The first regular meeting of the 2005-2006 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, September 13, 2005, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

## I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

April 19, 2005, and April 26, 2005, minutes
III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
B. Announcements
C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor
D. Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
E. David Dosser, Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee
F. Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the Faculty
G. Brief Moment in History, Henry Ferrell
H. Question Period

## IV. Unfinished Business

A. Recommendation from the Process Improvement Committee Concerning Five Year Unit Evaluations, Michael Poteat (attachment 1)
B. Resolution on Classroom Discussion on Alcohol, Brian McMillen (attachment 2)
V. Report of Committees
A. Committee on Committees, Henry Ferrell

1. Nominee for Faculty Assembly Delegate (attachment 3)
2. Nominees for Appellate Hearing Committee (attachment 4)
B. University Budget Committee, Henry Ferrell (Past Chair)

Report on University Expenditures.
C. Faculty Governance Committee, Dee Dee Glascoff (Past Chair)

Proposed Interpretation to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L (attachment 5)
VI. New Business

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Recommendation from the Process Improvement Committee Concerning Five Year Unit Evaluations
In accordance with Faculty Senate Resolution \#04-21 (noted below), the Process Improvement Committee recommends that the cycle for the Five-Year Unit Evaluations be modified to fit the schedule of (combined undergraduate and graduate) program review (coordinated with external professional accreditation reports whenever possible). The Unit Evaluation would serve as a faculty comment on the unit's self study, a response to the findings and recommendations of the review team, and would be used in the development of a unit response to the recommendations derived from the program review.

For the purpose of this recommendation, a unit is defined in accordance with Appendix D of the East Carolina University Faculty Manual which states "academic units are defined as departments described in the codes of operation of professional schools, the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, professional schools without departments, Academic Library Services, Health Sciences Library, and any other units in which faculty appointments are made. In the College of Arts and Sciences and in professional schools whose unit codes describe departmental structures, departmental chairs are the unit administrators. In schools that do not have departments described in their unit codes, the dean of the school is the unit administrator."

Resolution \#04-21
Approved by the Faculty Senate: April 20, 2004
Approved by the Chancellor: April 26, 2004
Report on Streamlining Reporting Processes, including the following recommendations.

1. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies the formation of a new Administrative Committee, the Process Improvement Committee, consisting of the Director of IPRE, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of Institutional Research and Testing, a representative from the Division of Academic Affairs, the Division of Health Sciences, the Faculty Senate, ITCS, the Graduate School, and three representatives of the Faculty Senate on staggered terms and a dean's representative from each college or school. The charge of this administrative committee should be to review the reporting process and make recommendations to the vice chancellors to coordinate reports, reduce duplication of effort, and enhance the usability of information requested. The committee will develop a charge and membership with staggered terms.
2. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies that graduate and undergraduate program review should be initiated using a 10-year cycle beginning in fall 2005. The reviews should be coordinated with external professional accreditation reports whenever possible. For programs that have professional accreditation, the program review process will not involve external reviewers and will consider the accreditation agency's standards. It is possible that the accreditation report would suffice for internal review purposes. Both internal and external reviewers will review programs without professional accreditation.
3. The committee recommends to the Department of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs a significant revision of the Unit Annual Report to be used in spring 2004. The revised report eliminates requests for information that is provided in other reports or that is no longer being used.
4. The committee recommends that the Process Improvement Committee continue to move toward developing relational databases to improve efficiency in report preparation and analysis and to provide units more access to information.
The committee recommends that the Process Improvement Committee develop a staggered schedule for the Five-Year Unit Evaluations to begin in 2004-05.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS <br> Resolution on Classroom Discussion on Alcohol

Whereas, students have complained about instructors either joking about student drinking, canceling classes or exams because of concern too many students will be hung over, or telling their own drinking stories, and

Whereas, $\quad 20 \%-23 \%$ of ECU students report that they are either abstinent or non-drinkers and another $20 \%$ report that they are light drinkers(OtC Student Health Survey 2002, Core Inst. Student Survey 2004), and

Whereas, the majority of ECU students are enrolled in order to gain an education, and
Whereas, jokes about student drinking and canceling classes or exams promote drinking and insult the non-drinkers, and

Whereas, heavy problem drinking has caused serious harm to a number of students and one recent death, and

Whereas, the Student Government Association has asked the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University to join with them in a request that the draft letter noted below be sent to all members of the faculty at the University.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that a letter (similar to the one noted below) be sent to all East Carolina University faculty under the signature of either the Provost or the Chancellor.

## DRAFT

This memorandum is being sent at the request of the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association. It is natural and useful in the classroom to make use of light humor in order to build rapport with students and reduce the monotony of lectures. However, several students have noted that their instructors have made light of the presumed heavy drinking by ECU students. An example would be noting that a regular quiz for Monday will be canceled because "I know everyone will be too hung over to function."

These attempts at humor send a message that problem drinking by our students is both expected and condoned by you and the University, which it is not. Students who abstain ( $20 \%$ to $23 \%$ in our surveys) or drink lightly (another $23 \%$ ) have said they felt insulted by these comments because they are not at ECU to drink. They are here for an education. Further, they do not want to hear stories about their instructor's drinking prowess, past or present. The SGA and other student organizations are working with !MPACT ECU, the coalition to reduce the use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs. These mixed messages are not helpful for these efforts.

Most of you are irritated by the reputation of ECU being a party school. You know that you are teaching at a serious academic institution and should expect better of your students. Please, join both the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate in support of the efforts of !MPACT ECU to improve the quality and safety of our University and help improve our image statewide.

Faculty Senate Agenda
September 13, 2005

## Attachment 3.

## COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT <br> Nominee for Faculty Assembly Delegate

## Nominee for Faculty Assembly Delegate

Jan Tovey, English
Nominee for Faculty Assembly Alternate
Elizabeth Hodge, Education

## FACULTY ASSEMBLY DELEGATES

| Name | Department / School | Term | Office Location | Tele \# |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Catherine Rigsby | Geology (Chair of the Faculty) | 2006 | Graham 204 | $328-4297$ |
| OPEN |  | 2006 |  |  |
| Dee Dee Glascoff | Health and Human Performance | 2007 | Minges 161 |  |
| Brenda Killingsworth | Business | 2008 | Bate 3134 | $328-6583$ |
| John Cope | Psychology | 2008 | Rawl 110 | $328-6235$ |

FACULTY ASSEMBLY ALTERNATES

| Name | Department / School | Term | Office Location | Tele \# |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| James Holloway | Business | 2006 | Bate 3131 | $328-6561$ |
| Patricia Anderson | Education | 2007 | Speight 302 | $328-4123$ |
| Steve Estes | Health and Human Performance | 2007 | Minges 155 | $328-0017$ |
| Ralph Scott | Academic Library Services | 2008 | Joyner 4106 | $328-0265$ |
| Jan Tovey | English | 2008 | Bate 2125 | $328-1544$ |

## COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Nominees for the Appellate Hearing Committee

## Nominees for Regular Membership

Richard Mauger, Geology for 2006 term
Maury York, Academic Library Services for 2008 term

## Nominees for Alternate Membership

open for 2006 term
Jim Kirkland, English for 2008 term

REGULAR MEMBERS (with vote)

| Name | Academic / Administrative Area | Term | Office Location | Tele \# |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| open |  | 2006 |  | 328 - |
| Greg Lapicki | Physics | 2007 | Howell E308 | $328-6894$ |
| Beth Velde | Allied Health Sciences | 2007 | AHS Trailer 306B | $328-2301$ |
| open |  | 2008 |  | $328-$ |
| Claudio Sibata | Medicine | 2008 | L. Jenkins 172A | $744-3712$ |

## ALTERNATE MEMBERS (with vote)

| Name | Academic / Administrative Area | Term | Office Location | Tele \# |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Leslie Pagliari | Tech \& Computer Science | 2006 | Sci \& Tech 403 | $328-9663$ |
| Richard Mauger | Geology | 2006 | Graham 201 | $328-6016$ |
| K. Gopalakrishnan | Technology and Computer Science | 2007 | Science Bldg. 114 | $328-9688$ |
| Maury York | Academic Library Services | 2008 | Joyner 3300 | $328-0252$ |
| Yong Wang | Geography | 2008 | Brewster A-223 | $328-1043$ |

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT Proposed Interpretation to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L.

## Issue:

Which faculty members are allowed to vote on the acceptability of nominees put forth by the administrative officer nominating committee?

The relevant parts of Appendix L are in Part A and Part B, which distinguish between faculty who allowed to vote on the nominating committee and faculty who are allowed to vote on the names put forward by that committee. The Manual reads as follows:

Part A: "As pertains to faculty voting for the unit's nominating committee for appointment of administrative officials . . . a voting faculty member is someone who is appointed to a full-time faculty position; who is a permanently tenured or probationary term faculty person; who has been employed in any faculty position for at least 12 consecutive months at East Carolina University; who has regular academic faculty rank . . . ; and who must, except as noted below for faculty on leaves of absence, be carrying at East Carolina University, at the time of the voting, not less than half the normal teaching/research program as practiced in the unit of appointment."

Part B.2c: The "nominating committee . . . shall determine by secret ballot that the nominees are acceptable to a majority of the permanently tenured faculty of the school, department, or college.

## nterpretation:

Part B of Appendix L allows ALL permanently tenured faculty members, regardless of administrative appointments, leaves of absence, etc., to vote on the acceptability of the nominees. Hence, in the case of a search for a new department chair, a nominee would be considered acceptable if he or she gets the endorsement of a majority of all of the permanently tenured faculty in the department. The total number of permanently tenured faculty in the department includes any tenured departmental faculty on leave of absence (if present and voting) or on administrative assignment within or outside the department.

