

P
5
2

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF MARCH 31, 2009**

The seventh regular meeting of the 2008-2009 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, March 31, 2009, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of February 24, 2009 were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Lazure and Zoller (Art and Design), Gabbard (Education), Talente and Levine (Medicine), Eason (Nursing), Coddington and Ciesielski (Technology and Computer Science), Parker (Theatre and Dance), Taggart (Past Chair of the Faculty/Music), Vice Chancellor Horns, and Chancellor Ballard.

Alternates present were: Professors Lillian for Deena (English), Boswell for McCammon (Health and Human Performance), and Boklage for Novick (Medicine).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolution from the November 4, 2008, Faculty Senate meeting:

- 08-49 Approval of ENGL 3920: Film Theory and Criticism as a Foundations Curriculum Course for Humanities. (Rejected 12-12-08/ Rejection Rescinded and now Approved, 2-24-09)

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the January 31, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting:

- 09-01 Foundation Curriculum Courses for Humanities, as follows: ASIA 2010/GRBK 2010 Great Books of Modern China, GRBK 2400 Great Books of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, GRBK 2500 Great Books of the Enlightenment, GRBK 2600 Great Books of the 19th and 20th Centuries.
- 09-04 Request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree program, MS in Counselor Education, within the College of Education; Request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree, BS in Industrial Distribution and Logistics, College of Technology and Computer Science; Request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree program, BSBA in Management, College of Business; Request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree program, BSBA in Management Information Systems, College of Business; and a Request for authorization to establish a new distance education degree program, BSBA in Marketing, Operations, and Supply Chain Management Concentration, College of Business.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the February 24, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting:

- 09-07 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I.D. Class Roll Verification.
- 09-09 Request for authorization to establish a MS in Sustainable Tourism in the Center for Sustainable Tourism, Division of Research and Graduate Studies.
- 09-12 Revised *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section VI. Due Process Before Discharge or the Imposition of Serious Sanctions.
- 09-14 Faculty Welfare Committee report on the proposed increase in fees for parking permits and support of the recommendation that the Parking and Transportation Committee and the university's administration reconsider its plans to increase the fees for parking permits for the coming two academic years.

Academic Committee Chairs are reminded that Committee Annual Reports are due in the Faculty Senate office by Friday, May 1, 2009.

Faculty members are reminded that April 1 Chancellor Ballard will call for candidates for the prestigious 2009/2010 Oliver Max Gardner award. A copy of the University's nomination procedures is available at:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/aa/maxgardneraward.htm>

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard was unable to attend today's meeting due to an earlier scheduled meeting with Marc Basnight and other legislators in Raleigh.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Provost Sheerer began her comments by stating that she wanted to review what administrative deductions have been taken as far as the budget cuts. Provost Sheerer stated information on vacant positions changes weekly. (Administrative Reduction Report.) She reviewed purely administrative cuts in 2007- 2008 and possibility of 2009-2010; the cuts for the current and future year were somewhat less detailed since they are currently being finalized. EPA non teaching 2007-2008 eliminated six EPA non teaching positions \$602,000; there is also operating or funding for support persons positions in the Academic Affairs division. In the Division of Administration and Finance there were a series of cuts: some of these positions were in the mailroom, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of military programs, an employee training person, another manager and temporary staff and operating money was reduced. Probably around \$300,000 was saved in these reductions. In Advancement, there was an administrative support position eliminated for a savings of \$46,000 from the operating budget. The Chancellor had \$ 46,000 cut from his operating budget. Health Sciences had a reduction \$770,000 cut from their operating budget, Research and Graduate studies cut \$52,000 from the operating budget student affairs eliminated a career services position for a total of over \$1.3 million in 2007-2008. These were all administrative cuts. There was also a total of \$54,000 in temporary money eliminated as well.

In 2008-09, Academic Affairs, a Director who was EPA non teaching, and an Associate Dean in one of the Colleges, two SPA positions that were administrative support, and one EPA non teaching positions in another college, The Director of the Academic Enrichment Center, which

was an EPA non teaching position, and operating funds of about \$117,000. In Administration and Finance, there were inspectors in Health and Safety, a warehouse manager, Assistant Pro Card Manager, administrative support positions, four housekeeping, electricians, a receptionist position and operating funds of \$310,000. In Advancement there was a \$40,000 reduction in the operating budget. There was a consolidation in the Chancellor's office that saved about \$35,000 in EPA non teaching positions. In Health Sciences, an Associate Vice Chancellor of Communications, an Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Programming, an Associate Vice Chancellor for Regional Health an administrator in academic affairs and operating funds of about \$440,000 were eliminated. In Research and Graduate Studies the Federal Relations position was consolidated into Dr. Megeean's office without a stipend; this saved \$80,000. In addition, \$238,000 in operating funds was removed. Student Affairs reduced their salary reserves and operating budget by about \$40,000. This is a total for 2008-2009 of about \$2,255,000 in permanent positions as well as some non recurring cuts.

In 2009-2010, Academic Affairs is considering eliminating sixteen EPA non teaching positions. An Associate Vice Chancellor' position in the Provost office has been eliminated. A number of other administrative positions across academic affairs are being proposed for elimination. If the reduction requirement goes up to 7% most eliminated; beyond 7% all of the positions will be eliminated. Academic Affairs anticipates a reduction of \$576,000. Administration and Finance indicates thirty-two SPA positions eliminated in addition to operating funds of \$1,176,000. In Advancement, 2 EPA non teaching positions are proposed to be eliminated for a total of \$200,000, two SPA positions at \$72,000 in additional to \$50,000 in operating funds. In Health Sciences, six SPA positions for a total of \$280,000 and operating funds of \$500,000. In the Chancellor's office there will be a further consolidation of EPA non teaching positions for an additional \$8,000. In Research and Graduate Studies a savings \$201,600 in EPA positions and \$202,800 in operating funds. Student Affairs eliminating two EPA non teaching positions. This would be a savings of about \$6,874,000 in 2009-2010 ; this is also a reduction of about \$10,430,000 in the three year period.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that in the March 19, 2009, Board of Governors meeting, Chancellor Ballard spoke in favor of financial exigency. He then asked what would trigger a request, by the Chancellor, to start the process for declaring a financial exigency, what steps would be taken under a declaration financial exigency that could not be taken otherwise, and why financial exigency being considered as necessary at ECU and not at UNC Chapel Hill? Provost Sheerer responded that University Attorney Donna Payne defines financial exigency equal to bankruptcy. If there was a declaration of a financial exigency, it would allow for the removal of faculty and staff in an easier fashion. Right now the processes provided for within the University are cumbersome. While faculty would be the last employees being considered for cuts the 147 faculty positions being discussed are about 3% of the total number of faculty and staff complement. Most of those positions are vacancies and that number changes weekly. If trying to terminate faculty positions so EPA nonteaching faculty and SPA employees are being cut first and the consideration of financial exigency would only be a last resort.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated that within his college half of the departments are made up of mostly tenure track and fixed term faculty and that there was a simmering anger from fixed term faculty who have sought him out. The fixed term faculty has been used to drive the enrollment expansion and first to hit the chopping block in this time of financial crisis.

Professor Robinson stated that the Chancellor's staff should have included the March 19 Board of Trustees' policy framework for resource allocation in serving in an open, transparent way. This material has not been forwarded to the University Budget Task Force and it was a contradiction to the Board of Governors values statement document that was distributed under Chancellor Ballard's name. The Board of Governors calls for "unconditional protection of the academic core" and sees it as the highest priority. The ECU Board of Trustees statement was that the faculty should be protected 'as much as would be possible'. Thus the Board of Trustees' document is at variance to the Board of Governor's document and Governor Perdue's directives that 98% of the UNC budget should be funded. He then asked Provost Sheerer how can the contradiction be explained between what the Board of Governors are stating that academics are the first priority and the ECU administration saying maybe but we have other priorities.

Provost Sheerer replied that the budget task force had been looking all possible options to save money except the elimination of teaching positions. The difficulty in looking for other ways of saving money is that 85% of budget is in personnel expense. A number of administrative cuts have been made and more are planned as were reviewed in this meeting. The administration did not start with cutting faculty positions. Most of the 147 positions that are now being considered are now vacant, although that number changes daily, and represented less than 3% of the total staff and faculty complement. The effort is not to touch the academic core.

Professor Jenks (History) stated that administrators are instructing Deans to not grant faculty research leave until such time as there is a University policy on this practice. This relates to the core mission of the University. He asked what was the nature of the University policy that might be developed. Who would develop it and couldn't this be considered an assault on the departmental autonomy, i.e. disciplinary integrity? The professoriate should decide what research is necessary and deserves support. Provost Sheerer replied that the University Attorney, Donna Payne had stated that there was no University-wide policy for those who take research leave. There is a need for the output to be detailed when leave was utilized, and faculty research leave involved the use of State funds; some metric of productivity is necessary. At UNC-CH for example, a university-wide committee exists that determines what money is available for academic leave and grants. Other Universities have more private research money. A policy is needed to clarify the committee made by the Dean with respect to the expected outcomes of the faculty member's research time. Reassigned time has been handled informally up to now and used very liberally across the disciplines, and given the budget situation we find ourselves in the administration is looking at how that is being handled.

Professor Matthews (Anthropology) stated that she understood the issues but over a long time period, this could affect talented people from doing active research across many disciplines. She is aware of a lot of nervousness among faculty in relation to how faculty can do their job and achieve their research goals. The Provost responded that in two years we would be in a better position to grant academic leave. However, a policy is still needed to make clear when academic leave is given, why it is given, and what is expected in return.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked how did Provost Sheerer define productivity when meeting with the Chairs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Was she able to identify a relationship between productivity and annual evaluations, i.e. people with good

annual evaluations but not being productive? What were the results of the administrators who have not given thoughtful evaluations of their faculty and have mismanaged their resources? Provost Sheerer that yes she has found evaluations are very high and often they do not match if they are research productive. She trusts the chair and/or dean to report who is doing solid research within academic units. There is no norm across the University. Provost Sheerer stated that she does not find anything consistent so the only norm is from within her office. She also finds inconsistencies among units when looking at faculty work loads and how many student credit hours are faculty producing. She stated the teaching loads are not equitable across the University and that sometime there are legitimate research activities and sometimes research activity is unclear. She sees a need to equalize the faculty workload across the University and to establish clearer expectations and norms.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked, for a point of information, if Provost Sheerer was using the *ECU Faculty Manual* when evaluating the productivity of faculty? Also how was she evaluating the productivity of administrators? Provost Sheerer responded that she does indeed do evaluations with feedback forms and that the rate of return from faculty of the IDEA report is about 25% which is very low. She also stated that she felt good about how the administrators were being evaluated in terms of how they are working on the goals that have been identified as important or needing improvement in their units. The Chancellor has been clear that administrator's evaluations must be on file.

Professor Jenks (History) stated that the number of administrators had grown but so had the faculty population. He asked if there were numbers to show an increase in the ratios of increase in faculty and administrators over the same 10 year period to show which area was growing the fastest. Dean Niswander stated that this information was available from the annual University's Fact Book.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) stated that in reference to the University Budget Task Force matrix, there had been a suggestion to eliminate administrative stipends costing \$4 million dollars. Provost Sheerer replied that she was reviewing all stipends in her division and that the reason it was being studied was because these monies have been committed to people to do an extra job. The language changed because Board of Trustees member Brody recommended that all stipends be "zeroed out" as of June 30 and then request that those EPA non faculty employees provide a rationale as of July 1 for continued stipends.

Professor Robinson's second question related to establishing a hiring freeze. Provost Sheerer responded that there was resistance to eliminating all faculty hires in the last Budget Task Force meeting because we will miss the opportunity to take key areas forward over the next 2 year budget period. The administration can not state that there will not be any faculty hires because there are some critical needs and the applicant pool has a wide selection of good candidates due to the economic decline across the country.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that in reference to financial exigency, Chancellor Ballard did state that he was willing and ready to declare financial exigency. In his letter, he states that he is not ready to do that today and would need approval from Erskine Bowles, Board of Governors, etc. As you know, major program curtailment and financial exigency require significant faculty involvement according to Board of Governors policy 605c1. The process

needs to be open, transparent communication and things should not be responded to without thoughtful discussion and open dialogue. It is her understanding that most information discussed in the University Budget Task Force has not been shared with the University community. There has been no attempt to follow current manual policies, i.e. standing University committees. She then asked Provost Sheerer if the administration was willing to step back and include the current in-place policies when trying to address this budget crisis. Provost Sheerer stated that the University Attorney had looked at what would be required to close a non productive program; this is an example of using the policies that now exist. She had taken the time to review those in-place policies and did not think that there was any attempt to hide information. She was going to ask the University Budget Task Force at the next meeting to provide specific statements if something was being done incorrectly. It was her attempt to be transparent and participate in shared faculty governance. She concluded that there are no secret agendas.

Professor Niswander (Business) asked if there was anyone in the Faculty Senate had attended at the Board of Governors meeting of March 19, 2009. He then stated that if the answer were no, that the body should not jump to conclusions. The Chancellor was willing and ready as a point of fact to discuss this issue and that the body does not have a clue whether what was being assigned to him was actually true or not. Professor Sprague (Physics) replied that he was told about the Chancellor's remarks by someone who was reliable and was present at the meeting. He stated that he had intended to ask the Chancellor if he had been in attendance at today's meeting.

E. Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Dr. Horns was unable to attend the meeting due to her attendance in Greensboro attending Governor Beverly Perdue's White House Regional Forum on Health Care Reform.

F. Janice Tovey, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Tovey stated that she had several important items to discuss and may go over the allotted time, but asked for their indulgence as she discussed the proposed university policy manual and the budget issues surrounding fixed term faculty, and the possibility of furloughs and financial exigency. She stated that she had mentioned several meetings ago that a committee had been formed by the Chancellor to develop the format and guidelines for a University Policy Manual to serve all divisions of the university, including faculty, and identify the process for policy development and who would be responsible. The charge came originally from the Board of Trustees, which identified the lack of a university-wide policy manual as a weakness at ECU.

This work began during Professor Mark Taggart's time as Chair of the Faculty, and he and Professor Dee Dee Glascoff were appointed to the committee. Now, I serve on this committee, and Faculty Governance Committee Chair, Professor Puri Martinez has recently been added. Our task was to ensure that the role of faculty in policy making was affirmed and articulated, that the specific policies and procedures for which the faculty have primary responsibility are identified and then articulated and incorporated into the document that will guide the process for developing the university's manual. We will be meeting next week for this very purpose.

The faculty officers met on Founders Day with Bob Greczyn and David Brody, Chair and Vice Chair respectively of the Board of Trustees, at their request. The reason for this meeting was to make certain the faculty officers were aware of the need for a streamlined faculty manual, but

also for the faculty officers to communicate the importance of having faculty involved with this process. ECU has been functioning for a very long time with some policies for many business practices not clearly defined and/or accessible. While the *ECU Faculty Manual* has grown to be a very large document, it covers items that are not the immediate purview of the faculty, but the manual, more importantly served to fill a gap. And it's time for the university to have a policy manual that presents business practices of all divisions and offices, in addition to faculty policies and procedures.

The faculty officers, the vice chancellors, and the board chair and vice chair understand that this is a process of revision and cannot necessarily be accomplished overnight. We anticipate several semesters of work before this policy manual becomes a reality. And I want you to understand that also. And I'm counting on you, as senators, as senate committee members and as faculty to contribute to the development of the faculty portion of any university manual. We will have to revise our current policies and procedures to conform to the new format.

This effort will be challenging yet necessary—and we must preserve shared governance as part of a more coherent university manual. I want to include senators, members of senate committees, and the faculty in general. The revisions will be treated as all revisions to the manual are treated now and will follow the same process, working their way through committee to the Senate and on to the Chancellor via resolutions. It will be a deliberate process that will provide an opportunity for open comment by all senators. Right now, the next step for the committee, once the guiding document is completed, will be to present it to all divisions—you can count on hearing a report next fall at one of our Senate meetings.

Next, each time the faculty officers get together for our weekly meetings the budget situation has become worse. Worst cases become best cases and no one seems to know when the state revenues will start to stabilize. Given this budget situation and the fact that so many faculty are not available in summer, we need to have a serious discussion of the principles that should guide faculty advice to the Chancellor during the summer. At this time, I want to thank the members of the AAUP, ECU chapter for their letter outlining their recommendations concerning financial exigency and furloughs. You have that letter in front of you.

This is an effective way to begin this discussion. The faculty officers would like to invite the members of the ECU-AAUP Executive Board, Chairs of Senate Committees and other interested faculty of a meeting on Monday April 6 at 12:30 in the Senate conference room to discuss the principles and criteria surrounding the contract renewals of fixed term faculty, of furloughs, and of financial exigency.

Let me provide some context for this called meeting: faculty in some colleges have been asked to "rank" the fixed term faculty in their units. The Deans of these colleges have determined that faculty should help him or her decide who gets contracts as money becomes available. Faculty input is important; we all know that; however the faculty officers are concerned about having objective criteria to identify these rankings. For some units who already have a clearly defined evaluation process, this request may not be difficult. But others don't do this on a regular basis. Do we go by seniority and longevity? By subjects they can teach? What about clinical and research fixed term faculty? Are they subject to different guidelines? We would like to discuss and clarify how a ranking might proceed—if it must be done at all. Once we have some

guidelines and focus, the officers will be better able to advocate for faculty and maintain a highly qualified professional faculty. And we need your advice and counsel NOW while we can advocate for a strategic and fair decision-making process.

Finally, we endorse the letter from the AAUP chapter in principle and would like the opportunity to engage faculty in further discussion about the principles that should guide any furloughs or financial exigency. While there is a process in place for declaring exigency, we would like to review it and ensure that any decision of this sort is also strategic and fair. Furloughs are another story—they are still illegal in North Carolina, but we don't know for how long that may be the case. Obviously, then, we have no procedures or guidelines for how they might work with faculty, in particular, or other employees. We should discuss the challenges that face us.

The Faculty Officers believe that this is an opportunity to provide insight and perspective into the processes that we may have to deal with in the near future. We want to create a set of guiding principles that can be reliable when jobs are evaluated and when some of our fellow faculty members may lose their jobs. Please consider joining us on Monday, April 6, 12:30 in the Senate conference room, Rawl Annex 142 for this discussion. We are willing to devote as much time as necessary—please feel free to come and go as your schedule permits. If you can't join us, please feel free to email any of the officers with your concerns, ideas, or suggestions.

Professor Sprague (Physics) asked why weren't faculty policies going through the Faculty Governance Committee, which is what it was designed for? Professor Tovey replied that there was no timeframe yet established and was not sure how it would all work.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated that she was one of the original faculty (along with Mark Taggart) who attended a meeting at NC State to learn how things were done there. She imagined that anyone could set up a meeting with faculty at NC State to alleviate faculty concerns on how the policies are combined.

Professor Greene (Education) asked if the dialogue meeting would be open to all faculty? Chair Tovey responded yes. Professor Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) asked if an announcement would be distributed to all faculty? Chair Tovey responded yes.

Professor Robinson (Mathematics) asked when there is a conflict between the new policy manual and *ECU Faculty Manual*, which will supersede? Professor Tovey responded that pieces of the *ECU Faculty Manual*, will be reformatted to fit into the new manual format. The *ECU Faculty Manual* supersedes until the new manual is designed and that the policies will remain the same unless they go through the standing University committee approval process.

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that she has not met yet with the new policy manual committee, but was eager to meet with them next week. She stated that members of the Faculty Governance Committee were committed to making sure that this process was done right and that she continued keep the Committee informed on any issues being addressed as the manual was designed. Professor Tovey stated that the group would work one step at a time until they got it right.

Professor Paul (Business) asked who would have ownership of the new manual once it was developed? Professor Tovey replied that right now it would be housed on the Academic and Student Affairs website and that the faculty policies would be the purview of the faculty with everything still considered advisory to the Chancellor.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) provided an example of how faculty involvement benefits the University community. In April 2003, the Board of Governors directed the creation of a Serious Illness and Disability Leave Policy for Faculty. The directive stated "Each constituent institution must establish a written policy to provide a period of leave for faculty in cases of extraordinary illness, major disability, or for parental purposes." The proposed policy was referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review, discussion, and approval before being presented to the Faculty Senate for final approval in March 2005. This Serious Illness and Disability Leave Policy for Faculty was a success, even with problems now being addressed, because it was discussed openly involving representatives from administration and faculty taking time to gain an agreement across the University community. If this particular policy was taken out of the *ECU Faculty Manual*, faculty could lose their involvement and possible authority on these kind of policies.

G. Ken Wilson, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Wilson (Sociology) provided information relating to the March 27, 2009 Faculty Assembly meeting. Links to all materials (agenda, minutes, annual report, nominations, budget comparison, academic program planning and establishment process, and resolution) are available online at:

<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/fsminute/fsm309facultyassemblyreport.htm>. He stated that all five Assembly Delegates traveled on their own accord to the meeting. Within his brief remarks, Professor Wilson stated that distance education was still in the hands of the faculty just like any other curriculum course and that tuition by the credit hour was on hold for the foreseeable future. He also noted that Professor Catherine Rigsby (Geology) was elected as Vice Chair for the UNC Faculty Assembly.

H. Approval of Spring 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the complete of degree requirements.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) moved approval of the Spring 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the complete of degree requirements. **RESOLUTION #09-16**

I. Question Period

Professor Martinez (Foreign Language and Literatures) asked for an update on the SOIS scores and resolution relating to this that had been denied by the Chancellor. Professor Tovey (English) stated that she was meeting with David Weismiller and Provost Sheerer soon to discuss this issue and that she hoped to see a report to the Faculty Senate in April.

Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) asked VC Mageean about the Stimulus Package and the money being made available to ECU. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that a huge amount of money was put into education areas and that all of this information was updated daily on the Research and Graduate Studies website. There was nothing definite because the stimulus money had to be applied for and a complex and multi-faceted approach was required for the

stimulus money. Vice Chancellor Mageean stated that a task force had been formed with Jan Tovey a part of the group to represent the faculty.

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 Standards Committee

Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee, presented for approval request for Removal of Foundation Credit "FC" designation from ALL BUT the following School of Theatre and Dance courses: THEA 1000, -1010, -2001, -4066; DNCE 1001, -1002, -1003, -1011, -1012, -1013, -3014, -3703, -4044, -4045. There was no discussion and the request for Removal of Foundation Credit "FC" designation from ALL BUT the following School of Theatre and Dance courses: THEA 1000, -1010, -2001, -4066; DNCE 1001, -1002, -1003, -1011, -1012, -1013, -3014, -3703, -4044, -4045 was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-17**

B. Academic Standards Committee and Admissions and Retention Policies Committee
Professors Linda Wolfe (Anthropology) and Wendy Sharer (English), Chairs of the Committees, presented a joint response to the Strategic Enrollment Management Task Force recommendations on Academic Policy Changes (section 2.8 of the SEMTF report). This was provided to the Senators at this time for information only.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) thanked the Committee for working on this and asked what was next for all of the other recommendations from the Strategic Enrollment Task Force. Professor Tovey responded that she will need to sit down and come up with a timeline to handle all of the recommendations from the Task Force.

Professor Matthews (Anthropology) asked about the drop date and stated that the old drop date schedule may have worked to stop the revolving door and increase student retention. Now, if students do not drop, it could still hurt retention so why now no drop date and not just a shorter one. Professor Sharer responded that a student does not know until halfway through the semester if you are doing well in class. In the past, there was an understanding that faculty should give at least one exam prior to the drop date period. Professor Lillian (English) expressed her support in extending the deadline of a drop date because of the tight timeframe.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked if the Committee had considered how this would affect financial aid for students. Judi Bailey responded yes and that those who have more feedback on their course success do better and have less financial aid.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that as Chair of the Student Academic Appellate Committee, there were many students who complained because they did not have enough time to know their progress in the course before dropping. The academic standard has now been changed too which does aid the students.

C. Calendar Committee

Professor Shanan Gibson (Business), Chair of the Committee presented the proposed Summer 2010 – Spring 2011 University Calendars. She stated that the Committee had added in dates by which students must apply for summer graduation, last day to pay fees without penalty and a reference to “late” registration, drop, etc. The date for late drop was deleted where it caused confusion. The final exam schedule had also been addressed because of problems in the past due to possible overlapping.

Professor Lillian (English) expressed concerns with faculty meetings and registration all on one day. Professor Gibson stated that the rationale was to not have faculty meetings on a Friday. Professor Lillian asked than why not start on Tuesday. Professor Gibson replied because the Committee could foresee a potential nightmare.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) drew attention to the dates for deadlines for applying for graduation and asked how faculty could help the registrar’s office in this effort. Judi Bailey (Enrollment Management) asked all advisors to complete senior summaries prior to the last semester. Professor Vail Smith (Health and Human Performance) said that they send those things in but do not hear back from the Registrar in a timely manner and that faculty need to actually receive a confirmation. Professor Bailey agreed and stated that she would speak with Angela Anderson, University Registrar.

Professor Gibson (Business) stated that since the move of the University Commencement ceremony to Friday, the Committee was unable to use Fridays as exam days, so that backs everything else up a day and forces a start on Monday with a combination of activities.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked if there would still be recognition ceremonies within units in light of the budget crisis and now Friday University commencements. Provost Sheerer stated that this issue has not been thought through yet in relation to the budget crisis and how it may relate to the unit recognition ceremonies. There can not be any ceremonies prior to the University one on Friday. Provost Sheerer stated that she thought if there were no expenses associated with the unit’s ceremonies then there should not be a problem.

Professor Matthews (Anthropology) asked why are we graduating faculty on Friday and forcing units to hold departmental ceremonies on Saturday when a lot of faculty will be gone. Provost Sheerer responded that it is being done in an attempt to have more participation in the University commencement and reverse the practice of more students attending the unit ceremonies and not the University-wide commencement.

Following discussion, the proposed Summer 2010 – Spring 2011 University Calendars were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-18**

D. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor Puri Martinez (Foreign Languages), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of ECU. These revisions were proposed to make matters better for fixed term faculty.

Professor Lillian (English) moved to remove Section V. Reemployment of Fixed Term Faculty Members pending consultation with persons responsible for the hiring and staffing decisions in every academic hiring unit within the University stating that there are specifications in this section that may tie the hands of those involved in the units and could be used unfortunately to push out faculty.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked what was the problem with the current language and wasn't there at least one administrator on the Fixed Term Faculty Task Force. Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that yes, there were 3 Vice Chancellors, Arts and Sciences Dean, Philosophy Department Chair, fixed term faculty, and Academic Standards Committee members participating on the Fixed Term Faculty Task Force.

Professor Lillian (English) stated that when faculty are hired for a position, it may not be suitable down the road to place them in a tenure position. With 57 fixed term faculty position in her unit, she tries to recognize those with terminal degrees but not at the expense of those without terminable degrees but performing well. She expressed concern that this language in the manual could cause a class situation because it may be too sweeping.

Professor Sprague (Physics) spoke against the motion stating that the proposed language was meant to prevent the abuse of fixed term faculty members. Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated that she saw no language that precluded what Lillian was stating, particular the last line and that the language was actually written to protect fixed term faculty against abuse. Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) responded that this recommendation came straight from the Fixed Term Task Force recommendations, which was approved in 2006.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) spoke against the motion and stated that the Task Force recommendations had been vetted by the Task Force and top ECU administration and followed the General Administration's directives. Professor Lillian (English) responded that she does support the notion of protecting fixed term faculty but simple asked that we delay the consideration of this particular section of Appendix C until more groups can take part in the discussion. She stated that small things could have big, big percussions.

Professor Gilliland (Medicine) called the question and once the vote was held, the motion to amend the proposed revisions to Appendix C failed.

Professor Fraley (Communication) asked what the Chancellor had rejected earlier. Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) replied that the two issues of concern for the Chancellor were 1) reference to the word "contract" and that Academic Affairs request to streamline the contact process and 2) he wanted the code of conduct included for all employees. For now, she stated that all had agreed to remove that language until the code of conduct for the University could be drafted .

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of ECU were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #09-19

Professor Martinez then presented a proposed addition to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section V.

Procedure for Review of Notice of Non-Reappointment or Non-Conferral of Permanent Tenure. She stated that this one sentence had been accidentally left off of the document presented to the Faculty Senate in February and that Hope Murphy, the University Assistant Attorney had brought it to the attention of the Chancellor's staff prior to his consideration of the approved resolution.

Professor Lillian (English) made a motion to change the wording of the proposed sentence to read:

"Within 14 days before the hearing, the complainant and respondent will submit documents and a list of witnesses, and at least 7 days before the hearing, the complainant and respondent will submit supporting documents to be used in the hearing."

Professor Coleman (Medicine) asked that the motion to change be split apart. Professor Tovey agreed and stated that the body could handle the sentences included in the motion separately. Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked for a point of clarification about the 14 days and stated wasn't it consistent with other procedures in the manual. Professor Martinez stated that the committee had looked through all of the stated deadlines to make sure that the impact would not be hurtful for either side.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that the Faculty Governance Committee had had many meetings with the various appellate committee chairs and the current Hearing Committee members, along with past Faculty Officers, and that this recommendation was based on the recommendations of those closely involved in the appellate process.

Professor Jenks (History) asked if the split in time requirements were meant to provide more time for the parties involved in the hearing. Professor Martinez replied yes and that the Committee had looked at everything prior to placing this on the agenda for consideration.

Professor Sprague (Physics) called the question and the motion to revised the sentence failed.

Professor Niswander (Business) offered a friendly amendment to add the following to the sentence "no later than 14 calendar days before the hearing". The friendly amendment was accepted. Professor Wang (Geography) offered another friendly amendment by adding "calendar" after 14. There was no objection.

Following discussion, the proposed addition to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D, Section V. Procedure for Review of Notice of Non-Reappointment or Non-Conferral of Permanent Tenure was approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #09-20**

E. Unit Code Screening Committee

Professor Andrew Morehead (Chemistry), Chair of the Committee, presented the proposed revised Department of Psychology Unit Code of Operation, Department of Geography Unit Code of Operation, and Department of English Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the revised unit codes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-21**

F. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Jane Manner (Education), a member of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the February 26, 2009, meeting. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-22**

Agenda Item VI. New Business

There was no new business to come before the body at this time and the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunt McKinnon
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Interior Design and Merchandising

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE MARCH 31, 2009, MEETING

09-16 Spring 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates, subject to the complete of degree requirements.

Disposition: Chancellor, Board of Trustees

09-17 Removal of Foundation Credit "FC" designation from ALL BUT the following School of Theatre and Dance courses: THEA 1000, -1010, -2001, -4066; DNCE 1001, -1002, -1003, -1011, -1012, -1013, -3014, -3703, -4044, -4045.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-18 Summer 2010 – Spring 2011 University Calendars.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-19 Revisions to the ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix C. Personnel Policies and Procedures for the Faculty of ECU.

Disposition: Chancellor, Board of Trustees

09-20 Addition to ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix D, Section V. Procedure for Review of Notice of Non-Reappointment or Non-Conferral of Permanent Tenure, as follows:

V. Procedure for **Review Appeal** of Notice of Non-Reappointment or Non-Conferral of Permanent Tenure.

....

D. Procedures for the Hearing.

1. Time and Date of Hearing

If the request for a hearing is validated, the committee shall provide a complete copy of the request for a hearing to the individuals named in the request for a hearing. The committee shall set the time, date, and place for the hearing. The date for the hearing must be within ~~30~~ **42 calendar working** days of the notification to the complainant that the request for a hearing was validated, **except under unusual circumstances such as when a hearing request is**

received during official university breaks and holidays and despite reasonable efforts the hearing committee cannot be assembled. The committee shall then notify the complainant, the respondents, the chair of the faculty, and the chancellor, of the time, date, and place of the hearing. At least ~~45~~ **21 calendar** ~~working~~ days before the hearing, the complainant shall notify the committee, the respondents, the chair of the faculty, and the chancellor of the identity of the complainant's advisor, if any, and whether or not the advisor is an attorney. ("Attorney" is defined as anyone with a Juris Doctor, or other recognized law degree, regardless of whether or not that person is licensed to practice law in the State of North Carolina and/or whether or not that person is "representing" the employee). **No later than 14 calendar days before the hearing, the complainant and respondent will submit documents and a list of witnesses to be used in the hearing.**

Disposition: Chancellor, Board of Trustees, UNC General Administration

09-21 Revised Department of Psychology Unit Code of Operation, Department of Geography Unit Code of Operation, and Department of English Unit Code of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-22 Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the February 26, 2009, meeting.

Disposition: Chancellor