and Paul Tschetter reports to Lehman and Gemperline in the research division. Smith will continue to review the changes with the deans. Smith then pointed out a number of other special assistants including: Davis, special projects; Rosina Chia, global initiatives; and Muller, academic initiatives. The collaborative teams have been formed and include faculty members.

Concerning the budget, Smith reported that of the 14 million dollars budgeted for Distance Education enrollment increases; ECU is to receive 12 million, subject to legislative approval, of course. Smith has asked the Deans to report on 107 monies (DE).

Dean search in the College of Fine Arts and Communication will be an external one and Mike Dorsey has indicated that at this point he will not be a candidate. He will return to the classroom. Dean Ernie Uhr of Business will retire at the end of the summer and Smith thanked him for his leadership over the last 21 years.

Smith stated that a degree in general engineering in the College of Technology and Computer Science has passed the curriculum committee and will come to the Senate. If approved at campus and college levels by June 30, 2004, planning money will be released to the university from the Office of the President. He said that a review of the 2002-03 Academic Affairs salary increases and searches is underway and Smith will report in January. The University Planning Process should be complete prior to February Senate meeting.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) asked about the enrollment of international students, which at this time is the lowest it has ever been. Smith responded that he is aware of the problems and Rosina Chia's inclusion as a special assistant is in part a response. He also reiterated his support for Charles Lyons and believes that he can effect some changes. The goal is to have a strategic plan for that office within 6 months. He will share that plan with Senate.

Martinez (Foreign Languages) asked about last year's special task force for fixed term faculty and if multi-year contracts could be offered. Smith stated that he is aware of the issues but has not done anything to this point. Obviously, this remains a tough problem because we probably won't get the additional positions that we need. Multi-year are contracts seem like a feasible solution, but he will

Attempt to have something substantive on that issue.

Hall (Psychology) expressed concern about the increasing number of fixed-term faculty (about 1/3) and how that is changing the shape of the university. Smith agrees that this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed. While he has no immediate solution, he will continue to study the issue and report back.

E. Jim Talton, Chair of the ECU Board of Trustees and Chancellor Search Committee
Mr. Talton was unable to attend the Senate meeting and Phyllis Horns, Secretary of the Search Committee was asked to speak briefly on his behalf. Professor Horns noted the web site devoted to the Chancellor Search Committee <http://www.news.ecu.edu/search2003/search2003.html>.

Chair Niswander announced that Chair of the Board of Trustees and of the Chancellor Search Committee, Jim Talton, was unable to attend due to business demands. Dr. Horns, secretary to the committee agreed to speak to the Senate and Mr. Talton agreed to meet with Faculty Senators on Thursday morning at 9:30 in Mendenhall 244.

Horns reported that ads had been placed and applications were beginning to arrive. She asked the Senate to encourage interested individuals whom they know to apply. The next step in the process is a screening of the application in terms of the leadership statement and specified qualifications. Time line calls for first cut during the first week of February. The Board of Trustees and the system would like the search conducted as quickly as possible. A link to the search is available on the ECU website.

Pravica (Mathematics) asked about the Senate resolution, which calls for specific qualifications for the chancellor. He expressed concern about the consultant's comments about a corporate model for the university. Horns responded that the committee is committed to finding the individual who is the best fit for university and the ad reflects the qualities that the Senate included in its resolution. The search consultant felt that her comments in the newspaper were taken out of context, for we are not looking to depart radically from the description in the ad, but the committee must maintain an open mind to look critically at all applicants, recognizing that we are an academic institution and have values we all hold as highly important. Niswander agreed with Horns assessment and reminded Senators that newspapers are limited by space.

Sprague (Physics) stated that he was unable to find the link to the chancellor search on the ECU home page and asked exactly how to access the committee's webpage. Horns reported that the link is through the News Bureau. <http://www.news.ecu.edu/search2003/search2003.html>

Martinez (Foreign Language) asked if the committee had made a decision about open forum. Horn reported that the committee has discussed at length the campus community's desire for an open process. However, they feel a decision at this point is premature and will be made at the appropriate time.

Robinson (Mathematics) referred to the October 7 Senate resolution, which recommended that 1/3 of search committee be faculty. Since the chair recently added a member who is not faculty, and one of the faculty members is now in administration, he asked what procedure will be used to add a faculty member. Horns suggested that this question should be asked of Mr. Talton, since he appointed the committee. He has taken very seriously the views of community and faculty in appointing members. She added that she couldn't speak for him.

Wall (Philosophy) expressed that it would be to our benefit to meet with the candidates and also that it would be of benefit to the finalists to meet with the Senate. Horns responded that there are sitting Presidents and Chancellors who would jeopardize their careers to be part of an open search. She, too, would appreciate the opportunity to have finalists meet faculty, but the final list will help to determine that decision. Substantive and valid reasons do exist for not having an open search from the beginning.

Robinson (Mathematics) expressed appreciation that Talton was willing to meet with the Senate but feels it unfortunate that he could not, since meeting with the Senate can build trust. He then asked if there were plans for Talton to meet on monthly basis with the Senate to discuss the progress of the search. Niswander responded that Talton would be present at the February meeting. Two other members of the committee will be invited to attend the January meeting. Horns added that the faculty is key to the search but it is important to remember that this committee will report to the Board of Trustees who will make the recommendation to the Office of the President.

F. Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Niswander began his comments with a report that faculty members had been appointed to the collaborative teams and thanked the faculty members who are serving. He urged the Senators to read the critical issues report. Students, deans, alumni all contributed to these issues in addition to the faculty senate and the report is indicative of the diversity of issues facing the university. Search for Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance is proceeding, has narrowed the field to 3 candidates who will be meeting with search committee and other constituencies, including Faculty Senate budget committee, and a decision is expected shortly after the holiday break.

G. Puri Martinez, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Martinez presented a written report on the Faculty Assembly meeting of November 21, 2003, and briefly discussed various issues included in the report. There are three attachments to this report including an UNC Faculty Salary Increases report, Legislative Update, and a report on the Selected Measures of Out-Of-Classroom Faculty Activity. (All of these reports are available in the Faculty Senate office, ext. 6537)

Martinez specifically pointed to a number of issues on her report: high priority for salary increases, the Delaware Study and its use for out-of-classroom faculty activities, discrepancies among campuses in post tenure review and whether there needs to be system-wide approach. She added that the intent of the Delaware Study is not to require more production from faculty

Pravica (Mathematics) asked about the Delaware Study and its implications. Martinez responded that is important to understand what faculty does outside the classroom and the intent of the Delaware Study is not to require more production from faculty.

Sprague (Physics) asked about faculty salary issues and other compensation benefits. Martinez responded that the administration is aware of problems with benefits. Faculty Senate at Chapel Hill has asked administration for a study comparing their benefits with others and that is tool UNC-CH Senate will use to look at the issue. Sprague suggested that we take similar action. Niswander responded that Faculty Welfare Committee is considering this issue.

I. 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. No additional questions were offered 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

Tim Hudson (Mathematics), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of November 13, 2003, Committee meeting. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-56**

B. Agenda Committee

Puri Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed 2004-2005 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates. There was no discussion and the report was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-57**

C. Academic Standards Committee

Jim Decker (Health and Human Performance), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed changes to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey.

Wall (Philosophy) asked if these were just an extension of the current questions and, if so, he was against the changes because it was not clear what the survey measured. Decker responded that no, this was not just an extension. It further details the questions for specific types of classes. Charles Rich (Institutional Effectiveness) stated that he believes studies of validity had been done when the measure was first adopted.

Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) agreed with Professor Wall. He noted that he had not seen a validity test and questioned what the SOIS actually measured. He requested the validity tests from the institution that developed the survey be made available. And if it has not been validated, it should be validated before we revise it. Rich offered to look into the process, and noted that the survey was designed at ECU.

Sprague (Physics) stated that he had a problem with basing a career decision on one number—the results of one question. He stated that answers from students for all of the questions were good for instructors to help them improve themselves but reiterated his concern about how the results were used.

Pravica (Mathematics) reminded the Senate of the difficulties of creating such an instrument. The results are a compromise of many different views. McMillen (Medicine) noted that it was only one measure, and, since one could receive low scores and be an excellent teacher, it should not be used as the only measure for evaluating faculty teaching. Warren (Education) reminded faculty members that peer review was also an important measure. The survey is one measure, not **the** measure.

Brown (Education) asked if this revision was primarily to provide more specialized questions for different types of classes, lab and field, classes and supervisors of these classes. Decker replied that yes, in the case of education, for example, a student teacher's supervisor might use these questions as a guide. Brown then asked about the surveys for online courses. Decker replied that it has been difficult to get responses to the surveys from distance education students. Niswander added that the return rate for DE students was abysmal—only about 20% university wide.

Gares (Geography) asked for clarification about who the evaluator is and who is being evaluated in terms of the questions for the field-based courses. Decker replied that the field-based supervisor would be able to use the survey. The language for that may need to be clarified.

Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) reiterated his concern about the advisability of revising this instrument for field-based and lab courses and its continued use as a basis for decisions about tenure and promotion without evidence of the validity of the instrument as it stands.

Wall (Philosophy) stated that since we did not know what the SOIS measured on pedagogical terms, he doubted that we were getting accurate data. He suggested that this tool not be used or revised until the Academic Standards Committee had investigated it as a tool of evaluation.

Pravica (Math) noted that he served on the Teaching Effectiveness Committee when they formulated this measuring tool and that it was a very time consuming task. The same issues raised at this meeting were all discussed at the time of the last revision several years ago.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) questioned how to evaluate student's learning at the administrative level. He stated that many institutions have not resolved this issue.

Following discussion, the proposed changes to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-58**

D. Committee on Committees

Henry Ferrell (History), Chair of the Committee presented a revised University Athletics Committee charge. The revision includes the addition of the "Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs" as an ex-officio member without vote, but with all other parliamentary privileges. The word "alternates" was also changed to "designees". There was no discussion and the revised University Athletics Committee charge was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-59**

E. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented recommendations pertaining to unit evaluations. Morrison (Chemistry) asked if these recommendations would require changes to the *ECU Faculty Manual*. Chair Niswander responded no. There was no further discussion and the recommendations pertaining to unit evaluations were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #03-60**

F. Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee

John Reisch (Business), Chair of the Committee, presented a resolution to aid students in poverty.

Professor Jim McKernan spoke briefly to the group on the importance of this resolution. There were no questions and the proposed resolution to aid students in poverty was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #03-61

5. University Budget Committee

Henry Ferrell (History), Chair of the Committee, presented a report on the Campus Based Tuition Request and the Proposed Use of the Funds. Included in the report were several handouts: Correspondence to the Board of Trustees on the SCT Banner Fee and Campus Initiated Tuition Proposals, Critical Funding Needs for Campus-Initiated Tuition Increase, School of Medicine's Proposal, and the University's Proposal. The Faculty Senate office (ext. 6537) also has copies of the State Budget Summary Report and UNC Bonds Projects Report for interested faculty.

Gares (Geography) stated that he was concerned about salary increases and noted that the University had never dealt with the issue of increases for faculty who are promoted. He stated that faculty members receive 2 promotions throughout their academic career and currently there is nothing offered for compensation with these promotions. He suggested that someone or an assigned group, perhaps through the Senate, draft a statement that reads "You will be rewarded for promotion with \$____." He noted again that with each promotion faculty may or may not receive compensation.

Christian (Business) noted that this point has been made in the report but a change in salary policy must happen at the higher level. Some of the disparity has been the result of new faculty hired at higher salaries than the faculty already working at or above their levels.

Following discussion, the Committee's report was accepted.

Agenda Item VI. New Business

David Pravica (Mathematics) presented a resolution on the Chancellor Search Committee. He noted that the percentage of faculty representation on the search committee had been decreased with the addition of an additional non-faculty member and of one faculty member's recent administrative appointment. Only 3 of the 13 members are faculty. He requested that the Senate approve this resolution to ask Chair Talton to add a faculty member, elected by the Senate, to the search committee.

Finley (Human Ecology) questioned what happens if this resolution is passed, along with the others. Our requests are not binding and if the others have been ignored, why do it again.

McMillen (Medicine) stated that this resolution sounded like the faculty were whining and does a disservice to faculty. He suggested that faculty representation doesn't guarantee success and noted an unsuccessful hire a number of years ago when the faculty was involved.

Reisch (Business) wondered why we were arguing about ½-percentage-point discrepancy in the number of faculty on the search committee.

Robinson (Math) stated that the Faculty Senate should address this issue because Chair Talton had expanded the Committee after the first Senate resolution requesting further faculty involvement and failed to add additional faculty members. He stressed this resolution is legitimate and should be taken seriously. Faculty have a great interest in who will be selected to lead them and Robinson supports the resolution to add another faculty member to the Search Committee to be an advocate for faculty and not as an affront to the Chairman.

Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) spoke in support of the resolution and noted two important things about the UNC Faculty Assembly: its informality in relating to Molly Broad, General Administration, etc. and its use of resolutions to request action from the administration. This resolution may be repetitive, but it isn't redundant; repetition is often how we learn. She stated her desire to cooperate with the Board of Trustees and this resolution lets them know.

Tabrizi (Computer Science) questioned the difference between those faculty members selected to serve on the Search Committee and the administrators. Faculty members are still faculty members even if they assume administrative duties. He stated that the faculty should be more flexible. As an example, Paul Gemperline was an excellent faculty member even though he had recently taken on administrative duties.

Sprague (Physics) asked if the resolution was asking for one or two faculty members to be added to the committee. Pravica responded one.

Ciesielski (Industry and Technology) spoke against the motion because the number of faculty did not matter if the "1/3 faculty" was present.

Pravica (Math) stated that he respected Paul Gemperline as a friend and chemist and was not speaking unkind of him.

Wall (Philosophy) questioned if the newest member added to the Committee by Chair Talton a voting member. Niswander responded that yes, all members on the committee were voting members.

Following a standing vote, the resolution on the Chancellor Search Committee failed by a vote of 17 to 27.

There was no further business to come before the Faculty Senate, the meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Tovey
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of English

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate office

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 9, 2003, MEETING

03-56 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the November 13, 2003, University Curriculum Committee meeting.

Disposition: Chancellor

03-57 2004-2005 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee Meeting Dates.

Agenda Committee will meet: Faculty Senate will meet:

August 31, 2004	September 14, 2004
September 28, 2004	October 12, 2004
October 26, 2004	November 9, 2004
November 23, 2004	December 7, 2004
January 11, 2005	January 25, 2005
February 8, 2005	February 22, 2005
March 8, 2005	March 22, 2005
April 5, 2005	April 19, 2005
	April 26, 2005 Organizational Meeting

Disposition: Faculty Senate

03-58 Changes to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey as follows:

Current SOIS	Add these to the LAB COURSES	Add these to the FIELD BASED COURSES
1. The instructor has created an atmosphere of helpfulness	1. The lab instructor has created an atmosphere of helpfulness	1. The ECU instructor has created an atmosphere of helpfulness
2. The instructor has informed students about criteria used for grading	2. The lab instructor has informed students about criteria used for grading	2. The ECU instructor has informed students about criteria used for evaluating the field experience including grading
3. The instructor has made the objectives of this course clear	3. The lab instructor has made the objectives of this laboratory course clear	3. The ECU instructor has made the objectives of this course clear
4. The instructor has been well prepared for each class	4. The instructor has been well prepared for each lab session	4. The ECU instructor has been well prepared for each meeting
5. The instructor has shown enthusiasm in teaching this course	5. The instructor has shown enthusiasm in teaching this lab	5. The ECU instructor has shown enthusiasm in supervising this course
6. The instructor's course evaluation methods (quizzes, exams, papers, etc) have been fair	6. The lab instructor's course evaluation methods (quizzes, exams, papers, etc) have been fair	6. The ECU instructor's course evaluation methods (quizzes, exams, papers, etc) have been fair
7. The textbooks used have been appropriate to the course	7. The lab manuals used have been appropriate to the course	7. The textbooks or other reading materials used have been appropriate to the course
8. This class has challenged me to learn course material, concepts, and skills	8. This lab has challenged me to learn course material, concepts, and skills	8. This class has challenged me to acquire skills related to my professional and academic ambitions
9. The instructor's syllabus has clarified the expectations of the course	9. The instructor's syllabus has clarified the expectations of the lab	9. The ECU instructor's syllabus has clarified the expectations of the course
10. The instructor has provided the opportunity to ask questions	10. The lab instructor has provided the opportunity to ask questions	10. The ECU instructor has provided the opportunity to ask questions
11. The assignments, including reading and projects, have	11. The assignments, including reading and lab activities, have contributed to my	11. The assignments, including reading and projects, have contributed to my understanding of

contributed to my understanding of the subject	understanding of the subject	the subject
12. The instructor has been available to students out of class	12. The lab instructor has been available to students out of class	12. The ECU instructor has been available to students
13. The instructor has provided useful feedback when returning tests and assignments	13. The lab instructor has provided useful feedback when returning tests and assignments	13. The ECU instructor has provided useful feedback
14. The instructor has demonstrated respect for me	14. The lab instructor has demonstrated respect for me	14. The ECU instructor has demonstrated respect for me
15. When applicable, the instructor has provided different points of view toward the subject	15. When applicable, the lab instructor has provided different points of view toward the subject	15. When applicable, the ECU instructor has provided different points of view toward the subject
16. The instructor has tested on the material emphasized	16. The instructor has tested on the material emphasized in the lab	16. The ECU instructor has evaluated me on the material and activities emphasized
17. The content of the course has been	17. The content of the course has been	17. The content of the course has been
18. The amount of work/reading assigned in this course has been	18. The amount of work/reading assigned in this lab has been	18. The amount of work/reading assigned in this course has been
19. Overall, the instructor is effective in teaching this course	19. Overall, the lab instructor is effective in teaching this course	19. Overall, the ECU instructor is effective in teaching this course
	20. Overall, this lab has contributed to the knowledge and skills required by this course	20. Overall, I have received adequate supervision from my ECU instructor in the activities involved in this course

Disposition: Chancellor

03-59 Revised University Athletics Committee charge.

Disposition: Chancellor

03-60 Recommendations pertaining to unit evaluations as follows:

1. That the initiation of the 2003-2004 five-year unit evaluation be postponed until after the Faculty Senate receives a report from the committee on integrating and streamlining planning, review, assessment and evaluation processes, provided that this report is made no later than the April 20, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
2. That if the committee on integrating and streamlining planning, review, assessment and evaluation processes does not report its recommendations to the Faculty Senate by the April 20, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the five year unit evaluations shall be conducted on all units during the 2004-2005 academic year in the manner currently mandated by the Faculty Senate.
3. That the Chair of the Faculty appoint one member of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee and one Faculty Senator as members of the committee on integrating and streamlining planning, review, assessment and evaluation processes.

Disposition: Chancellor

03-61 Resolution to aid students in poverty as follows:

1. The faculty requests that East Carolina University include \$5 million in the centennial capital campaign to be held in an endowment the earnings from which will be used as grant aid for the benefit of economically disadvantaged students admitted to and enrolled at ECU.
2. The appropriate Faculty Senate committee be consulted as to applicable criteria for awarding and disbursing such grant aid.

Disposition: Chancellor