

**Meeting with Chancellor Ballard
Tuesday, January 23, 2007**

Issues from the Agenda Committee to be addressed at the Senate meeting:

Annual report on Faculty Employment including Longitudinal Profile of Faculty Tenure Status and Tenure Status of Permanent and Temporary Faculty by Unit

Update on PACE – President's Advisory Council on Efficiency and Effectiveness

○ General Administration's Accountability Matrix that impacts budgeting – now shifting to graduation and retention rates

VC Student Life Search?

New Issues:

One position for the VC for Health Sciences and Dean of the School of Medicine

Open search for Chief Information Officer (currently Jack Brinn is serving as Interim)

Faculty participation in Commencement ceremony

Managing the Math/Engineering curriculum issue

Academic Program Development

Teaching Awards Ceremony

Thanks for the funding

Provost Smith to take a lead role

Checklist of outstanding issues

Issues from last meeting:

- Lunch meeting with the School of Medicine Senators/Alternates
- Yardley Report
- Goal of inclusive, transparent governance
 - Search committees should be formed for administrative positions - even middle management positions

Lee, Lori

From: Anderson, Patricia
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2007 10:42 AM
To: Taggart, Mark Alan; Knickerbocker, Dale; Glascoff, Mary A
Cc: Lee, Lori
Subject: my involvement in discussions

Hello, all. We had our planning meeting yesterday afternoon with Pellicane and Swope, and it's becoming increasingly clear as I am farther away from the actual event that there are many levels of problems that will have to be dealt with in the next steps of our proposal for the new PhD in Curriculum and Instruction. I've been working on this degree process for almost 4 years, and to be honest, I'm feeling very disheartened by the status of our proposal in light of the current "mode of operation" regarding program development. At this point, I'm very uncomfortable and very unsettled about discussing this further with you and most of all, with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors. It's my thinking at this time that my vocal criticisms of the process in the last year have had some negative effects on my own proposed program, and my further involvement with criticism about the campus-wide status of the program development process could have even more detrimental effects on my proposed program. In other words, I'm feeling as if I'm "caught" between what's in the best interests of my program that I've devoted 4 years of work to and the overall needs of the university to work to improve the process.

Theoretically, I believe I can separate the university-wide concerns from my own experiences, but internally, this causes me great pain. I don't believe, for example, that I can sit in a discussion next Tuesday about the process without calling up my own experiences and disappointment in the actual development process. It's for that reason that I'm going to step back from these discussions and not be involved on this topic with you all any longer. I will not be attending the "plan for discussion" meeting on Tuesday at 1:30 and I will not be attending the 3:00 meeting with the Chancellor and group that day.

Patricia J. Anderson, Ed.D.
Professor and Graduate Director
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858
252.328.4123
252.328.2585 (fax)
andersonp@ecu.edu

01/23/2007

Lee, Lori

From: Knickerbocker, Dale
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2007 8:20 AM
To: Anderson, Patricia; Lee, Lori; Glascoff, Mary A
Cc: Taggart, Mark Alan
Subject: RE: memo on faculty participation at commencement - for your approval

Tricia's words are very wise—procedurally and tactically. I wholeheartedly agree.

From: Anderson, Patricia
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2007 8:04 PM
To: Lee, Lori; Knickerbocker, Dale; Glascoff, Mary A
Cc: Taggart, Mark Alan
Subject: RE: memo on faculty participation at commencement - for your approval

I've just read the original draft of this memo and feel insulted. There were over 70 faculty present at the Saturday graduation in december--a huge number in comparison to many previous ceremonies! I think citing a general perception without specific numbers is demeaning to those of us who do attend--or who have done so voluntarily in the past.

I'd definitely ask that this issue be addressed at a different venue--I don't like the idea of Mark being asked to sign off on this kind of memo because a non-Senate task force (appointed by the Chancellor) has decided that adding more "pomp" to the ceremony would be such a good idea. Perhaps we should ask for this group to make a report to the Senate--or have a Senate committee review the proposal. I don't think Mark should just suggest a simple revision--this is not the kind of policy-setting that our Senate and our Chair have engaged in in the past.

Mark--I realize you'll get pressure on this one--but I'd encourage you to say that you'll present it to a committee for review OR present it as new business on the floor of the Senate at the January meeting if they want some sort of immediate response so they can send out something immediately. Don't sign anything--and don't just revise their letter that makes a mandate on faculty time and resources that faculty have not had input into agreeing to that mandate, even though it's disguised as being by a unit for meeting the mandate.

Tricia

From: Lee, Lori
Sent: Thu 1/18/2007 12:40 PM
To: Anderson, Patricia; Knickerbocker, Dale; Glascoff, Mary A
Cc: Taggart, Mark Alan
Subject: FW: memo on faculty participation at commencement - for your approval

Faculty Officers –

Mark has asked that I forward this to you and ask if you wish for this to be included in the agenda for the meeting next Tuesday with the Chancellor and VC's or do you wish to just discuss it among yourselves on Tuesday and Mark respond directly to the Chancellor? Just let us know since we are about to distribute the agenda for next week's meeting with

01/23/2007