

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 22, 2008

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S
PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

Academic Standards Committee Report
Proposed revisions to Appendix C. Section III. Evaluation
in reference to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Revise Section III.1. Teaching to read as follows:
(addition noted in **bold** print, deletion noted in ~~strikethrough~~):

"The quality of teaching must be evaluated **using multiple methods** ~~by means~~
~~of~~:

- ~~a. data from surveys of student opinion, when such data have been gathered in accordance with established procedures of the department or the university which guarantee the integrity and completeness of said data. As part of the effort to evaluate the teaching of faculty members, each unit shall either: develop and use its own instrument(s) as approved by the chancellor to determine student opinion of teaching or utilize the instrument developed by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee to determine student opinion of teaching.~~
- ~~b.a.~~ **b.a.** formal methods of peer review, including direct observation of the **teaching of new and tenure-track faculty members** ~~classroom teaching of new and tenure-track faculty.~~
- ~~a.b.~~ **a.b.** **data from surveys of student opinion when an individual faculty member's data are consistently (more than 2 semesters) and significantly (more than 1 mean absolute deviation) from the unit's median for similar courses.**
- c.** **other procedures provided for in the unit codes (for example, review of selected course materials such as syllabi, reading lists, outlines, examinations, audiovisual materials, student manuals, samples of student's work on assignments, projects, papers, examples of student achievement, and other materials prepared for or relevant to instruction).**

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 22, 2008

Resolution on UNC Tomorrow Taskforce
(Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly on April 4, 2008)

Whereas faculty input has been widely recognized as necessary for the success of UNC Tomorrow;

Therefore be it resolved, that each campus's Response to the UNC Tomorrow Report be provided to the Faculty Senate prior to May 1, 2008;

And that Chair of the Faculty Senate solicit a reaction to the campus's response to the UNC Tomorrow Final Report from the faculty of the institution and submit it to Faculty Assembly by May 30, 2008;

And that all of the Campus Responses and Faculty Senate responses be posted on the Assembly Website;

And that the General Administration actively involve the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee as it reviews and acts on these reports;

Be it further resolved that the Forum recommended in Resolution 2008-3 be implemented.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
2007-09 CAPITAL PLAN

4-22-08
FS mtg.

| EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| Six Year Capital Plan in Priority Order | | 2005-2007 Updated Budget | 2007-2009 Budget adjusted for 8% for each of 2 years |
| New School of Dentistry | | | 90,000,000 |
| New Family Medicine/Geriatric Center* | | | 46,800,000 |
| New Science Building ** | | 50,746,000 | 130,000,000 |
| New Academic Building A | | 64,125,000 | 84,500,000 |
| New Performing Arts Building | | | 85,000,000 |
| Land Acquisition | | | 10,000,000 |
| Utility Infrastructure, Academic Support, Phase II | | 8,500,000 | 9,914,000 |
| IT Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase II | | 3,300,000 | 3,849,000 |
| Health and Human Performance Addition | | 10,000,000 | 11,664,000 |
| Academic Office Building | | 8,750,000 | |
| New Facilities Services Space | | 8,969,600 | 10,462,000 |
| Austin Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 11,405,908 | 13,304,000 |
| Graham Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 5,240,504 | 6,113,000 |
| Ragsdale Hall. Comprehensive modernization. | | 11,022,189 | 12,856,000 |
| Fletcher Music Center. Comprehensive modernization. | | 8,636,513 | 10,074,000 |
| Spilman Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 3,894,830 | 4,543,000 |
| Whichard Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 4,508,863 | 5,259,000 |
| Brewster Building A, B C & D Wings Comprehensive modernization | | 14,108,362 | 16,456,000 |
| Rawl Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 9,524,341 | 11,109,000 |
| Rivers/HESC. Comprehensive modernization. | | 8,733,622 | 10,187,000 |
| Brody Medical Science Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 23,303,979 | 27,182,000 |
| Health Affairs - Life Sciences Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 1,689,646 | 1,971,000 |
| Biotechnology Building. Comprehensive modernization. | | 2,433,684 | 2,839,000 |
| Howell Science N, E, & S Comprehensive modernization. | | 26,308,836 | 30,687,000 |
| McGinnis Theater. Comprehensive modernization | | 3,745,536 | 4,369,000 |
| Willis Building. Comprehensive modernization | | 2,141,737 | 2,498,000 |
| Wright Annex. Comprehensive modernization. | | 4,290,471 | 5,004,000 |
| Wright Auditorium. Comprehensive modernization. | | 2,563,647 | 2,990,000 |
| Minges Academic Space Modernization. | | 3,077,597 | 3,590,000 |
| New Lab Space | | 78,461,099 | 71,796,000 |
| Physical Education Space to meet program needs. | | 23,738,300 | 27,688,000 |
| New Office Space. Per capacity analysis. | | 12,291,704 | |
| New Student Support Office Space | | 14,680,638 | |
| New Library and Study Space Requirements-Phase II | | 17,173,800 | 20,032,000 |
| Upgrades to Hazardous Storage | | 1,554,525 | 1,813,000 |
| Minges Chiller Plant | | 2,753,730 | |
| Replacement of 22 Telecommunications Urbans | | 3,257,100 | 3,799,000 |
| Data Network Infrastructure Upgrade and development | | 4,335,679 | 5,057,000 |
| Main Campus Utility Infrastructure, Academic Support, Phase III | | 19,866,380 | 23,172,000 |
| East End Chiller Plant | | 4,383,761 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL PHASE II Request | | 483,517,582 | 806,577,000 |

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
2007-09 CAPITAL PLAN

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| * The Family Medicine/Geriatrics Center has a state \$36.8M and non-state (\$10M) component. | | | |
| ** The project cost has been revised. | | | |

Self Liquidating Capital Projects

| ECU Six Year Non-Appropriated Capital Improvements Priorities 2007-2013 | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Priority | Project | Request |
| 1 | Scott Residence Hall Renovation | 10,100,000 |
| 2 | Health Sciences Student Services and Food Service Facility Expansion | 7,000,000 |
| 3 | Wright Soda Shop Renovation and Expansion | 1,500,000 |
| 4 | General Internal Medicine and Medicine/Pediatrics Clinic Facility | 18,000,000 |
| 5 | Student Recreation Center and Wellness Expansion | 12,250,000 |
| 6 | Main Campus Police Department Expansion | 6,300,000 |
| 7 | Student Health Services Addition & Expansion | 3,600,000 |
| 8 | Croatan Dining Facility Renovation & Expansion | 1,500,000 |
| 9 | Greek Student Housing | 16,000,000 |
| 10 | Main Campus Book Store Expansion | 5,000,000 |
| 11 | Ficklen Stadium Concession Booth Renovation | 1,000,000 |
| 12 | North Recreational Fields Complex Expansion, Phase 2 | 10,500,000 |
| 13 | Ficklen Stadium East End Zone and Press Box Renovation & Expansion | 50,000,000 |
| 14 | Softball, Women's Soccer, Women's Track Support Facility Expansion | 2,500,000 |
| 15 | Soccer and Track complex Replacement | 3,000,000 |

UNC Tomorrow Taskforce
(Approved by Faculty Assembly on April 4, 2008)

Whereas, faculty input has been widely recognized as necessary for the success of UNC Tomorrow;

Therefore be it resolved, that each campus's Response to the UNC Tomorrow Report be provided to the Faculty Senate prior to May 1, 2008;

And that Chair of the Faculty Senate solicit a reaction to the campus's response to the UNC Tomorrow Final Report from the faculty of the institution and submit it to Faculty Assembly by May 30, 2008;

And that all of the Campus Responses and Faculty Senate responses be posted on the Assembly Website;

And that the General Administration actively involve the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee as it reviews and acts on these reports.

Be it further resolved, that the Forum recommended in Resolution 2008-3 be implemented.

Proposed Resolution
ECU Response to UNC Tomorrow Report
(Presented at ECU's Faculty Senate Meeting on April 22, 2008)

Whereas, faculty input has been widely recognized as necessary for the success of UNC Tomorrow;

Therefore be it resolved, that ECU's Response to the UNC Tomorrow Report be provided to the Faculty Senate prior to May 1, 2008.

Be it further resolved, that the Chair of the Faculty Senate solicits a reaction to the campus's response to the UNC Tomorrow Final Report from the faculty and submit it to Faculty Assembly by May 30, 2008.

Be it further resolved, that ECU's Response and Faculty Senate response be posted on ECU's Faculty Senate Website and the Faculty Assembly Website.

Be it further resolved, that the General Administration actively involve the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee as it reviews and acts on these reports;

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 22, 2008

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Substitute the following proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*,
Appendix C. Section III. Evaluation in reference to the
Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Revise Section III. Evaluation, 1. Teaching to read as follows:

"The quality of teaching must be evaluated by means of:

- a. formal methods of peer review, including direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and tenure-track faculty
- b. other methods of evaluation including materials such as syllabi, reading lists, outlines, examinations, audiovisual materials, student manuals, samples of student's work on assignments, projects, papers, examples of student achievement, and other materials prepared for or relevant to instruction.
- c. data from surveys of student opinion when an individual faculty member's data is consistently (more than 2 semesters) and significantly different (in the top 10 percent or the bottom 10 percent of the distribution) when compared to similar courses in the unit.
- d. other procedures provided for in unit codes."

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III.
Evaluation in reference to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Revise Section III. Evaluation, 1. Teaching to read as follows:
(addition noted in **bold** print, deletion noted in ~~strikethrough~~):

"The quality of teaching must be evaluated by means of:

- ~~a. data from surveys of student opinion, when such data have been gathered in accordance with established procedures of the department or the university which guarantee the integrity and completeness of said data. As part of the effort to evaluate the teaching of faculty members, each unit shall either: develop and use its own instrument(s) as approved by the chancellor to determine student opinion of teaching or utilize the instrument developed by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee to determine student opinion of teaching.~~
- ~~b.a.~~ formal methods of peer review, including direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and tenure-track faculty.
- b. review by the unit administrator and/or peers of course materials such as syllabi, reading lists, outlines, examinations, audiovisual materials, student manuals, samples of student's work on assignments, projects, papers, examples of student achievement, and other materials prepared for or relevant to instruction.**
- c. data from surveys of student opinion when an individual faculty member's data is consistently (more than 2 semesters) and significantly (more than 1 mean absolute deviation) from the unit's median for similar courses.**
- ~~e.d.~~ **other** procedures provided for in unit codes."

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 22, 2008

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Substitute the following proposed revisions
to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XII.B.2.a. and Part XII.B.3.a

Revise Part XII.B.2.a. and Part XII.B.3.a to read as follows:
(addition noted in **bold** print, deletion noted in ~~strikethrough~~):

"The Personnel Action Dossier shall include the following items:

- A.
- B. Recommendations
 - 1. For reappointment:
 -
 - 2. For tenure:
 - a. **One cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Tenure Committee. A draft of this cumulative evaluation, to be completed after the candidate turns in the PAD, should be available for discussion by the entire Tenure committee before the vote.**
~~A cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Tenure Committee.~~
 - b. A cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit administrator.
 - c. Unit Tenure Committee's recommendation, signature of the chair of the unit Personnel Committee, and date
 - d. Unit administrator's recommendation, signature, and date
 - e. Dean's recommendation, signature, and date
 - f. Provost/Vice Chancellor's recommendation, signature, date
 - 3. For promotion:
 - a. **One cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Promotion Committee. A draft of this cumulative evaluation, to be completed after the candidate turns in the PAD, should be available for discussion by the entire Promotion committee before the vote.**
~~A cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Promotion Committee.~~
 - b.

Faculty Senate Agenda
April 22, 2008
Attachment 8

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XII.B.2.a.

Revise Part XII.B.2.a. to read as follows:
(addition noted in **bold** print, deletion noted in ~~strikethrough~~):

The Personnel Action Dossier shall include the following items:

B.

C. Recommendations

(Note: The documents listed here will be added by the appropriate official as the Personnel Action progresses.)

1. For reappointment:
 - a. Unit Tenure Committee's recommendation, signature of the chair of the unit Personnel Committee, and date
 - b. Unit administrator's recommendation, signature, and date
 - c. Dean's recommendation, signature, and date
 - d. Provost/Vice Chancellor's recommendation, signature, date
2. For tenure:
 - a. **One cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Tenure Committee. A draft of this cumulative evaluation, to be completed after the candidate turns in the PAD, should be available for discussion by the entire Tenure committee before the vote.**
~~A cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit Tenure Committee.~~
 - b. A cumulative evaluation in narrative form of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and any other relevant duties, prepared by the unit administrator.
 - c. Unit Tenure Committee's recommendation, signature of the chair of the unit Personnel Committee, and date
 - d. Unit administrator's recommendation, signature, and date
 - e. Dean's recommendation, signature, and date
 - f. Provost/Vice Chancellor's recommendation, signature, date

Notes on the Faculty Assembly Meeting, April 4, 2008
Presented to the Faculty Senate, 4-22-08

1. Chair's report: Brenda Killingsworth

Dr. Killingsworth reported changes in the UNC Code¹ dealing with Post tenure review². After lengthy discussions the document provides solid performance reviews and is based around faculty development planning at the unit level.

She also talked about the current push from GA to lower student costs for education. Specifically she mentioned programs related to textbook costs⁴. A rental system is not currently being considered in the *Report on the Cost of Textbooks* submitted with the Campus-based Tuition and Fee Increase Requests for 2008. However, the emphasis is definitely on measures that might be effective in lowering the cost of books. She talked about how a guaranteed buy-back program might work and reminded all to submit textbook orders early in order to allow bookstores to search for lower cost used books.

2. President Erskine Bowls:

The president reiterated comments by Dr. Killingsworth regarding student costs and the price of books in particular. He was careful to note that the GA was being careful not to jump to conclusions about undue costs but that they (he) was also very serious about examining all components in the system toward a goal of holding the line against unnecessary cost increases. He also restated the issues relevant to submitting book orders in a timely manner, and noted that this data was going to get close attention.

President Bowls Spoke about how the middle class is currently taking the brunt of the cost for education. For example a family of four making at or below \$42 K per year can almost get someone through college debt free. This is not the case for those in the next levels of income

In addition to the above, he discussed three basic areas of focus: The UNC Tomorrow progress review, Budgetary Concerns, and Problems with the most recent Joint Education Board meeting; which he felt was not making good progress toward coordinating the K-12, Community College and UNC systems (please see UNCFA Minutes, <http://uncfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/minutes/index.htm> for details).

As to the budget, Need-based Education was considered the first priority with advancing faculty pay being the second priority. Approximately \$70 million is being earmarked for a tentative 4% across the board raise, \$72 million toward the goal of reaching the 80th percentile rank across faculty, \$7 million for distinguished professorships, and about \$5 million for equity cost adjustments and discretionary money for retention etc.

Respectfully submitted, John G. Cope, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Resource Documents:

1 UNC Code

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-03/minutes/Appendix%20J.pdf>

2 Guidelines on Performance Review for Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

[http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/docs/legal/policymanual/2008/Post-Tenure Guideline 400.3.3.1.pdf](http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/docs/legal/policymanual/2008/Post-Tenure%20Guideline%20400.3.3.1.pdf)

3 BOG Policies: Senior Academic and Administrative Officers

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-03/minutes/Appendix%20H.pdf>

Employees Exempt from State Personnel Act

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-03/minutes/Appendix%20I.pdf>

4 Report on the Cost of Textbooks

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-02/finance/Discussion%203.%20Report%20on%20Cost%20of%20Textbooks.pdf>

5 Committee on Education Planning ,Policies and Programs:

Revision of Academic Program Planning Process

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-03/planning/TAB4.%20Revision%20of%20the%20Academic%20Planning%20Process.pdf>

<http://intranet.northcarolina.edu/content.php/docs/bog/bogdocs/2008-03/workshops/Outline%20of%20Workshop%20PresentationV2.pdf>

**Faculty Senate Agenda of April 22, 2008
Additional Items of Committee Business**

Item 1.

**EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT
Response to the UNC Tomorrow Report**

The Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) considers relevant to our charge part 5.2 of the UNC Tomorrow Report, which states the need to "streamline the academic planning process", "eliminate unnecessary duplication", and create seamless UNC articulation or "integration" of course credit.

The EPPC believes that curriculum and program development is a faculty responsibility. Any system-wide changes to the planning process must reflect that principle. In addition, if programs are to be reviewed for elimination on grounds of productivity or duplication, the EPPC will need to draft formal guidelines on what criteria other than productivity statistics will be used to draft our recommendation to the chancellor on such matters. Furthermore, any articulation of course credit or degree requirements must be achieved through faculty committees, respecting each institution's mission and the strengths and goals of individual academic units.

Item 2.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

1. Request to add Graduate Certificate programs in Health Care Administration and Health Informatics within the Department of Health Services & Information Management's, College of Allied Health Sciences.
2. Request to add new certificates in Global Understanding and Global Understanding with Distinction within International Studies', College of Arts and Sciences.
3. Request to change the title of the Ph.D. in Bioenergetics to Bioenergetics and Exercise Science within the Department of Exercise and Sports Science, College of Health and Human Performance.
4. Request to add a Graduate Certificate in Deaf-Blindness within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education.
5. Request to establish new M.A. concentrations in English Studies, Creative Writing, Linguistics, Literature, Multicultural and Transnational Literatures, Rhetoric and composition, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages [TESOL], and Technical and Professional Communication within the Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences.
6. Request to establish new minors in Architectural Design Technology and Mechanical Design Technology within the Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science.
7. Request to establish a minor in Recreational Therapy within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance.

Item 3.

UNIT CODE SCREENING COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revisions to the Health Sciences Library Unit Code of Operation

C. Unit Administrator Evaluations

The director of the Laupus Library shall be evaluated **in accordance with established University policies** ~~as specified in Appendix L of the Faculty Manual.~~

D. University Administrator Evaluations

Faculty shall participate in the annual evaluation of administrators **in accordance with established University policies** ~~as specified in Appendix L of the Faculty Manual.~~

Link to full unit code:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/unitcodes/healthsciencelibrary.htm>

Item 4.

UNIT CODE SCREENING COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed revisions to the *General Guidelines for Writing and Revising A Unit Code of Operation*

Proposed additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted in ~~strikethrough~~.

**GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR WRITING
AND REVISING A UNIT CODE OF OPERATION**

Unit codes should be developed according to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L. East Carolina University Code. Units should include descriptions of procedures followed in the unit that are not covered in Appendix L and other Appendices of the *ECU Faculty Manual*. In addition:

1. Codes should be submitted on line numbered paper. All pages should include page number and date: e.g., new codes: 1:10/05/94; revised codes: 1: 10/10/94 rev.
2. Amendments must be made by following the amendment procedure of the current unit code. When submitting amendments, Unit Code Committees should briefly describe the reason for the change and indicate the line numbers affected, as well as provide copies of the affected pages in the current code with proposed changes underlined. They should also submit the revised amendments along with the original text. Amendments will be treated by the Faculty Senate Unit Code Screening Committee in isolation.
3. Comprehensive Code Review. Every seven (7) years, the Faculty Senate Unit Code Screening Committee will review a unit's entire code according to the following cycle: (latest current code in force approval date in parenthesis.):

- 2008/09 Anthropology (97), English (97), Sociology (97), History (98), Philosophy (99), Political Science (99), Foreign Languages (99), Music (99), Biology (00), Theatre and Dance (00),**
- 2009/10 Medicine (01), Geography (01)
- 2010/11 Physics (03), Chemistry (03), Academic Library Services (03)
- 2011/12 Social Work (04), Child Development and Family Relations (04), Interior Design (04), Economics (04), Criminal Justice (04)
- 2012/13 Technology and Computer Science (05) Education (05), Art and Design (06), Allied Health Sciences (06), Business (06),
Math (05)
- 2013/14 Geology (07), Nutrition and Dietetics (07), Health and Human Performance (07)**
- 2014/15 Nursing (08), Psychology (08), Communication (08), Hospitality Management (08), Health Sciences Library (08)**

One year prior to this date, code units will be asked by the Chair of the Faculty, to form a unit code committee to determine whether the current code still reflects current practice and is in compliance with university regulations, to propose changes (if any), to the tenured faculty of the unit. In the following year, representatives will be asked to meet with the Faculty Senate Unit Code Screening committee to discuss the current code and any amendments approved by the tenured faculty. All unit codes must comply with applicable portions of the Code of the University of North Carolina, the Code of East Carolina University, as well as relevant North Carolina and Federal Statutes.

4. Submit fourteen (14) copies of the code and amended code, if appropriate, to the Faculty Senate office with Attention to the Unit Code Screening Committee Chair. The new/amended code will be placed on the web at the Faculty Senate Unit Code Screening Committee site.
5. Codes should be submitted with a cover letter (see I. below)
6. Codes should be submitted with a cover page (see II. below)

I. Cover letter

The cover letter should state that the code was approved by majority of permanently tenured faculty members of the unit. See Appendix L, Sect C 1.

- A. First Codes: Cover letter should state that it is the first code from the unit. Explain how the unit was established, for example by dividing one unit into two. See Appendix L, Sect D 2b "dividing a code into two or more code units."
- OR
- B. Amended Codes: Clearly indicate the changes that are being proposed and why. Amended codes should include copies of the current code and the proposed code with amended sections underlined. Units may ask to amend only sections of the code.

II. Cover page

The cover page should include the name of the unit, Unit's school or college, East Carolina University, and the signatures of the appropriate university officials and chairs

with the effective date of the unit's code. See "Cover Page Example". Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 6.

Note: The Unit Code Screening Committee should be notified when a code status is changed, for example when a Department from the College of Arts and Sciences is transferred to the School of Education, the smaller unit's code is no longer in use. Refer to Appendix L, Sect D Code Unit Changes.

III. Checklist

This checklist will be used by the Unit Code Screening Committee to insure that codes comply with the appropriate *ECU Faculty Manual* Appendices. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3. New or amended unit codes being submitted to the Unit Code Screening Committee should:

- A. Include a cover letter and cover page.
- B. Include the unit's preamble
- C. Define the unit's faculty, graduate faculty, voting faculty, and who votes on a given issue.
- D. Define the unit's administrative organization.
- E. Define the membership, terms and duties of standing committees, and state to whom committees report or make recommendations.
- F. Include in the process of faculty evaluation:
 - 1. procedures and criteria in the evaluation of faculty members annually and otherwise for all personnel actions, including recommendations for merit awards, reappointment, promotion, and the award of permanent tenure (see Appendices C and D,)
 - 2. a statement regarding relative weights for teaching, creative activity/research, service, patient care/clinical and reassigned time to be used in the unit administrator's annual performance evaluation of faculty members.
- G. Include procedures for holding meetings within the unit.
- H. Define procedures for unit faculty members to indicate in a timely fashion and by vote their approval or disapproval of the unit's major planning documents, assessment documents and other major reports of unit operation prior to their submission in final form to person(s) outside the unit.
- I. Include procedures for discussing with its unit administrator the unit's annual budget request and annual report.
- J. Include procedures for developing criteria for salary increases.
- K. Include amendment procedure.
- L. Be as specific as possible when explaining procedures, for example if "input" is received explain the process used.
- M. State where recommendations are directed, to what person or body.
- N. State, "Unit administrators should ensure that code procedures are followed".

CODE FORMAT

Name of Unit

PREAMBLE

THIS CODE ALLOWS FOR FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN AND ESTABLISHES PROCEDURE FOR THE UNIT'S INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND IS CONSISTENT WITH ALL APPLICABLE APPENDICES OF THE *EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY MANUAL*.

Section I. Objectives/Mission

Objectives/Mission may be stated here or reference made to another document.

Section II. Organization/Composition

A. Definitions of voting faculty members.

1. Pertains to the unit's nominating committee for appointment of administrative officials, for making recommendations on code content to the permanently tenured unit faculty members, and for evaluations of the effectiveness of unit administrators. Refer to Appendix L, Sect A and Appendix D, Sect IV.
2. Pertains to making recommendations for appointments, reappointments, promotion, and the conferral of permanent tenure to faculty. Refer to Appendix D, Sect IV.

B. Administrative organization of the unit and its subdivisions. Give the titles and responsibilities of administrative officials, including coordinators and directors. Also, for administrative officers, include appointment procedures, terms of office and evaluation procedures. Refer to **current University policies. Appendix L, Sect B.**

C. Unit administrator will discuss with faculty the unit's annual budget request and annual report. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3h.

Section III. Standing Committees

Include titles of committees, membership, method of selection, term of office duties/responsibilities/functions, where recommendations are forwarded. Committee membership should be included with each committee. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3d.

Section IV. Faculty Personnel Actions

(Do not repeat the procedures outlined in Appendices C or D)

- A. Selection and Appointment of New Faculty. Refer to Appendix C, Sect I.
- B. Teaching Assignments and Reassigned Time. Refer to Appendix C, Sect II.
- C. Faculty Evaluation
 1. Establish criteria for conducting procedures outlined in Appendix L, Sects C 5, E, F, and G.

2. Include a statement regarding relative weights and how they are used to evaluate faculty. Refer to Appendix C, Sect III and Appendix L, Sect 3e.
- D. Reappointment and Professional Advancement. Establish criteria for each faculty rank. Refer to Appendix C, Sect III and Appendix L, Sect C 3e.
- E. Merit Award/Salary. Establish criteria for the evaluation of faculty for merit salary raises. Refer to Appendix C, Sect V and Appendix L, Sect C 3e.
- F. Personnel/Evaluation Files. Refer to Appendix C, Sect VI.
- G. Tenure and Promotion. Refer to Appendix D and Appendix L, Sect C 3e.

Section V. Meetings

Include requirements and procedures for calling meetings, and by whom, agenda requirements and reference to conduct by *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 1.

Section VI. Evaluation of Unit, Unit Administrator(s) and University Administrators

Develop procedures for:

- A. Faculty to indicate in a timely fashion and by vote their approval or disapproval of the unit's major planning documents, assessment documents, and other major reports of unit operations, such as evaluations of administrative officials prior to their submission in final form to person(s) outside the unit. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C. 3g. **and University policies.**
- B. Program evaluation. Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3e.
- C. Unit administrators evaluations. **Unit administrators shall be evaluated in accordance with established University policies.** ~~Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3f.~~
- D. University administrators evaluations. **University administrators shall be evaluated in accordance with established University policies.** ~~Refer to Appendix L, Sect C 3g.~~

Section VII. Unit's Annual Budget and Report

Develop procedures for discussion with unit administrator the unit's

- A. Annual budget request
- B. Annual report

Section VIII. Criteria for Salary Increases

Develop procedures for developing criteria for salary increases

Section IX. Other Policies and Documents

Include a list or summary of content and location of other governing policy documents used in the unit, if appropriate.

Section X. Enabling

Upon the approval by a majority of the permanently tenured faculty members of the unit by secret ballot and after approval by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor. Refer to Appendix L, Sect D 1.

Section XI. Amendment of Code

Include procedures for amending code, how much prior notice is required, and what kind of vote is required (majority, 3/5, etc.). Refer to *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* "Bylaws," #55, Article IX. "This Code MUST be approved by a majority of the permanently tenured faculty members of the unit." (Appendix L. C. 1.)

COVER PAGE EXAMPLE

Effective date: ____ Latest Rev. date ____

UNIT CODE OF OPERATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF/UNIT NAME _____
SCHOOL/COLLEGE OF _____
EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Initial Code Approval

1. Approved by the tenured faculty of the Unit:

Chair, Unit Code Committee: _____ Date: _____

2. If changed, reapproved by tenured faculty:

Chair, Unit Code Committee: _____ Date: _____

3. Submitted to Dean for advice:

_____ Date: _____

4. Reviewed/recommended by Faculty Senate Unit Code Screening Committee:

Chair: _____ Date: _____

5. Approved by the East Carolina University Faculty Senate:

Chair of the Faculty: _____ Date: _____

6. Approved by East Carolina University Chancellor/or designee:

Chancellor: _____ Date: _____
(Effective Date)

Revision of Code: ____ Complete; or ____ Part(s) Effective ____

**FUNDED 2008-2009 RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY
SUMMER STIPENDS AND DUAL SUMMER STIPENDS
AND PROJECT EXPENSE GRANTS**

REVISED 4-24-08

| 2008 | Name | Unit | Proposal Title | Type | Amount |
|------|--|----------------------|--|------|----------|
| 07 | Thomas D. Raedeke | Health & Human Perf. | Physical and Depression: Evaluating the Impact of a Psychotherapist Led Activity Promotion Intervention | Dual | \$22,034 |
| 22 | Colin S. Burns | Chemistry | Quantitating Prion-Derived Peptide Anchoring to Membranes by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance: A Key Step in Exploring Prion-Prion Interactions | Dual | \$19,441 |
| 26 | Anthony Kulas | Health & Human Perf. | Effects of Truck position on knee biomechanics during a single-leg squat | Dual | \$21,296 |
| 27 | Margaret Bauer | English | Understanding Tim Gautreaux: A Book Manuscript | Dual | \$14,813 |
| 29 | Randall Parker | Economics | Interwar historical antecedents of modern inflation targeting central banks | SS | \$17,029 |
| 39 | Constance Mullinix | Nursing | Description of retired registered nurses in the national sample survey of registered nurses | SS | \$13,835 |
| 41 | Yong Wang | Geography | Mapping estuarine shorelines of Albermarle-Pamlico Sounds on a routine basis: a satellite remote sensing approach | Dual | \$19,480 |
| 47 | Jason Bond | Biology | Evaluating genetic structure at the population/species interface: the development of genomic molecular markers and novel coalescent-based computational approaches | Dual | \$23,819 |
| 51 | Linda Darty | Art and Design | Creating metal jewelry and vessels using industrial liquid enamel | Dual | \$21,259 |
| 55 | Jonathan Reid | History | From religious dissent to religious revolt: the rise of the reformed church in Poitiers and Rouen, 1520-1562 | Dual | \$20,519 |
| 56 | Haiyong Liu | Economics | Maternal Work Schedules, Childcare Arrangements, and Child Development | SS | \$12,813 |
| 57 | Mohammad Reza Jahan-Parvar | Economics | The curse of natural resources: A study of impact of high oil prices on less developed oil exporting countries | Dual | \$18,470 |

Lee, Lori

From: Lee, Lori
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2008 6:29 AM
To: Faculty Senate
Cc: Poteat, Michael; Wolfe, Linda
Subject: SOIS Analysis
Attachments: berk.pdf

A correspondence from Michael Poteat is below. He will be unable to attend the Senate meeting today and asked that any questions be directed to him at poteatg@ecu.edu. Thanks.

ECU Faculty Senators,

As you consider the resolution from the Academic Standards Committee on modifying the Faculty Manual regarding the assessment of teaching effectiveness, I wanted to share some information about the SOIS. I also want to point out that this represents my opinion and it has not been vetted by anyone else in the ECU administration.

First the on-line SOIS is still experiencing problems with response rates. Institutional Effectiveness is attempting to increase the student response rate on the web version of the SOIS, but faculty members need to encourage student participation. As I have related before, we currently could not return to printing the old SOIS because we don't have: (1) the computer programs which were written at least partially in COBOL, (2) the mainframe that housed the programs, and (3) an impact printer. I think the cost of printing forms using the former method is prohibitive. I spoke with the director of Institutional Research at UNC-Asheville last week and at UNC-A the departments purchase the forms and the departmental office administrators must pencil in all of the course information (course ID and instructor ID). I know that UNC-A is a very different place from ECU, but ECU is doing a massive number of surveys. (Our response rates are lower for every survey we are currently conducting.) We could have the SOIS forms printed off campus (actually pre-slugged) with the course information. That would also be expensive and we would have to have the forms printed early in the semester, and no adjustments (for the wrong instructor etc.) could be made. Another option would be to go with an external survey (e.g. the IDEA student survey). The use of an external printed form would probably be cheaper than using our own forms, but we would face similar time limitations. Remember, that IPRE (and specifically Institutional Effectiveness) builds the list of courses, section numbers, instructor's ID, number of students, ending date of the course, method of instruction, etc. from the Registrar's database. The information is entered by departments and every mistake (e.g. not putting an early ending date for a block course) causes a lot of extra work on our part (specifically it falls on Chuck Rich).

A related issue that I want to comment on is the use of **incentives** for the **SOIS**. We are offering incentives to students this semester who complete the student opinion of instruction survey. Students who complete the survey will be randomly selected and will receive \$100 gift certificates. Recently, I have had several faculty who questioned the ethics of offering incentives to student for completing the SOIS. Obviously, the only way for faculty to offer

incentives is to the class as a group for achieving a certain overall response rate for the class. I don't have any ethical qualms about faculty offering this form of incentive. I don't see it as being different than offering extra-credit for additional homework assignments or for class attendance. I believe that an attempt to require faculty to offer incentives or to forbid faculty from offering incentives would be seen as an infringement on academic freedom. Participation in the evaluation of a course is important as part of the course. Nonetheless, I think this is a decision that must be left to individual faculty.

This past week, I had a faculty member e-mail and ask if any research had been done on the effect of incentives on ratings. My answer was that my office had not done any research, but that research had been done by others and demonstrated no significant effects. I found the following reference after a brief search:

Dommeier, C. J., Baum, P. Hanna, R. W., & Chapman, K. S. (2004) "Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: their effects on response rates and evaluations." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 29, (5) 611-623.

Abstract: This study compares student evaluations of faculty teaching that were completed in-class with those collected online. The two methods of evaluation were compared on response rates and on evaluation scores. In addition, this study investigates whether treatments or incentives can affect the response to online evaluations. It was found that the response rate to the online survey was generally lower than that to the in-class survey. Additionally, the study found that online evaluations do not produce significantly different mean evaluation scores than traditional in-class evaluations, even when different incentives are offered to students who are asked to complete online evaluations.

After some reflection, I realized that Institutional Effectiveness had (**unintentionally**) looked at the effective of incentives. We have for the past 4-years compared the DE survey (incentives have routinely been offered to DE students who complete the survey) with the face-to-face SOIS (no incentives) including matching sections on the basis of instructor and course. We found no significant statistical differences doing a series (by semester) of matched paired t-tests using samples usually greater than 70.

Other issues with the SOIS:

I have now examined the distribution of the SOIS in some detail. My professional opinion (**for what it is worth**) is that the SOIS can be used to identify faculty with extremely low student ratings. The data are extremely left skewed and there are groups of faculty who clearly fall out as having exceptionally low student ratings (note that I did not say they were not effective instructors). However, it is very difficult to differentiate between the remaining faculty. In the spring of 2007 for example, only 5% of faculty had scores on Item 19 below 4.35. The cut off for the upper 5% was 7.0 and the upper 10% was at 6.89 (this is the 90th percentile). In fact, 80% of the mean Item19 ratings were between 5.0 and 6.89, and 50% were above 6.37. A very similar pattern was observed with the sum of the means for Items 1-16 (minus the textbook item). I think it is important to note that students rating of the difficulty of the course were more strongly correlated with Item 19, and the mean of Items 1-16, than the class response rate. That is, courses perceived as demanding and difficult receive lower ratings from students. This is not an extremely strong relationship but it is one of the most consistent

findings in the literature on student ratings.

The **legality** of using an un-validated instrument (I don't think anyone has ever effectively demonstrated criterion related validity for student ratings) as the only or main measure of teaching effectiveness has been challenged. Sproule (2000)

Concerning questions about the legal basis of student evaluations of faculty, Lechtreck (1990) points out that, "In the past few decades, courts have struck down numerous tests used for hiring, and/or promotions on the grounds that the tests were discriminatory or allowed the evaluator to discriminate. The question, How would you rate the teaching ability of this instructor, is wide open to abuse" (p. 298). In his column, "Courtside," Zirkel (1996) states, "Courts will not uphold evaluations that are based on subjective criteria or data" (p. 579). Administrative assumptions to the contrary, student evaluations of faculty are not objective, but rather, by their very nature, must be considered subjective. (p. 2) (Note 3)

The AAUP has a statement on the evaluation of teaching at: <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/evalstatement.htm>. The AAUP supports the use of student opinion measures but also identifies a number of other sources of data that should be included in completing evaluations. A radically different opinion is offered by Haskell (1997) and can be found at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v5n6.html>. Also, the **CAUT** (Canadian Association of University Teachers which is the equivalent of the AAUP) offers the following observation:

Surveys of student opinion about teaching should not be characterized or described as if they measure teaching effectiveness. While students are uniquely placed to comment on their own reactions to what happens in the classroom, they are not in a position to assess all of the components of teaching effectiveness. See <http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=300&lang=1> for the complete statement (in English).

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness: I have attached an article by Berk (2005) on the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Berk is a professor of Biostatistics and the former Dean of Teaching at John Hopkins. He has reviewed the literature and identified 12 measures of teaching effectiveness.

There are 12 potential sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness: (a) student ratings, (b) peer ratings, (c) self-evaluation, (d) videos, (e) student interviews, (f) alumni ratings, (g) employer ratings, (h) administrator ratings, (i) teaching scholarship, (j) teaching awards, (k) learning outcome measures, and (l) teaching portfolio.

Berk makes the following conclusions:

- (1) Student ratings is (? sic) a necessary source of evidence of teaching effectiveness for both formative and summative decisions, but not a sufficient source for the latter. Considering all of the polemics over its value, it is still an essential component of any faculty evaluation system.**
- (2) Peer ratings of teaching performance and materials is the most complementary source of evidence to student ratings. It covers those aspects of teaching that students are not in a position to evaluate. Student and peer ratings, viewed**

together, furnish a very comprehensive picture of teaching effectiveness for teaching improvement. Peer ratings should not be used for personnel decisions.

- (3) Self-evaluation is an important source of evidence to consider in formative and summative decisions. Faculty input on their own teaching completes the triangulation of the three direct observation sources of teaching performance: students, peers, and self.
- (4) If faculty are really committed to improving their teaching, a video is one of the best sources of evidence for formative decisions, interpreted either alone or, preferably, with peer input. If the video is used in confidence for this purpose, faculty should decide whether it should be included in their self evaluation or portfolio as a "work sample" for summative decisions.
- (5) The quality control circle is an excellent technique to provide constant student feedback for teaching improvement. The group interview as an independent evaluation can be very informative to supplement student ratings. Exit interviews may be impractical to conduct or redundant with exit ratings, described in the next section.
- (6) Although exit and alumni ratings are similar to original student ratings on the same scale, different scale items about the quality of teaching, courses, curriculum admissions, and other topics can provide new information. Alumni ratings should be considered as another important source of evidence on teaching effectiveness.
- (7) Employer ratings provides an indirect source of evidence for program evaluation decisions about teaching effectiveness and attainment of program outcomes, especially for professional schools. Job performance data may be linked to
- (8) Administrator ratings is (sic) typically based on secondary sources, not direct observation of teaching or any other areas of performance. This source furnishes a perspective different from all other sources on merit pay and promotion decisions.
- (9) Teaching scholarship is an important source of evidence to supplement the three major direct observation sources. It can easily discriminate the "teacher scholar" and very creative faculty from all others for summative decisions.
- (10) As a source of evidence of teaching effectiveness, at best, teaching awards provide worthwhile information only on the nominees, and, at worst, they supply inaccurate and unreliable feedback on questionable nominees who may have appeared on Law and Order. The merits of teaching awards should be evaluated in the context of an institution's network of incentives and rewards for teaching.
- (11) Learning outcome measures should be employed with extreme caution as a source of evidence for faculty evaluation. It's safer to use in conjunction with the direct data sources described previously for program improvement.

- (12) **As a collection of many of the previous sources and them some, the teaching portfolio should be reserved primarily for summative decisions to present a comprehensive picture of teaching effectiveness to complement the list of research publications.**

In summary, I don't think the SOIS can be used to differentiate faculty except into very broad categories. Faculty who have very low ratings can be identified, but discriminations between faculty who have ratings above the 5th or 10th percentile are difficult to justify. At the best, I think faculty can be classified as (1) having extremely low ratings, (2) having ratings below the median, (3) having ratings above the median, and **perhaps** (4) having extremely high ratings. To discriminate between faculty who have ratings of say 6.1 and 6.3, or between 6.3 and 6.5, is (again, in my opinion) unwarranted. An increased emphasis on other measures of teaching effectiveness and the development of disciplinary appropriate measures for assessing teaching should be encouraged. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is difficult but also important. I regret that I cannot attend the Faculty Senate Meeting to answer questions.

G. Michael Poteat, PhD
Director of Institutional Effectiveness
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology