

P  
V  
A

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 2008**

The eighth regular meeting of the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, April 22, 2008, 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 March 18, 2008, were approved as distributed.

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

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Levine (Medicine) Grymes (Music), Rose (Nursing), and Chancellor Ballard.

Alternates present were: Professors Lawrence for Thomas (Academic Library Services), Bell for Jenkins (Allied Health Sciences), Lillian for Deena (English), Felts for Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), Theurer for Hall (Music), and Gopalakrishnan for Smith (Technology and Computer Science).

**B. Announcements**

The Senate recognized a moment of silence prior to the start of the business for all those within the University community who have died during the academic year.

A special thanks was extended to Interim Vice Chancellor Phyllis Horns and Associate Vice Chancellor John Toller for their efforts to provide the 2007/08 EPA Salary data online.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the February 19, 2008, Faculty Senate meeting.

- 08-04 Report regarding the planning of a new PhD program in the Department of Economics, a new concentration in Atlantic World History in the Department of History's MA in History, a new Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Science and Technology in the Department of Geography, and a new Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.  
Excerpt from Chancellor Ballard's letter: *"While it is generally known around campus that the academic planning rules from the General Administration have changed, I do want to reinforce the necessity that all plans for new programs address the state need for the program, the relevance of the program to UNC Tomorrow, and the sources of revenue necessary to ensure excellence in the new program."*
- 08-05 Revised Health Sciences Library Unit Code of Operations (with exceptions).  
Excerpt from Chancellor Ballard's letter: *"is approved, with the exception of Section VI.C (Unit Administrator Evaluations) and Section VI.D (University*



*Administrator Evaluations), which I am remanding to the Faculty Senate for its resolution consistent with the Board of Trustees' Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers at ECU policy. I look forward to your quick turnaround of this matter."*

08-06 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the January 24, 2008, Committee Meeting

08-08 Series of transitional problems with the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS) results for Fall 2007

Unit administrators and all online program coordinators are asked to please complete the Distance Education Administrator's Survey, which can be accessed by the link below. This survey was developed by Faculty Senate standing Academic Continuing and Career Education Committee. The purpose of this survey is to identify and explore key issues for administrators in the development and management of Distance Education programs. Valuable information is included in the survey in the form of live links to sites that codify accreditation standards or offer administrative and faculty support. This survey has 35 questions. The time it takes to complete will vary according to response; several text boxes are included for comments.

[http://www.cpe2.ecu.edu/surveys/CCEC\\_DE\\_Administrator\\_Survey.htm](http://www.cpe2.ecu.edu/surveys/CCEC_DE_Administrator_Survey.htm)

Faculty interested in periodically receiving issues of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* are asked to call the Faculty Senate office at 328-6537 and place their name on a list for distribution.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard was out of town and unable to return in time to attend the meeting.

D. Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies

Vice Chancellor Mageean began her remarks by thanking the Faculty Senate for allowing her to report on UNC Tomorrow again. She thanked the 62 faculty, administrators, and an ECU Board of Trustee member for all their work on the UNC Tomorrow report. Dr. Mageean discussed the UNC Tomorrow Response Team. ([Link to team members](#)) She also acknowledged and thanked the Faculty Senate committees for their individual reports and responses. In reference to the UNC Tomorrow Report, she stated that the committees and subcommittees had been assigned to respond to the UNC Tomorrow report by May 1. Mageean stated that the initial ECU - UNC Tomorrow document, in response to specific points, would showcase the type of university ECU was and what we are doing well. VC Mageean stated that she would hire a writer and graphic artist to cohesively tie in all points before presenting the report to GA. She stated that the UNC Tomorrow committee had collected more information than could possibly be synthesized. She stated that all of this information would be stored for future purposes (marketing, future ideas, etc.) and may be attached to the UNC Tomorrow report as an appendix.

Vice Chancellor Mageean then discussed the Carnegie Classification on the Engaged University. Regarding the application for the Carnegie Classification on the Engaged University, due on September 1<sup>st</sup>, Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that sixteen faculty turned out for the retreat to discuss this new classification. VC Mageean reported that all of this information was on the Research and Graduate Studies website and stated that the Carnegie Foundation provides university designations, such as the Engaged University classification. A copy of the application, which consists of 40 pages of documentation, was needed in order to apply for this



designation. VC Mageean further stated that this was an involved process, even for such an engaged university as East Carolina University. She then announced that Professor Beth Velde (College of Allied Health Sciences), who had practiced the scholarship of engagement, had been asked to lead this university endeavor. VC Mageean stated that Professor Dee Dee Glascoff (Vice Chair of the Faculty, Health and Human Performance) had also been contacted, due to her experience with engaged scholarship, to be involved with the team upon her return to campus. Eight campuses have applied in the State, in addition to NCSU and UNC-CH, who already have this classification. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that ECU needed to define the scholarship of engagement, which appeared to be the most confusing area. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that there are overlaps in the UNC Tomorrow Response and Carnegie Classification (Engaged University). She stated that there was a group of administrators and faculty who are involved in looking at overall task forces, responses, and other intercepting factors.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages) stated that her specialty was medieval languages and that in relation to the aggressive pursuit of the Carnegie Classification as an Engaged University, does this now mean that the normal liberal arts academic scholarship will continue to garner University support. Vice Chancellor Mageean responded that engaged scholarship or funded research may not be for everyone. She stated that this classification would not affect core research and would help to define engaged scholarship for the university.

E. Mark Taggart, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Taggart stated that it had been an honor for him to represent the faculty the past two years and to learn more about the University. He stated that every day that he has been in the position, his respect for ECU faculty has grown. It has been a pleasure to discover that faculty members who, after joining ECU, become dedicated to providing students with rich, distinctive undergraduate and graduate experiences. He noted that he appreciates the contributions that each of the Senators have made to ECU, whether it was in the classroom, the lab, or in service. ECU faculty members have taken our motto, "to serve," to heart, and their service through education, research and creative activity, leadership and partnership remains exemplary. Faculty have contributed in making ECU the wonderful place that it is. It doesn't mean that the Faculty Senate's work is done, however. The Faculty Senate will need to manage the expected increases in enrollment in the coming years. Chair Taggart stated that we, the faculty need to continue the discussion of planning for undergraduate and graduate programs. We also need to continue our conversation regarding the combination of the divisions of academic affairs and student life. And, in light of recent changes in policy, faculty members and the Faculty Senate will need to continue its work on best practices in the hiring and evaluating of ECU's administrators.

Chair Taggart also took the opportunity to thank his officers. He was grateful for the opportunity to work with Vice Chair Deedee Glascoff, Secretary Marianna Walker, and Parliamentarian Dale Knickerbocker. He also expressed thanks to all of the faculty who had served on the various standing University committees this past year. He thanked them for their hard work and dedication to shared governance. Chair Taggart also gave a special thanks to Lori Lee, who was invaluable in helping keep everything running seamlessly and smoothly.

F. John Cope, Faculty Assembly Delegate



Professor Cope provided the following written comments on the April 4, 2008, Faculty Assembly meeting.

Chair's report: Dr. Brenda Killingsworth reported changes in the UNC Code dealing with Post tenure review. After lengthy discussions the document provided solid performance reviews and was 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 costs. A rental system was 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 was 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.

President Erskine Bowles 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 Bowles Spoke about how the middle class was currently taking the brunt of the cost for education. In addition, President Bowles 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 (link to full 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 was being earmarked for a tentative 4% across the board raise, \$72 million toward the goal of reaching the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile rank across faculty, \$7 million for distinguished professorships, and about \$5 million for equity cost adjustments and discretionary money for retention etc.

Professor Cope referenced a resolution passed by the Faculty Assembly on April 4, 2008, then offered a similar one for Senate consideration:

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 solicit a reaction to the campus' response to the UNC Tomorrow Final Report from the faculty of the institution and submit it to Faculty Assembly by May 30, 2008.

Be it further resolved, that ECU's Response and Faculty Senate's 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 UNC Faculty Assembly Executive Committee as it reviews and acts on these reports.

There was no discussion and the proposed resolution on the UNC Tomorrow Report was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-17**

Professor Tovey (English) asked if anyone knew if President Bowles was aware that the bookstore did not always order the books in a timely fashion even though the faculty may get the orders in early. Cope replied no.

Professor Robinson (Math) asked Dr. Killingsworth what changes were discussed in Faculty Assembly about the University post tenure review process. Professor Killingsworth (Faculty Assembly Delegate, Business) stated that GA approved what was sent forth regarding post tenure review. She reported that they did not make any changes to what the faculty delegates proposed. Professor Killingsworth reported that the faculty assembly is now working on fixed-term faculty issues.

G. Question Period

Professor Jones (Criminal Justice) discussed a particular website that asked for students to rate their professor(s) and wondered if administrators were using the data on this to evaluate faculty members. Professor Niswander (Business) stated that all of that was useless information on the referenced website and that he would doubt any University administrator utilized that data.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) stated that her unit had lost three graduate students this year due to the late applications received and wondered if changes were now in place within the Graduate School to eliminate the delays experienced this year. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that again this semester, Banner and registration did not go smoothly, i.e. "special add" and wondered how things were going to be addressed over the summer so that there would not be repeat problems.

Dr. Judi Bailey (Senior Executive Director of Enrollment Management) stated that she thought that this issue had been resolved. She stated that it was her understanding that there was a place on Banner for an advisor and student to do this electronically. She stated that she would address this in her staff meeting and talk with Angela Anderson (Registrar). She stated further that there were constraints in how questions are received and then answered. Dr. Bailey stated that she would try to resolve the issue. Some of the questions/issues involve a retooling of the system, which cannot be resolved during the registration period.

Professor McCammon (Health and Human Performance) asked about length of time in processing senior summaries. He stated that the time line was too long. Dr. Judi Bailey (Senior Executive Director of Enrollment Management) stated that she was aware of the problem and that Mary Beth Corbin was now working with the Registrar to decrease the time and increase the efficiency in processing senior summaries.

Professor Wang (Geography) asked Judy Bailey about Banner registration and relayed the experience he had when he was unable to assist a student in dropping the last course. Dr.



Bailey stated the student may have to wait until the next day to drop a course. Professor Wang (Geography) stated that that this did not resolve the issue.

Professor Robinson (Math) asked Interim Provost Sheerer about the rotational 5-year unit evaluation and wondered why this was still not being done across campus. Interim Provost Sheerer responded that Professor Weismiller (Medicine) and the SACS review team would explore this issue, especially in the area of assessment. Professor Weismiller (Medicine) responded that student outcomes, quality assessment, and performance management assessment were all helpful in program review.

#### **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. Academic Awards Committee**

Professor Patricia Dragon (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. There was no discussion and the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report was approved as presented.

##### **RESOLUTION #08-18**

##### **B. Academic Standards Committee**

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee, first presented a substitute motion to the Committee's earlier proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III. in reference to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey. Professor Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked if these were in ranked order, or could a faculty member do one or the other?

Professor Rigsby (Geology) referenced the Faculty Governance Committee's proposed substitute resolution and asked why the Committee had now decided to go a different way. Professor Bailey (Philosophy), member of the Academic Standards Committee, replied that he had suggested, after hearing the discussion with the Faculty Governance Committee to put the SOIS third in the order because of all of the problems, and combined with peer reviewing and other methods that the units are currently utilizing.

Professor Jesse (Nursing) moved to have the wording changed to read: "The quality of teaching must be evaluated using multiple methods that are listed in ranked order as follows:" Professor Lillian (English) spoke against that idea. Professor Dosser (Child Development and Family Relations) stated that methods of peer review should not be used in this way. Professor Jenks (History) stated that this was contradictory and that if faculty want multiple methods to be utilized, then we should prioritize the list of multiple methods. Professor Romack (Chemistry) stated that that may be inappropriate.

Professor Sprague (Physics) offered a friendly amendment to delete the text that refers to lists in ranked order so that it reads "The quality of teaching must be evaluated using multiple methods." Rigsby (Geology) spoke against the friendly amendment. Professor Lillian (English) offered another friendly amendment to change the wording to read "The quality of teaching must



be evaluated using multiple methods chosen from among the following." Professor Zoller stated that the friendly amendment did not work to address the issue being discussed. Niswander asked who would choose the methods. Lillian responded that the same problem was there even without her amendment. Professor Romack (Chemistry) stated that this was a good starting point with nothing ranked higher than anything else. Professor Lillian's friendly amendment passed.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) moved to have this report returned to the Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Governance Committee for further consideration by both committees. Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that this was very much needed and that the manual revision needed to be clear and state who makes the choices of what methods to use, i.e. peer review is required for new faculty. All of this needs to be reviewed collaboratively with both the Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Governance Committee. Professor Gopalakrishnan (Technology and Computer Science) stated his support for returning the item to the committee noting that units should not be allowed to set their own procedures as referenced in "d. other procedures provided for in unit codes".

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* were referred to the Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Governance Committee for further review.

**RESOLUTION #08-19**

Professor Wolfe then presented a proposal for posting Student Opinion of Instruction Survey results on the web. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that the unit administrator would be able to obtain information for all faculty members, but not specific comments addressed to the faculty members. Professor Stapleton (Education) asked if this information could be downloaded. Professor Lillian (English) spoke against the proposal stating that all of the data should be easily downloaded and transferred to the faculty members' annual evaluation and annual report form.

Professor Martinez offered an amendment to the title to read: Proposal for faculty access to student opinion of instruction survey information on the web. The motion passed. Professor Roberts (Philosophy) moved to amend the first line editorially to hyphenate "turn-around". Professor Robinson (Math) asked what the summary report meant. Wolfe replied that the summary report excluded any comments about the faculty member.

Following discussion, the proposal for posting Student Opinion of Instruction Survey results on the web was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #08-20**

Professor Wolfe then presented revised Guidelines for Outcome Assessment of Foundations Courses. Professor Lillian (English) offered an editorial amendment to add "her" to all "his" references. There was no further discussion and the revised Guidelines for Outcome Assessment of Foundations Courses was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-21**

C. Admissions and Retention Policies Committee

John Kerbs (Criminal Justice), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented first a resolution on Undergraduate Retention. Professor Jones (Criminal Justice) asked about the mandatory attendance reference and mandatory study skills workshops and the enforcement of this resolution. Study skills workshops are beneficial but it shouldn't be mandatory. COAD 1000



incorporates study skills into that class. Professor Corbett (Geology) stated that more focus should be on retaining students. Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked about the goal for the retention rate increase by Fall 2011.

Professor Lillian (English) stated that she liked to see a report's references and that she had not seen any research on why ECU's students leave. Does such research exist and if so she would like to see what ECU students need so that resources can be focused on those particular issues. Professor McCammon (Health and Human Performance) stated that a problem he is aware of is the time between classes is so limited that students do not have time to get from Minges to Brewster, etc. which causes students to miss classes.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) spoke in favor of the resolution on Undergraduate Retention stating that introductory students don't have study skills and that this effort would be welcomed in order to provide students with what they needed to be successful. He stated that ECU is going to have to help students in dealing with the various first-year college problems or misconceptions. For example, he stated that he changed his attendance policy, to actually have one, because students were interpreting that if a faculty member did not have an attendance policy, that they need not attend class.

Professor Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) stated that workshops were good ahead of time, when we can flag their records but where does it end. It will only become perfunctory to the students if we continue to just front-load student activities.

Professor Sharer (English) stated that in reference to the attendance policy, which fell under the purview of the Admission and Retention Policies Committee, revisions to the current University attendance policy were needed in order to gain broader faculty support of actively promoting and encouraging class attendance. The committee will try to address this in the Fall with a goal of emphasizing the importance of class attendance.

Professor Jones (Criminal Justice) moved to delete the word "mandatory" from the motion and spoke about the two meanings of "mandatory" and stated that the University should find out which students need the mandatory study skills workshop. The motion passed.

Professor Schenarts (Medicine) stated that there was no data referenced in the resolution to address key data on ECU students that would make the efforts more specific. He asked about distance education and the need for additional support for this growing population.

Professor Robinson (Math) stated that he got into trouble for having a remedial program in Mathematics although the students performed better later, particularly in algebra. He stated that the unit was discouraged in offering this program and were told to reduce the passing score on the placement test, allowing students to be exempt from remedial classes due to the lower required score on placement tests.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that this resolution did not address admission standards and it was impossible to talk about retention without talking about admission. Professor Tovey (English) stated that the English department had two specific programs designed to support students.



Professor Brown (Psychology) spoke in favor of the motion, stating that these issues affect faculty of all disciplines and that although the resolution doesn't address admissions it does address attendance and study needs. Students currently have a good academic support system and faculty should encourage more students to utilize the opportunities already available.

Professor Felts (Health and Human Performance) asked about requiring freshman students to live on campus and did the University have actually enough dorms for this. Professor Sprague called the question. Following discussion, the resolution on Undergraduate Retention was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #08-22**

D. Continuing and Career Education Committee

Jocelyn Nelson (Music), Chair of the Committee, presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. There was no discussion and the committee's report was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-23**

E. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Dale Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages), Chair of the Committee, presented first a Request for a new Concentration Area in Theatre for Youth, School of Theatre and Dance, College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request for a Name Change of the Minor being offered, from "Management of Recreation and Facilities Services" (MRFS) to "Recreation and Park Management" (RPM), Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance; Notification of an Intent to Plan a Master of Science in Sustainable Tourism, North Carolina Center for Sustainable Tourism, Division of Research and Graduate Studies; 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; Request to add new certificates in Global Understanding and Global Understanding with Distinction within International Studies', College of Arts and Sciences; 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; Request to add a Graduate Certificate in Deaf-Blindness within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education; 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; 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; Request to establish a minor in Recreational Therapy within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance. There were no questions and the academic unit requests were approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION #08-24**

Professor Knickerbocker then presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. There were no questions and the committee's report was approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION #08-25**



F. Faculty Governance Committee

Puri Martinez (Foreign Languages), Chair of the Committee, first presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. There was no discussion and the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report was accepted as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-26**

Professor Martinez then presented a substitute motion to the Committee's earlier proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XII.B.2.a. to also include a revision to Part XII.B.3.a. by adding "tenure" and "promotion" to clarify what the vote is on. Professor Niswander (Business) asked what does "vote" mean, then offered an editorial amendment to include vote "on tenure" and vote "on promotion" to Part XII.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked if in large academic units like hers, could the unit decide to allow a smaller group to get together to draft the cumulative report, and then present it for approval to all eligible to vote. Professor Sharer (English) asked who approved the evaluation report and would the committee vote on the wording of the cumulative evaluation and the actual vote on the faculty member.

Professor Lillian (English) asked when did the cumulative letter change from being a draft to a final report. Professor Sharer (English) stated that she thought that the term "evaluation" was confusing. Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) called the question. Following discussion, the substitute motion was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #08-27**

G. Unit Code Screening Committee

Garris Conner (Nursing), Chair of the Committee, first presented proposed revised Communication and Medicine Unit Codes of Operation and a new Department of Hospitality Management Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the unit codes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-28**

Professor Conner then presented a proposed revised Health Sciences Library Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the unit code was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-29**

Professor Conner then presented proposed revisions to the [General Guidelines for Writing and Revising A Unit Code of Operation](#). There was no discussion and the proposed revisions were approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION #08-30**

H. University Budget Committee

Ralph Scott (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. Professor Jenks (History) stated that he was disturbed by the focus on scholarship of engagement and did not want money diverted from traditional education. VC Mageean stated that she was not requesting or planning to divert money from other funds to cover something else. The plans were to have seed money to jumpstart them and that the scholarship of engagement should be external funding and not cause anyone to have to divert money away.



Professor Lillian (English) moved to insert the "Faculty Senate request" in all four resolution texts. There was no objection. Professor Rigsby (Geology) moved to change the second resolve statement about developing a reward model, because it refers to promotion and tenure, to read "that the Faculty Senate in cooperation with the Chancellor and Board of Trustees". There was no objection.

Professor Sharer (English) asked about the reference to the \$50 million and wondered if the money shifting from that campaign would affect the scholarships, etc. set up for students.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) spoke against resolution and echoed the concerns on the scholarship of engagement. He stated that, having reviewed NC State's approved application, this was taking the University outside of traditional standard of scholarship. VC Mageean stated that this discussion was getting away from the UNC Tomorrow Report and the response.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that he encouraged the development of initial funding but that the University needed to work directly with VC Mageean and not through the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

Chair Rigsby (Geology) moved to delete the second resolve referencing \$50 million and change the resolve above that to read that the Faculty Senate encourages the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to allocate initial funding for seed grants. The amendments were accepted as presented.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that the Carnegie designation was a confirmation that a particular institution indeed engages in scholarship engagement. If so, doesn't this mean that if the UNC Tomorrow Report references it, then we really have the Carnegie designation. Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that the Scholarship of Engagement was not equal to the Carnegie designation.

Following discussion, the amended University Budget Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #08-31**

Professor Scott then presented a proposed resolution on the Transparency of the so-called "BD-119". It was moved to delete the word "staff" from the resolution. There was no objection and the resolution was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #08-32**

I. University Curriculum Committee

Jane Manner (Education), a member of the Committee, presented first the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the March 27, 2008 and April 10, 2008 committee meetings. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-33**

Professor Manner then presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. There was no discussion and the report was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #08-34**

J. University Environment Committee



Charles Hodson (Medicine), Chair of the Committee, presented the Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. Bill Koch, a member of the Committee, spoke on the summary of energy conservation and other sustainability initiatives, in addition to the new sustainability website under environmental health and safety and the new grant received to do a "retro" on the Technology and Computer Science building to check the sensors in the system. Mr. Koch stated that the University was engaged in energy conservation and had plans to decrease the campus use of petroleum. Following discussion, the report was approved as presented.

**RESOLUTION #08-35**

**Agenda Item VI. New Business**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 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 APRIL 22, 2008, MEETING**

08-18 Academic Awards Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:  
As requested by the Chair of the Faculty, the Academic Awards Committee at our meeting on March 6, 2008, discussed the UNC Tomorrow Report and formulated this response to the areas of the report that were related to our charge.

Our discussion centered on recommendation 5.3:

"UNC should lead the campuses in a refinement and adjustment of the tenure, promotion, and incentive system to place greater value on faculty involvement and engagement in applied research and outreach that will enhance the state's competitiveness without decreasing support for teaching, basic research and scholarship."

Viewing our committee as part of the incentive system for faculty, we had a discussion of how the scholarship of teaching, learning, and engagement is evaluated in the existing awards.

The committee agreed that the creation of a new award(s) for scholarship of engagement (in the sense of applied research and teaching) should be pursued in order to give faculty incentive to be productive in this area. However, in order to preserve support for basic research and scholarship, the committee felt that existing criteria for research awards should remain as they are.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

08-19 Referred the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III. Evaluation in reference to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey to the Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Governance Committee for further consideration.



**Disposition:** Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Governance Committee

- 08-20 Proposal for faculty access to Student Opinion of Instruction Survey information on the Web, as follows:

In an effort toward conservation and to facilitate reporting the results of the SOIS, IPRE would like to implement online access to SOIS data for faculty members. This would allow a more secure way of handling this sensitive information and provide easy access for faculty to review the results for all their courses in one location and ultimately across numerous semesters. Providing online access to the results would also allow for a quicker turn-around time thus enabling faculty to utilize the feedback in a more timely fashion.

The most important issue is safeguarding access to the results. For Fall 2008, the instructor reports (and comments) would be available for access online so that instructors can see their own results and comments. The supervisor would be enabled to access the instructor reports only (but not the comments). In the future summary reports would also be accessible online to the appropriate administrator with comparable security safeguards in place.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-21 [Guidelines for Outcome Assessment of Foundations Courses](#)

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-22 [Resolution on Undergraduate Retention](#)

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-23 Continuing and Career Education Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:

According to its charge, the Continuing and Career Education Committee addresses issues relating to 4.1 (Global readiness), 4.2 (Citizen access to higher education), and 4.3 (Improving public education) of the UNC Tomorrow document.

This statement specifically addresses the following points:

4.2.1 (Citizen access to higher education)

The Continuing and Career Education Committee takes pride in East Carolina University's standing as the largest provider of distance education in the UNC system. ECU is committed to continuing as the model for comprehensive Continuing and Career Education delivery. We will continue to maintain and expand online distance learning in Eastern North Carolina regions. ECU dedicates significant resources to outreach to the military community in NC. We must continue to advocate for firm legislative support for comprehensive broadband availability to all persons.

4.2.3 (UNC as a model for accommodating persons with disabilities)

East Carolina University has much to offer children and adults with disabilities in Eastern North Carolina. The University has policies and practices that ensure that websites, online programs, and content where appropriate are ADA compliant.



4.3 (Improving public education)

ECU's Office of Teacher Education has established the Walter and Daisy Carson Latham Clinical Schools Network. This is a partnership between East Carolina University and 31 public school systems in eastern North Carolina which provides access to quality clinical settings for teacher education as well as opportunities for professional development. ECU continues to work through bureaucratic impediments to increase the effectiveness of collaborative programs and to develop additional partnerships.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-24 Request for a new Concentration Area in Theatre for Youth, School of Theatre and Dance, College of Fine Arts and Communication; Request for a Name Change of the Minor being offered, from "Management of Recreation and Facilities Services" (MRFS) to "Recreation and Park Management" (RPM), Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance; Notification of an Intent to Plan a Master of Science in Sustainable Tourism, North Carolina Center for Sustainable Tourism, Division of Research and Graduate Studies; 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; Request to add new certificates in Global Understanding and Global Understanding with Distinction within International Studies', College of Arts and Sciences; 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; Request to add a Graduate Certificate in Deaf-Blindness within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education; 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; 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; Request to establish a minor in Recreational Therapy within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, College of Health and Human Performance.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-25 Educational Policies and Planning Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:

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.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-26 Faculty Governance Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows: We have determined the extent of our involvement in response to the *UNC Tomorrow Report* according to the timeline that we received when asked to write the present document. It should be noted that according to that timeline, Faculty Governance should be/have been involved in the following:

Phase I

- Preliminary Information for Development of a 10-Year Enrollment Plan—Due February 2008
- Final Draft on 10-Year Enrollment Plan—Due March 2008
- Report on Plans to Respond to Outreach and Engagement Recommendations—Due May 2008
- Report on Proposed Changes to Internal Policies and Processes—Due May 2008

Phase II

- Report on Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention—Due December 2008
- Report on Review of Tenure and Rewards Systems—Due December 2008

Impact on Faculty Governance Committee Charge

The *UNC Tomorrow Report* does not affect our charge. However, it will have an impact on the management of the committee's responsibilities and workload. The tight timelines established for Phases I and II for responses to the report clearly indicate that there will be short reaction/action times. In order for Faculty Governance to respond adequately to the request from General Administration and our own campus, the following will be necessary:

1. Involvement of Faculty Governance in all the stages of the creation of the different reports. However, as indicated below, Faculty Governance has not been involved in any of the activities that ECU has conducted to regarding Stage I. If this is not resolved, then it will not be possible to fulfill step number 2.
2. Timely response from Faculty Governance in the drafting of policies. If Faculty Governance does not respond in a timely manner policies could be developed or implemented without Faculty Governance, or even without seeking Faculty Senate approval.

Faculty Governance Committee and Phase I

- 10-Year enrollment plan

While the Faculty Governance Committee, per se has not been involved in the Strategic Enrollment Management Task Force, the Chair of the Faculty and multiple other faculty members have been involved and are expected to provide the appropriate linkage and communication with the Faculty Governance Committee. As this Task Force proceeds, matters related to faculty workload; retention and recruitment of faculty; promotion and tenure; and balance of fixed term and tenure-track faculty will be of concern to the Faculty Governance Committee.

- UNC Tomorrow Report on Outreach and Engagement Recommendations
- Vice Chancellor Mageean informed Faculty Governance of the need for our committee to work on this during the Fall of 2007. While this happened regarding the "Engaged University" Carnegie classification, the work will be the same. We need to study what



changes, if any, may be necessary to Appendices C and D of the *ECU Faculty Manual* to assure that the outreach and engagement activities of faculty are appropriately rewarded in annual evaluations, in advancement in title for fixed-term faculty, and in tenure and promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty. ECU's Academic Council is aware that this is the top priority issue for Faculty Governance next academic year.

- Proposed changes to Internal Policies and Processes

We anticipate that the Faculty Governance Committee will be contacted very soon and will be involved in any aspects of this report. The Chair of the Faculty and multiple other faculty members have been involved and are expected to provide the appropriate linkage and communication with the Faculty Governance Committee. We are aware of the existence of a Task Force on University Policies and Procedures, but we have not been asked to cooperate with it. The future involvement of Faculty Governance in this issue was detailed in the February 18 Joint statement by Chancellor Ballard and Chair of the Faculty Taggart. Point 3.a. reads: "We share a commitment that faculty leaders, the Governance Committee, and top administrators will work together expeditiously to develop a University Policies and Procedures manual that will provide clear guidance on areas in which policies are needed to ensure that the ECU operates effectively and transparently." Point 3.b reads: "The Governance committee will participate in development of campus policies that are pertinent to faculty responsibilities." Our involvement was further reaffirmed in the Faculty Senate meeting of March 19, 2008 when Chair Taggart, with the consent of Chancellor Ballard, clarified that all policies pertinent to faculty responsibilities would go to Faculty Governance and then to Faculty Senate for approval. We expect that Chancellor Ballard (or his representative) will provide us with a timeline and a list of duties in the near future.

Faculty Governance Committee and Phase II

- Faculty and staff recruitment and retention

The Faculty Governance Committee will be involved in generating this report. Faculty Governance has already addressed the following areas:

Recruitment and Retention of Faculty - Faculty Governance has actively participated in the past in workshops and information sessions regarding recruitment and retention of faculty, and we will continue to do so. We, together with the Chief Diversity Officer, are in the early stages of planning a workshop(s) for hiring diverse faculty. While participation in these workshops is not part of our charge, we view it as essential in maintaining one of the basics tenets of shared governance: hiring of faculty is a faculty responsibility.

Joint Appointments - Potentially, revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* regarding joint appointments could have an impact on faculty recruitment and retention. Faculty Governance has been working on this since Spring of 2006. In Fall of 2007 we formed a sub-committee to study the matter. Due to our heavy agenda, the sub-committee has not been able to report. This academic year, but joint appointments remain in our agenda for next academic year.

- Report on Review of Tenure and Reward Systems

Please see Outreach and Engagement Recommendations in Phase I regarding this issue and Faculty Governance. This semester we added to our agenda for the Fall 2008 revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual* regarding post-tenure review.

Conclusion



The UNC Report will have no effect on our charge, but underlines the need to speed our work regarding the Tenure and Reward Systems, especially regarding Outreach and Engagement. The committee accepts this responsibility and looks forward to active participation.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

#08-27 Revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, 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. ....

**Disposition:** Chancellor

08-28 Revised [School of Communication](#) and [School of Medicine](#) Unit Codes of Operation and new [Department of Hospitality Management](#) Unit Code of Operation.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

08-29 Revised [Health Sciences Library](#) Unit Code of Operation.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

08-30 Revised [General Guidelines for Writing and Revising A Unit Code of Operation](#).



**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-31 University Budget Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:  
WHEREAS, the Scholarship of Engagement is a key component of the University of North Carolina Tomorrow; and  
WHEREAS, East Carolina University has always been historically engaged with its local, regional, state, a nation and international constituents.  
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate request that the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees develop an adequate funding and reward model for the Scholarship of Engagement.  
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate encourages the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to allocate an initial funding of \$300,000 annually for Seed Grants for Engagement (\$30K to 10 faculty).  
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate, in cooperation with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, develop a reward model for those who participate in the Scholarship of Engagement (with emphasis on tenure, promotion and merit as the primary reward mechanism).  
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate request the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees develop a better tracking model so that East Carolina University can showcase current and future examples of the Scholarship of Engagement.  
**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-32 WHEREAS, the so-called "BD-119" has provided EPA employees of East Carolina University with important salary information; and  
WHEREAS, this information is a public record; and  
WHEREAS, this was made available in the past to EPA employees; and  
WHEREAS, this information has not yet been provided on a stable platform for the academic year 2007-2008; and  
WHEREAS, this information for 2007-2008 was made briefly available to some staff and not other the week of March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008; and  
WHEREAS, a key component of confidence in an administration is transparency of information.  
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate, through its delegates to the University of North Carolina Faculty Assembly, urge the President of the University of North Carolina to request the Chancellors of the 17 constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina make available to their EPA employees the salary information that was formerly released in the so-called "BD-119" in a timely and transparent manner. It is requested that the President should also note that such timely and transparent release is a key component of confidence in the administration.  
**Disposition:** UNC Faculty Assembly

- 08-33 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the [March 27, 2008](#) and [April 10, 2008](#), committee meetings.  
**Disposition:** Chancellor

- 08-34 University Curriculum Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:  
There are a number of items in the UNC Tomorrow Report which relate to the structure and development of curricula in the programs of East Carolina University, in accord with



the stated objectives of the *UNC Tomorrow* program. Our review of the items designated as curriculum committee matters finds them worthy of the efforts of our faculties and administration, including the University Curriculum Committee as colleagues and agents of both, but finds that these items regard the structure and development of ECU curricula from a perspective rather different from those viewpoints from which we have been accustomed to considering curricular change. The University Curriculum Committee of East Carolina University, as constituted and charged, has been accustomed to seeing proposed changes in ECU curricula originating from the 'bottom' up. That is, from faculty members by way of their departments, colleges or schools. Our oversight of, and input to, the process has been related to ensuring consistency and coherence of new curricular proposals with that of existing curricular structures and the representation thereof in University course catalogs. We seek to avoid unnecessary duplication, to reward collaborative interactions, to facilitate modernization with student futures foremost in mind, and to maximize the teaching and learning experience in our course offerings for both students and faculty. We ask faculty to frame requested changes in terms of motivation and anticipated outcome(s) so that we are in the best position to respond to and support their proposed curricular offerings. A group might be created with the responsibility for catalyzing by suggestion and practical support the kinds of curricular changes suggested in the *UNC Tomorrow report*. However, it will remain the responsibility for faculties to know how best to advance the teaching of their respective disciplines, and to evaluate any related suggestions that might come from such a group. Those are the duties in performance of which we claim academic freedom.

We would consider it worthy and consistent with our best purposes to include in our considerations, i.e. to ask faculty to include in their justifications, some information about how their various proposals address these stated objectives of the *UNC Tomorrow Initiative* (when in their final form they may be elevated to the level of University policy). In recent years, an important feature of the University Curriculum Committee's operations has been the establishment of our Liaison Program, whereby each academic unit has a Liaison trained to optimize proposals for curriculum changes and to facilitate their passage through the Committee. It occurs to us that, in support of these objectives, we could inculcate an appreciation for these long-term objectives in the training of the liaisons, and incorporate an opportunity for a statement of having considered those objectives in the justification requested of the faculty. In addition, the UCC has been working alongside the GCC and the Office of Academic Programs to provide regular curriculum development workshops for interested faculty. These workshops might also be a place where additional training and focus could be given to the *UNC Tomorrow Initiative*. By working with the liaisons and continuing in the development of the workshops, the development of curriculum at ECU can continue in a "bottom up" manner while reinforcing the goals of the *UNC Tomorrow Initiative*.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

08-35 University Environment Committee's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report, as follows:  
The University Environment Committee recommends that ECU pursue the following initiatives, which accord with the recommendations of the *UNC Tomorrow Report*, pp. 32-34, § 4.6 to 4.6.3 "Our Environment":

1. Approve and distribute to students, faculty, and staff the sustainability and conservation survey created by Dr. Shereif Sheta and Dr. Robert Chin.



2. Develop a website detailing sustainability practices and initiatives at ECU and feature this site prominently on the ECU homepage.

3. Create an Office of Campus Sustainability under the direction of Facilities Services and hire a full-time sustainability coordinator with administrative staff to publicize existing practices and coordinate new initiatives. This Office should perform the following:

- promote energy and natural resource conservation, as well as energy efficiency projects
- promote public awareness of conservation issues, along with campus conservation initiatives
- serve as a liaison with the City of Greenville and other government agencies regarding conservation and the environment
- help plan and design energy-efficient buildings and transportation links
- promote recycling across campus
- educate the university community about how to reduce energy and resource consumption
- relay student staff and faculty suggestions to university departments that can implement changes
  - periodically report on conservation, energy efficiency improvement efforts, recycling efforts, and other sustainability efforts to the university and the public
- maintain a sustainability website to educate the university community about sustainability

4. Establish a Sustainability Committee to focus on education and research. This committee should promote the inclusion of sustainability issues in the curriculum, as well as faculty research in areas related to sustainability. The committee should monitor efforts in both areas and report progress to the university.

5. Continue to replace old windows, doors, etc. and to insulate campus buildings to decrease campus energy consumption.

6. Construct all new buildings to at least LEED-silver standards.

7. Purchase more hybrid buses and hybrid or electric maintenance/parking vehicles.

8. Work with Greenville Utilities to install wind and solar power generation on campus in order to supply the relatively small amounts of electricity needed to heat water and operate lights.

9. Preserve existing mature trees by designating a list of significant trees across the ECU Campus, thereby ensuring that they will not be removed or destroyed in future construction projects.

10. Encourage Aramark and ECU Dining Services to purchase local, Eastern North Carolina produce and meat in order to ensure the freshest food possible for students and to support the regional economy. Mandate this practice in the next food service contract.



11. Include plans for expansion of sidewalks, bike lanes, and greenways in the upcoming ECU Campus Master Plan. ECU planners should maintain contact with the City of Greenville to ensure that ECU Campus sidewalks and bike lanes conform to the 2004 Greenville Greenway Master Plan. Funding of such facilities should be negotiated in partnership with the City, so that costs can be shared.
12. Set up more recycling bins around campus to encourage recycling.
13. Explore the possibility of recycling water from sinks into toilets to conserve water, at least in new buildings that will be constructed.
14. Launch a campus-wide initiative to reduce use and waste of plastic bottles.

**Disposition:** Chancellor