

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 9, 2007**

The second regular meeting of the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 9, 2007, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order**

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

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of September 11, 2007, were approved as distributed.

**Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day**

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Lazure and Zoller (Art and Design), Manner (Education), Cable (Health Sciences Library), Bode (Medicine), Grymes (Music), Lowery (Nursing), Vice Chancellor Mageean, Vice Chancellor Horns, Deans' Representative Niswander, and Chancellor Ballard.

Alternates present were: Professors Lillian for Tovey (English), Coleman for Schenarts (Medicine), Dobbs for Fletcher (Medicine), and Moll for Hall (Music).

**B. Announcements**

1. Faculty members not located on main campus (Allied Health Sciences, Health and Human Performance, Health Sciences Library, Medicine, and Nursing,) 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. Additional information is available from Mike Vanderven, Director of Parking and Transportation Services at 328-1961.
2. Faculty are reminded of the call for nominations for the Annual Lifetime and Five-Year University Research/Creative Activity Awards. The deadline for submission of materials (which include 7 copies of departmental and unit review committee nominating letters, complete CV, and 3 letters from outside referees) is November 1, 2007. All relevant procedures are available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/aa/academicawards.cfm>. Please direct any questions to Professor Patricia Dragon, Chair of the Academic Awards Committee, at 328-0296 or [dragonp@ecu.edu](mailto:dragonp@ecu.edu).
3. Announcements related to the Research/ Creative Activity Grants will be circulated in the near future to ECU faculty. Any proposed changes to the guidelines from last year will be considered by the Faculty Senate this Fall. Grant applications will then be available in the Faculty Senate office and online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/research.cfm>. Faculty are encouraged to contact Paul Gares, Committee Chair at [garesp@ecu.edu](mailto:garesp@ecu.edu) if you have any questions about the granting process.

**C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor**

Chancellor Steve Ballard and Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences (later added to the agenda), were both out of town and unable to attend the meeting.

D. Terry Holland, Director of Athletics

Mr. Holland provided an overview of the university athletic programs. He described frustrations regarding athlete class attendance and stated that the conference and NCAA needed to assist in making sure that athletic schedules did not interfere with class attendance. He stated that the men's basketball team had 13 conference games and the athletes would not have to miss any classes due to the conference schedule. Mr. Holland stated further that this was not the situation with other conference teams. Discussion continued relative to athletic participation and academics and that athletes are aware that academic achievement and graduation are priorities over athletic involvement. Mr. Holland reported on a situation where ECU received sanctions from the APR due to the non-acceptance of a qualified athlete who did not meet academic standards. The athlete was accepted at a University having a low APR ranking.

Mr. Holland also commended Professor Dosser for his work on the University Athletics Committee. He finished his report by discussing recent neighborhood complaints relative to longer tail-gating times.

E. David Dosser, Chair of the University Athletics Committee's Academic Integrity Subcommittee

Professor Dosser began by thanking Mr. Holland for his support as the faculty athletic representative. Professor Dosser discussed his role as the faculty athletic representative and asked for continued faculty understanding about athletic activities and athletes in general. Further reports were provided by Professor Dosser relative to the reform of athletics and academics and are linked below. He stated that student athletics has a good academic performance rate and Dosser referred to the handout distributed in the meeting (see below). He reported that a 60% graduation rate is good for athletes and that ECU is 4<sup>th</sup> in Conference USA. He encouraged faculty to take a more active role in understanding athletes and athletic activities.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) acknowledged Professor Dosser's involvement with student athletics and his presence at the athletic activities.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked if there was any information regarding students that the subcommittee is not receiving. Professor Dosser replied by requesting that faculty should let the Athletics Department or him know of such problems, involving preferential or unusual treatment of student athletes.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) thanked Mr. Holland and Professor Dosser for their involvement with academic standards and athletes. Robinson asked about specific websites (NCAA.org) involving the coalition of intercollegiate athletes, which may be accessed to increase faculty involvement with athletics.

Professor Dosser's full comments to the Faculty Senate and reports on the activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative, Academic Integrity Subcommittee, 2006/07 Academic Rankings of Squads in Conference USA, NCAA Division I 2005-06 Academic Progress Rate, and Graduation Rate are available online and are linked here in the minutes.

F. Jack Brinn, Interim Chief Information Officer

Dr. Brinn thanked Professor Taggart for faculty collaboration. He discussed ITCS and its major role in Banner. Dr. Brinn continued his report by discussing the history and status of Banner, including budget information (18.7 million), software considerations, and organization (Kevin Seitz – project owner, Don Sweet - project manager, Jack Brinn – Banner Executive Steering Committee Chair). Dr. Brinn also discussed the data base transfer, from the old to the new system (Banner) and reported that 99% of the data was correct, according to the Registrar. Brinn continued his report by describing Banner use at other state universities. He stated that he plans to redesign Banner based on user needs from One-Stop. Dr. Brinn continued his report by informing the senate that on October 19, Human Resources will be connected to Banner, paychecks will be processed under Legacy on October 31, and by November 15 all paychecks will be processed under Banner. He also stated that there may be problems at the unit level with this change. Dr. Brinn's full report to the Faculty Senate is linked [here](#).

Dr. Brinn stated that the old data system (MVS) will be turned off on December 31, due to server maintenance. Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance, Vice Chair of the Faculty) asked Dr. Brinn about MVS and student data in relation to graduation. She was reminded about the December 31 date, which answered her question about the possible problems of the data transition, relative to a December graduation date.

Professor Smith (Technology and Computer Science) asked about ECU's Business Intelligence Center (ecuBIC) and whether there was a specific mechanism in place at the University to prioritize training for usage of the new system? Dr. Brinn stated that it allows for specific reports to be generated and also contains different types of information that Banner does not contain. He then discussed training options.

Professor Smith (Technology and Computer Science) asked about getting improvements made in the user interface as there were significant problems with it currently (i.e. very unnecessarily awkward and time consuming to use). Dr. Brinn acknowledged that there were user interface issues, but that it would not be until January 2008 before they could begin to address these issues.

Professor Stiller (Biology) discussed the problems of Banner relative to the size of ECU, in comparison to other smaller universities. He asked Dr. Brinn whether ECU would continue to experience problems as the university grows. Dr. Brinn responded that the result should be the opposite and that the efficiency of Banner will only improve with continued use.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) questioned the use of Banner in relationship to Senior Summaries. Mrs. Anderson (Registrar) stated that Banner would be in place relative to Senior Summaries. She referred to CAPP and reported that the Registrar will be examining catalog updates and curriculum. She reported that [CAPP@ecu.edu](mailto:CAPP@ecu.edu) was the email address for Generic CAPP regarding coding.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance, Vice Chair of the Faculty) discussed the apparent discrepancies in GPA between MVS, ecuBIC and Banner and questioned about how this will affect senior summary completion and accuracy. Mrs. Anderson (Registrar) stated that there had been only one problem so far. Mrs. Anderson stated that other problems will arise, primarily due to transfer courses, but the problems will be tracked and handled in another way. She encouraged faculty to find discrepancies and to direct all problems directly to her. Mrs. Anderson also provided a [listing of informational websites](#) to the senators.

G. Catherine Rigsby, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) discussed her Faculty Assembly report that was distributed to faculty. Additional information on the September 28, 2007, UNC Faculty Assembly meeting is available online. Professor Rigsby described the recommendation to change the UNC code, relative to dismissal of tenured faculty and post-tenure faculty review, as a process to remove tenured faculty. She called attention to specific wording in the document relative to the use of "unsatisfactory" to describe teaching and research, which can be use by an administrative committee. Professor Rigsby called for the need of faculty resolutions at individual institutions to address these issues.

Professor Rigsby recommended that the UNC code committee should review the existing code to strengthen and streamline it. She reported that NCSU and UNC stated that the faculty assembly code committee went beyond its charge. Professor Robinson (Mathematics) discussed the Faculty Assembly website and the involvement of the UNC Faculty Council and NCSU Faculty Senate. He questioned why and how this proposed resolution will "fix problems" that do not appear to exist. Robinson then offered the following resolution:

Whereas, academic freedom and tenure are core values of the American academic system and thus are of significant concern to faculty; and

Whereas, the UNC system, as the oldest public university in the nation, has been and should continue to be a leader in best practices in academic; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has pointed out significant problems with key aspects of the revisions proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" (as of July 17, 2007), particularly those relating to institutional guarantees of tenure, grounds for discharge, utilization of post tenure review for discharge, and rights of "special faculty"; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has noted that there are areas in which the language of the proposed changes needs to be clarified in order to avoid possible future confusion and has developed alternative language to address its concerns with the "Code 603/604 Committee" proposal; and

Whereas, it is the view of both the UNC Faculty Assembly and the ECU faculty that the Code Review Committee's work exceeded its charge insofar as it included recommendations regarding post-tenure review processes that are inconsistent with policies reviewed and supported by the Assembly in late Spring 2007, as reported to the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure in June 2007; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has sought additional review from faculty from the constituent UNC campuses.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the ECU faculty affirms its support for UNC Faculty Assembly's criticisms of the changes proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" in its July 2007 draft.

Be It Further Resolved, that the ECU faculty respectfully requests that the administration of ECU join with the Faculty Senate in requesting that submittal of the "Code 603/604 Committee" recommendations be deferred so that appropriate Faculty Senate

committees might have adequate time to evaluate both the implications of the proposed changes for the status of academic tenure and the implications for administrating such changes within the academic units at this institution.

Professor Corbett (Geology) questioned the source and history of the proposed resolution and spoke in favor of the resolution.

Professor Killingsworth (Business/Faculty Assembly Chairperson) stated that the faculty assembly was going to delay its vote until further information could be collected. Professor Jones (Criminal Justice) inquired about the faculty assembly webpage. Professor Rigsby replied that there is a link from the Faculty Senate webpage to the UNC Faculty Assembly site.

Professor Rose (Nursing) inquired about the date of the proposed resolution (ECU Faculty Senate) and if the resolution could be postponed for six months.

Professor Killingsworth discussed the deferral of the Faculty Assembly in response to the UNC Code and that a meeting would be taking place in early October.

Professor Deena (English) stated that these current UNC code changes are just a "weapon of removal" for faculty and not really about post-tenure review.

Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) discussed that these type of procedures are already in place, but these actions are too difficult in the removal of tenured faculty.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) moved to revised the "Be It Further Resolved" to read:

"Be It Further Resolved, that the ECU faculty requests that submittal of the "Code 603/604 Committee" recommendations be deferred so that appropriate Faculty Senate committees might have adequate time to evaluate both the implications of the proposed changes for the status of academic tenure and the implications for administrating such changes within the academic units at this institution and respectfully invites the administration of ECU to join us with the request. "

Following discussion the proposed resolution concerning proposed changes to the UNC Code was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #07-21**

Professor Rigsby then presented the approval of revisions to UNC Faculty Assembly Charter. This was discussed at the September Senate meeting, but Senators failed to act on the change. Following brief discussion the proposed revisions to the UNC Faculty Assembly Charter, the Charter was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #07-22**

H. Mark Taggart, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Taggart stated that in the past few weeks, he had conversations with many faculty members regarding transparency and the state of shared governance at ECU. He thanked all for their input and for sharing their views. He stated that some had told him that, since the recent change in upper administrative positions, combined with the restructuring of the division of Academic Affairs and Student Life and creation of a Task Force on Administrative Leadership, there might be some clouds forming over the transparency of shared governance at ECU. He was reminded of Don Sexauer's definition of shared governance being that "fragile balancing act

between administration and faculty," and that he describes some of his recent experiences as if faculty were trying to balance themselves on a "glass tightrope."

Professor Taggart stated that he had found the guidance of former Chairs of the Faculty to be very helpful to him. He stated that there will always be some tension or some "give and take" between faculty and administrators in shared governance. However, one of the things faculty we must view with caution is the perception of actions not occluding us from what is actually occurring. He suggested that we continue to try and address issues that concern faculty in an open, honest, and forthright manner, noting that it was too frustrating to deal with shadows and perceptions.

Professor Taggart suggested that we continue to look for common ground on these matters and follow the procedures that are provided for us in the *ECU Faculty Manual*. So much of the contents of the Faculty Manual are the result of faculty and administration seeking common ground on issues to tenure, promotion, and governance. And if there are issues regarding the contents of the Faculty Manual that are unclear, he would work with Interim Provost Sheerer on providing clarification, and, if needed, interpretations of ECU's policies and procedures.

Professor Taggart stated that in recent conversations with Dr. Ballard and Dr. Sheerer, and other upper administration personnel, all have continued to express their commitment to shared governance, and to openness and transparency. Both faculty and administration are proud of ECU's role as the pinnacle of shared governance in the UNC system. But we must continue to pledge to work together, and to follow the procedures that are outlined for us in the Faculty Manual, and if there are issues with the contents of the Faculty Manual, to follow the procedures that we have in place for clarification or interpretation.

#### I. Question Period

Elmer Poe, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Outreach, was presented to address any questions on the approved Continuity of Instruction: During a Catastrophic Event plan. Don Joyner, Interim Director of Admissions, was present to address any questions on the Breakdown of the Freshman Class and number of home-schooled student admissions.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) inquired about the availability and sufficiency of IT resources in the event of a catastrophic event. Mr. Poe replied that IT resources were sufficient. He reported that IT had been stress-tested, and there did not appear to be problems with the resources.

Professor Lillian (English) discussed her concerns in the event of a natural disaster. She stated that the potential problems were more student related and not with faculty. She questioned whether all students would have access to computers and on-line access to courses. Mr. Poe replied that all students, regardless of internet connectivity, should have appropriate accommodations relative to computer access and completion of course requirements following a catastrophic event.

Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) inquired about the cancellation of classes the day after Halloween. Rigsby stated that previously this issue had been addressed in a letter from the Provost. Interim Provost Sheerer stated that a letter would be distributed discussing the issue of class attendance on the day following Halloween.

Interim Provost Sheerer took a moment to express her views regarding shared governance. She also commented about the Chancellor's lack of attendance at Faculty Senate and explained

that the Chancellor had to attend many meetings, which often conflict with other commitments. Interim Provost Sheerer briefly discussed the nature of her administration and pledged to support the process of shared governance.

Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked Mr. Poe, relative to a catastrophic event and secondary problems, whether faculty should already have a plan in place before such an event occurs. Mr. Poe replied by discussing the nature of a catastrophic plan, which was only part of the problem and the solution. He discussed academic outreach and contingency plans relative to the downtime of Blackboard. Mr. Poe recommended that the faculty include a contingency plan in each class syllabus, including an alternative plan for students who do not have internet connectivity.

Professor Lillian (English) inquired about parking, specifically on main campus. She stated that at 3:00 pm, non-A parking holders may park in "A" parking, which appears to be problematic for "A" parking patrons. She expressed her concerns regarding general parking and the time changes. Interim Provost Sheerer stated that she should pose this question to Vice Chancellor Seitz.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) inquired about Banner. Professor Brinn stated that there was full redundancy of Banner in the ECU School of Medicine. Professor Martinez then asked Interim Provost Sheerer about how the administration would perceive the proposed resolution just approved by the Faculty Senate. Interim Provost Sheerer stated that she perceived a favorable administrative response to the resolution.

#### **Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business to come before the body at this time.

#### **Agenda Item V. Report of Committees**

##### **A. Educational Policies and Planning Committee**

Professor Dale Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed Request for discontinuance of the Early Childhood Certificate Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, College of Human Ecology, Request to offer existing MAEd in B-K Education Online and a Request for Authorization to Establish Doctor of Audiology (AuD) Program, in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Allied Health Sciences.

Professor Jesse (Nursing) inquired about the differences between the Ph.D. and the AuD degrees. Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that there was approximately a 12-hour difference between the two degrees.

Professor Wang (Geography) inquired about the cost of the new program and in general, how much will the two degree programs cost the University. Professor Knickerbocker replied that the department had a budget in place, which included grant funding. Professor Knickerbocker stated that the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders had grants to fund half of the graduate assistantships and that Vice Chancellor Mageean would match the assistantships.

Following discussion, the requests were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #07-23.**

##### **B. Faculty Grievance Committee**

Professor Gene Hughes (Business), Chair of the Committee, presented an overview of the 2006/07 Committee Activities. Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) questioned the number of 0's on the report. Professor Hughes replied that the committee saw neither an increase nor decline in grievances. He stated that the grievances are constant and at the present time, there is nothing in process. Overall, he stated that this tally was about average for the academic period. Following a brief discussion, the report was accepted by the body.

#### C. Faculty Governance Committee

Puri Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Chair of the Committee, presented a progress report on Faculty Input in the Evaluation of Administrators. In her remarks she discussed the history of the administrator evaluation. She furthered her report by discussing the principles of the faculty governance committee in preparing the evaluation instrument, the open forums, and task force on evaluation of administrators.

Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) inquired as to whether the task force had reviewed the draft from the Faculty Governance committee. Professor Martinez stated that members of the Faculty Governance Committee and Professor Taggart had met and reviewed the draft. Martinez reported that there had been questions from the task force relative to the rationale behind the Faculty Governance Committee's work and policy draft. Martinez stated that the second meeting of the task force was scheduled for October 17, but that no agenda had been set. She reminded the Faculty Senate about the deadline of November 1 for the administrator evaluation to the Board of Trustees.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated that the administrator evaluation document must go through the Faculty Senate. Professor Martinez agreed with Professor Robinson, and stated that the Faculty Senate should endorse the Faculty Governance Committee's report.

Professor Rigsby (Geology, Past Chair of the Faculty) questioned how the Board of Trustees' deadline could be met, due to the many steps that must be undertaken before the Board of Trustees would see the instrument. She inquired about the time constraints relative to faculty involvement since the committee must write the report and then the Chancellor must approve it before November 1. Professor Martinez replied that she could not answer this question.

Professor Robinson made a motion that the Faculty Senate should accept the proposal of the Faculty Governance Committee before formally submitting the report to the task force on administrator evaluation.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that this motion might be premature, since there would be a third draft of the evaluation form. Professor Rigsby stated that the Faculty Senate represented the entire faculty; therefore, the Senate should make sure that the faculty endorses the work of the Faculty Governance Committee.

Professor Robinson (Math) then moved to endorse the principles on administrator evaluation that were enumerated in today's report by the Faculty Governance Committee, and to transmit this along with the latest draft of the instrument proposed by the Faculty Governance Committee to the Task Force on Administrator Evaluation and Chancellor. The full resolution stated:

The Faculty Senate endorses the following principles on administrator evaluations and moves to have these principles transmitted, along with the latest draft of the instrument being proposed by



the Faculty Governance Committee, to Chancellor Ballard and members of the Task Force on Administrator Evaluation.

- The Chancellor or his representatives is responsible for reviewing the administrative performance of the academic officers.
- The evaluation of administrators should be drawing on all informed sectors of the university community.
- The evaluation needs to be done periodically.
- The evaluation should be a collaborative endeavor involving the faculty, the administration and other campus constituencies.
- The evaluation must be constructive and developmental; its ultimate purpose should be to offer guidance on improving performance.
- There should be a commitment of all parties to a generally understood and agreed-upon procedure to carrying the review.
- According to the nature of the administrative post, there should be a distinction of the appropriate level of faculty involvement.
- The voice of the faculty is to be weightiest at the departmental and decanal level, and more diluted by the necessary presence of other institutional constituencies in the review of administrators above the level of dean.
- Faculty need to have reason to believe that their participation in the review has been meaningfully taken into consideration in the outcome.

Professor Sharer (English) questioned the principles and changes behind the administrator evaluation instrument. Professor Martinez stated that the Faculty Governance Committee would change the principles and make new changes to the document based on feedback.

Following discussion the report on Faculty Input in the Evaluation of Administrators, including the nine principles enumerated during the meeting (and included above) were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #07-24**

There was no additional business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianna Walker  
Secretary of the Faculty  
College of Allied Health Sciences

Lori Lee  
Administrative Officer  
Faculty Senate

#### **FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING**

**07-21** Resolution on Proposed Changes to the UNC Code as follows:

Whereas, academic freedom and tenure are core values of the American academic system and thus are of significant concern to faculty; and

Whereas, the UNC system, as the oldest public university in the nation, has been and should continue to be a leader in best practices in academic; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has pointed out significant problems with key aspects of the revisions proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" (as of July 17, 2007), particularly those relating to institutional guarantees of tenure, grounds for discharge, utilization of post tenure review for discharge, and rights of "special faculty"; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has noted that there are areas in which the language of the proposed changes needs to be clarified in order to avoid possible future confusion and has developed alternative language to address its concerns with the "Code 603/604 Committee" proposal; and

Whereas, it is the view of both the UNC Faculty Assembly and the ECU faculty that the Code Review Committee's work exceeded its charge insofar as it included recommendations regarding post-tenure review processes that are inconsistent with policies reviewed and supported by the Assembly in late Spring 2007, as reported to the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure in June 2007; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has sought additional review from faculty from the constituent UNC campuses.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the ECU faculty affirms its support for UNC Faculty Assembly's criticisms of the changes proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" in its July 2007 draft.

Be It Further Resolved, that the ECU faculty requests that submittal of the "Code 603/604 Committee" recommendations be deferred so that appropriate Faculty Senate committees might have adequate time to evaluate both the implications of the proposed changes for the status of academic tenure and the implications for administrating such changes within the academic units at this institution and respectfully invites the administration of ECU to join us with the request.

**Disposition:** Brenda Killingsworth, Chairperson of the UNC Faculty Assembly and Chancellor

**07-22** Revisions to the UNC Faculty Assembly Charter to read as follows:

1. Representation in the Assembly shall be apportioned among the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina with regard to the number of full-time faculty and professional staff members in the service of each institution. Each institution shall select the number of delegates based on the percent that their full-time faculty comprise of the full system-wide faculty according to the following cut-offs: <2%, two (2) delegates; >2 and <5%, three (3) delegates; >5% and <10%, four (4) delegates; and >10%, five (5) delegates. At any time that the number of full-time faculty and professional staff members of an institution changes as to entitle it to a larger or smaller number of delegates under the foregoing formula, the number of its delegates forthwith shall be changed accordingly. An exception to this will be made at the time of change to the charter (spring '07 date) such that no institution will decrease its number of delegates in the year of the change to the formula. Every delegate to the Assembly shall be a full-time faculty or professional staff member of the institution he seeks to represent. The manner of selection of delegates shall be determined by the faculties of the respective institutions consistent with their institutional practices. It is highly recommended, however, that one of the delegates from each institution be

the Chair of the faculty senate (faculty council) for that institution. Terms and rotation of delegates shall be specified in the bylaws.

2. The Assembly shall have a Chair and other such officers, who shall be chosen in such manner and for such terms, as the Assembly may provide its bylaws.
3. Each institutional delegation to the Assembly shall make available to the faculty of its institution the official minutes of the proceedings of the Assembly, together with the written report of the delegation.

**Disposition:** Brenda Killingsworth, Chairperson of the UNC Faculty Assembly

**07-23** Request for discontinuance of the Early Childhood Certificate Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, College of Human Ecology, Request to offer existing MAEd in B-K Education Online and a Request for Authorization to Establish Doctor of Audiology (AuD) Program, in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Allied Health Sciences.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

**07-24** The Faculty Senate endorses the following principles on administrator evaluations and moves to have these principles transmitted, along with the latest draft of the instrument being proposed by the Faculty Governance Committee, to Chancellor Ballard and members of the Task Force on Administrator Evaluation.

- The Chancellor or his representatives is responsible for reviewing the administrative performance of the academic officers.
- The evaluation of administrators should be drawing on all informed sectors of the university community.
- The evaluation needs to be done periodically.
- The evaluation should be a collaborative endeavor involving the faculty, the administration and other campus constituencies.
- The evaluation must be constructive and developmental; its ultimate purpose should be to offer guidance on improving performance.
- There should be a commitment of all parties to a generally understood and agreed-upon procedure to carrying the review.
- According to the nature of the administrative post, there should be a distinction of the appropriate level of faculty involvement.
- The voice of the faculty is to be weightiest at the departmental and decanal level, and more diluted by the necessary presence of other institutional constituencies in the review of administrators above the level of dean.
- Faculty need to have reason to believe that their participation in the review has been meaningfully taken into consideration in the outcome.

**Disposition:** Chancellor and Task Force on Administrator Evaluation