

P
5
2

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2009**

The third regular meeting of the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 3, 2009, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 6, 2009, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Gabbard (Education), Talente (Medicine), Novick (Medicine), Coleman (Medicine), Coddington (Technology and Computer Sciences) and Killingsworth (Business/Parliamentarian).

Alternates present were: Professors Sligar for Jones (Allied Health Sciences), Lamb for Reyes (Biology), Mahar for Vail-Smith (Health and Human Performance), Boklage for Abdel-Rahman (Medicine), Kenney for Shinpaugh (Physics), and Carlson for Parker (Theatre and Dance).

B. Announcements

After polling the faculty officers and the Agenda Committee, and in an effort to accept an invitation to meet on west campus, the December Faculty Senate meeting will be held in the Health Sciences Building on the west campus in HSB 1020. Holiday treats will be provided by Vice Chancellor Horns. There will be reserved parking for the senators in front of the building.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 2009 and October 2009, Faculty Senate meetings:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 09-33 | <u>Additional Revisions to the <i>ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix B</i>. Policy for the Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty of ECU.</u> |
| 09-34 | Revisions to the Procedures for the Lifetime and Five Year Research Awards. |
| 09-35 | Reinstatement of Dance 1000 as a Foundation Curriculum course for the Arts. |
| 09-36 | Recommendation on the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS). |

We have openings on the following University Committees. Brief committee descriptions are available online where noted below. Volunteers are asked to contact the Faculty Senate office.

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

- Biological Safety Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty representative
- Calendar Committee, 1 year term as Faculty Senate representative
- Faculty Information Technology Review Committee, 1 year term as Faculty Senate representative
- Family Weekend Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty representative
- Faculty Welfare Committee, 1 year term as Faculty Senate representative
- Libraries Committee, 2 year full committee term
- Infection Control Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty representative
- Radiation Safety (Basic Science) Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty rep.

- Resident Status Appeals Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty representative
- Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee, 1 year full committee term
- Teaching Grants Committee, 1 year term as Chair of the Faculty representative
- University Curriculum Committee, 1 year term as Faculty Senate representative

There will be only one monthly Faculty Open Forum in November (11-11) and December (12-9) due to the upcoming holidays. Both monthly forums will be held in the Science and Technology Building, room OC309 and mediasite recordings provided afterwards. Faculty are encouraged to attend these forums to discuss issues of interest and are asked to direct any questions or suggestions to Professor Marianna Walker at walkerm@ecu.edu.

Letters concerning unit elections for 2010-2011 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

Every year the University Calendar Committee is charged with developing the academic calendar for a future term. Although many aspects of the calendar are not changeable, there is some flexibility possible with regard to the start of the fall academic term. In order to make decisions related to this in an informed manner, we would greatly appreciate your feedback regarding the week we begin the fall term via the survey link noted below:

http://ecu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_430NUBHWfIVL1qs&SVID=Prod

The University Academic Awards Committee has issued an official call for nominations for the Lifetime and Five-Year Achievement University Research/Creative Activity Awards. The deadline for submission of materials, which include 7 copies of departmental and unit review committee nominating letters, complete CV, and 3 letters from outside referees is Monday, December 7, 2009. All relevant procedures are available online at:

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

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that there are five determining factors in risk management and that most of them related to legal issues that have changed significantly over the last several years. Currently the budget situation is a concern but Vice Chancellor Seitz and the other Vice Chancellors and Deans have put the University in good position. No predications can be made at this time but the legislature has indicated that there may be a \$2 billion structural budget deficit in the second year of the biennium. The definition of a structural deficit is when one time money is used to pay for recurring costs. The stimulus money that is being used now will not be available in the next year so the leadership of the Appropriations Committee believes that the state treasury will start the short session of the legislature with at least a \$2 billion deficit. Added to last year's shortfall the budget deficit may total \$4 billion for the biennium. The Chancellor continued by stating that the first quarter revenues are down one percent and that the budget projections are very uncertain. If the tax shortfalls continue then ECU will certainly be facing more "one time" cuts and perhaps permanent budget cuts in the upcoming year. The Chancellor stated that he is concerned about funding for this biennium and that President Bowles has expressed his concern about the funding into the beginning of the next biennium beginning in

2011. The Executive Council is discussing how to prepare for as much as a 15-20% budget cut to the University.

The Chancellor also stated that this is also the time of year when campuses make proposals for campus based tuition and fees. These proposals should be voted on in November by the ECU Board of Trustees and then forwarded to the Board of Governors for final action. Last year the legislature prohibited campus based tuition last year when there was a \$200 increase in tuition that went to the general fund and not to the university system. President Bowles has indicated that he believes that legislation will be reversed and that ECU will have the normal level of flexibility again this year. ECU started planning for this degree of flexibility last April. The Student Government Association approved the student fee portion of the plan last night recommending an increase of \$80. This fee is composed of \$40 for an education technology fee for improving classrooms, \$30 for an athletic fee, and \$10 for a student transit fee. The Board of Trustees will then decide the level of tuition increase in addition to these fees; the Chancellor feels that this total should be capped at the 3.6% which is the Higher Education Price Index. The division of increased tuition dollars is mandated by the Board of Governors to be divided in a prescribed way. For each dollar increase, fifty cents must go to financial aid; the Chancellor indicated that this is critical because of mandatory health insurance required if a student is not covered by private insurance coverage. This could be as much as \$600-\$700 per year for some students. The Chancellor's second priority for use of additional campus based tuition money would be in view of retention. The second part of the proportioning of tuition dollars is more flexible this year.

In the past 25% of the on campus tuition money has been mandated to go to faculty salaries, but this year that requirement does not exist. Instead there is flexibility on how the money can be used: 50% of the funds must go to financial aid and the other half to the academic core. The Chancellor indicated that the Board of Trustees is very involved in these decisions which led to a two week delay last year and an additional increase in fees from the original administrative proposal. The Chancellor's position is that additional campus based tuition and fees should be limited to provide affordability and accessibility; students should not have to pay a disproportionate share of increased the cost of education. The Chancellor summarized by saying that ECU provides a great bargain for what students receive in terms of what they pay and what they get in education at this university.

The Board of Governors approved a new policy regarding centers and institutes which was given to Chair Walker. The Chancellor reported that he continues to get feedback on areas where ECU is doing well and some areas where the University is not doing quite so well. UNC General Administration has reacted positively to the way that ECU dealt with reduction in administrative costs; 92% of the cuts have been taken from administrative categories. ECU was evaluated as the third best in the system based on this policy. General Administration has warned ECU that there must be improvements in retention and graduation rates. This is a systemic problem so suggestions from deans and department heads relative to how retention and graduation rates can be improved. Since college and departmental level efforts can make a big difference. This year the University is slightly below the 80% retention goal and will certainly be penalized in the future for not meeting the freshman retention and graduation goals.

Related problems are space utilization; ECU is still not maximizing the use of classroom and laboratory facilities in teaching based on an evaluation of teaching schedules. The other vulnerability is how we assist students who fall below a 2.0 and a 2.5 GPA; these students can often not get into a desired major. These are thousands of students who are admitted to the

University and told that they are in good standing but are having a difficult time getting into a major. ECU needs a creative response to finding options for these students.

On a more positive note, the Board of Governors has approved ECU's mission statement and the College of Education has just received a \$9 million grant. This is important, the Chancellor stated, because this university produces more teachers than any other university in the system and can now produce even better teachers. The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee recently praised ECU publically for the quality of the teachers graduated by this University.

The Chancellor then introduced Provost Sheerer who discussed the methodology used in the distribution of faculty positions. The Provost stated that a total of 47.71 faculty positions were received last year. The Academic Council then met and took 13 of these positions to be used for restitution and institutional priorities. Restitution means that these positions were awarded to programs that had been underfunded in the past. The institutional priorities this year were lead to 2 positions being allocated to engineering, 1 to research and graduate studies for the Center for Health Disparities. The remaining 34.71 positions were divided between Academic Affairs, on the east campus, and Health Affairs, on the west campus; the division of these positions was based on the relative share of the total derived faculty growth between 2007-2009. This is a formula established by UNC General Administration. Academic Affairs accounted for 81.35% the Health Sciences divisions accounted for 18.65% of this growth; thus, 28.3% FTE of the positions went to Academic Affairs and 6.42% FTE to Health Science.

These two divisions made allocations across the units that report to them. Based on a salary level based on the average teaching salary for the college in a 2008-2009 report provided by IPAR; in addition \$8,000 in enrollment increase operating funds were provided. The result was that the College of Business received 5.5 positions, the College of Education received 4.5 positions, the College of Fine Arts and Communication received 2.5, the College of Human Ecology received 2.5, the College of Health and Human Performance received 4.5, the College of Technology and Computer Science received 2.5, the College of Arts and Sciences received 9.5, the College of Allied Health Sciences 2.5 The College of Nursing 4.5, Brody School of Medicine 1.5, Research and Graduate Studies/ Health Disparities 1 position, four positions were retained in Academic Affairs for priorities and emergencies, and Health Sciences retained 1.5 positions. That is the total allocated positions and the method of divisions
Chancellor Ballard referenced a new policy from General Administration entitled Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in the University of North Carolina.

Professor Van Willigen (Sociology) asked Chancellor Ballard about stressing the importance of academics in light of classes being canceled due to a Thursday night football game. Chancellor Ballard stated total flexibility has been given to instructors in their courses and how they teach them. ECU administrators have done all they could do to balance the reality of traffic problems with classroom instruction. The Chancellor stated that if he were in charge of this there would be no Tuesday, Thursday, or Sunday football games but that these decisions are constrained by many variables that are national in scope. The student athletes are disadvantaged by having to balance academics against these sports schedules. The Chancellor stated that he is going to approach the Board of Trustees about game days other than Saturday after the conclusion of

this football season. The Chancellor stated that Provost Sheer could discuss the process of making the decisions if needed.

Chair Walker asked the Provost if she wanted to speak in response to this question: Provost Sheerer stated that the first proposal was that ECU do what UNC Chapel Hill did and simply closed the campus at an established time on a Thursday game day. Extended conversations resulted in the Executive Council and then the Faculty Officers were consulted. The Faculty advice was not to halt classes; so a compromise was reached which addressed safety issue of visitors to campus and parking problems and faculty were not being required to cancel classes. A time was set of 3:00PM so that locations like the Belk Building which would be severely impacted by game day parking could be leave early while not demanding that classes be cancelled. She noted that several faculty members had made alternate plans to work with the students.

Professor Givens (Foreign Languages and Literatures) referenced a recent student newspaper article that seemed to stress that the cost of parking on campus was more important than the cost of tuition and stated that even if these comments were considered sarcastic, ECU should not allow athletics to take precedence over academics and concluded that he wondered how this could be prevented from happen again. Chancellor Ballard stated that he felt that this article did not represent the majority of student opinion. He reiterated that mid week sporting events will be evaluated at the end of the season.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that more attention needed to be paid to the number of Monday Tuesday classes. He stated that he was not sure that he is a question but he did have an observation. ECU was trying to map out our classes, or consider cancelling classes, in view of parking for a football game and this is a situation that should not be allowed to unfold like this again. The Chancellor replied that his was a point well taken and that administrators had been worrying about the issues since August or September of this semester.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) asked, in reference to the budget situation, why there seemed to be a lot more justification on how the University used grant funds. She stated that there was a new requirement for travel allocation within some units requiring that travel justification address how the travel meets the University's mission. She asked if research did not relate to the University mission. Chancellor Ballard responded that he was not familiar with any new University-wide travel justification requirement and could not address what a unit head might require. Provost Sheerer stated that there were no centralize requirements on such a justification and that it must be a policy of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for updating the Faculty Senators on budgetary and university matters, listening to the faculty voices, and supporting the faculty at ECU.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Vice Chancellor Horns stated that The Health Sciences Division (HSD) is comprised of the Brody School of Medicine, College of Allied Health Sciences, College of Nursing, School of Dentistry, and the Laupus Health Sciences Library. The East Carolina Heart Institute, Metabolic Institute, Center on Aging, and Center for Health Services Research & Development along with some other entities also report to the Health Sciences Division (HSD). In conjunction with the

primary clinical partner, Pitt County Memorial Hospital (PCMH), the Health Sciences Division is classified as an Academic Health Sciences Center, one of about 100 similarly designated institutions nationwide. Additionally, it is important to restate that ECU does not own the hospital and even though their corporate umbrella is named "University Health Systems" this does not equate to ownership by the "University". The hospital is a separate institution with its own governing board. There seems to be continuing misunderstanding about this fact among the general public, but she indicated that she thought it is important that the ECU community be aware of this reality. ECU has a long term (20 yr) affiliation agreement with the hospital and the BSOM does receive financial support from the hospital through contractual arrangements in which the hospital purchases, at fair market value, medical services provided to the hospital by ECU's physician faculty. Last year this amount was approximately \$30M. Federal laws prohibit the "gifting" of dollars from the hospital to the Medical School.

Funding for the HSD is somewhat different from the remainder of ECU in that funding for the Colleges of Allied Health Sciences & Nursing, and the MPH program are funded through the Enrollment Growth Funding Formula (16065 budget code) along with the remainder of ECU's East Campus. The BSOM, School of Dentistry, and the Laupus Library are funded through a direct and fixed legislative allocation in a separate budget code--# 16066. The PhD programs in BSOM were recently added to the enrollment growth funding formula but the majority of their funding remains 16066 state dollars. Medicine and Dentistry are considered as "Off Formula" funded and thus receive no direct dollars from enrollment growth. Several other disciplines in the UNC system are similar—Law, Vet Med, Pharmacy, etc. Dr. Horns also indicated that another item for information was that the BSOM's entire budget is approximately \$200M/yr with around \$48M from State appropriations and approximately \$130M from Revenues generated by ECU Physicians, the multi-specialty physician clinical practice (patient care). This is a business being run by the Medical school and is a requirement for its teaching, research and service missions. In addition, the BSOM has about \$30M in grants and contracts.

Over the course of the past decade when programs funded through enrollment growth received new dollars sufficient to offset budget cuts imposed by the State, the BSOM participated in annual budget cuts but did not participate in the infusion of new dollars from the enrollment growth. The cumulative impact has been a loss of over \$34M of permanent funds from the Medical school's State funding. Obviously, this magnitude of loss is substantial forcing the School's leadership to shift many legitimate and essential academic costs from State funding to the Practice Plan, contributing in part to the depletion of reserves and a near desperate financial condition of the Practice which became evident about 3 years ago. We have been engaged in a financial turnaround for ECU Physicians since that time. Despite great progress in this effort to date including a balanced budget for this current year, Dr. Cunningham and his leadership team will be continuing this work for some time to come. Of current concern is the potential impact of federal health care reform proposals. Most contain reductions in reimbursements from Medicare and Medicaid. Since this group represents nearly 40% of the patient population of ECU Physicians, the financial impact could be disastrous.

Several people have had asked Dr. Horns to share with you some information about how we set salaries in the HSD specifically the Brody School of Medicine (BSOM) and funding sources for faculty salaries. The AAMC salary benchmarks for Medical Schools in the USA are used to determine salaries. These salary tables provide mean, median and mode data; 25%, 50%,

75% ratings; and are broken down by medical specialty, professorial rank, area of the country, and several other variables. Thus, the School can determine a salary comparable for a physician in endocrinology, general surgery, pediatric hematology, maternal fetal medicine, sports medicine, etc. Salaries for physician faculty vary greatly by medical specialty. ECU also uses salary comparative data for life sciences faculty. The School strives to set and maintain salaries at the 50% of AAMC comparables but in reality many of the BSOM faculty fall well below this goal. For example, most of our life scientists are below the 25%, with many receiving compensation for a 12 month appointment BELOW the 9-month salary of their East campus colleagues in the Sciences. Those who have salary support from grants are split funded in a similar way as East Campus. For physician faculty whose role includes "patient care" the salary is generally funded totally or partially from patient care revenues or PCMH contracts through ECU Physicians. Many of our physician faculty receive very few dollars from State sources and some get none at all. Salaries for physician faculty are market driven and must be competitive for retention. Virtually all our physician faculty have multiple outside opportunities for employment in this geographic area and elsewhere. Thus retention on our faculty is a high priority.

A few examples of physician faculty salaries in BSOM (anonymous):

Total salary: \$450,000	—State funded portion \$0
\$386,150	---State funded portion \$16,850
\$478,100	---State funded portion \$40,700
\$190,000	---State funded portion \$26,500

It has also been rumored that we have been awarding large bonuses to Department Chairs in BSOM. This is another false rumor. ECU Physicians does have a Clinical Faculty Compensation Plan which allows incentives, i.e., supplemental pay, bonuses, for highly productive clinical faculty largely based on work RVU's as defined by AAMC. No "bonuses" have been awarded to Department Chairs in recent months even though we have awarded some incentives to faculty.

The other units in the HSD also use national salary benchmark data from AACN, AHC, and other organizations in determining comparables and setting salaries rather than CUPA data which are used more commonly in non-health sciences areas. Another factor in salary setting in HSD is that all of Allied Health Sciences, Medicine, and Dentistry faculty and about 50% of the Nursing faculty are on 12 month appointments. This is necessitated by the year round need for clinical services in addition to year round academic programs to meet regulatory requirements and remain competitive with similar programs across the country.

For some time now, I have heard concerns being expressed about the "East campus" funding "Medicine". I have not been able to discover the exact origin of these questions. Dr. Horns stated that she wanted to assure this group that nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, there are a number of firewalls (including Dr. Sheerer and the Deans) which prevent this from occurring. There are seven positions that have been allocated to the BSOM for teaching courses for non-BSOM students. And of course, as mentioned earlier positions to support the MPH program and PhD programs are in BSOM but these are generated from the enrollment growth funding formula. The folks in Medicine actually see this picture differently. The Medical School has over the past decade infused nearly \$12M back into ECU through the auxiliary tax

on ECU Physicians that was initiated in 1996 to reimburse ECU for some essential support services such as payroll, purchasing, etc. (At that time ECU Physicians had more than \$70M in reserves). This last year the tax resulted in \$1.6M to ECU. In addition, the PhD programs in BSOM provided the basis for ECU's successful bid to become reclassified as a Doctoral II institution by the UNC System in 1998 resulting in the receipt of more than \$6M in additional permanent funding to the campus between 1999-2002. None of these dollars were allocated back to the BSOM. In addition, F & A receipts for the campus are currently at ~\$4.5M about 60% of which comes from grants in the HSD.

Last year there were lots of concerns and misunderstandings among the faculty about administrative stipends. I am here to report that just under \$3M of these stipends are in the HSD and a large proportion are paid from NON-STATE dollars (\$2,063,138M). The majority of stipends in the HSD are paid to "faculty members" who agree to take on additional "time limited" responsibilities beyond their regular duties. Many of these stipends are in support of the academic mission rather than being purely administrative in nature. For example, one of our current senators is receiving a stipend funded by PCMH for duties as a Residency Program Director. Another faculty member receives an ECU Physician's funded stipend for serving as the MS III Clerkship Director. Two ECU faculty members (one East Campus and one West Campus) receive state funded stipends for chairing IRB's. All persons receiving a stipend have a written contract which specifies the purpose and amount of the stipend as well as a notification that the stipend will be discontinued if the duties are no longer performed. To be very clear, the use of stipends is a necessary tool for getting all the work done. We do not have stipends being paid for unessential work and the work being supported by stipends cannot be eliminated. Thus, the blanket elimination of stipends would do irreparable damage to our academic core.

The Dental School continues its planning for the admission of the first dental students in 2011. The class size is planned to be 50 students all of whom will be NC residents. We have recently completed 2 searches to hire additional personnel whose roles are in Student Services and Clinical Services. These hires were critical to our eventual accreditation. We have searches underway for faculty and other key administrative positions particularly in Academic Affairs. Plans for the Dental School building here on campus have reached conclusion of the design phase with the first round of construction bids planned for December. The second round of bids is planned for early summer. Occupancy of the building is expected to be December of 2011. The first 3 service learning center locations were announced last week: Elizabeth City, Ahoskie, and Sylva. Planning is now underway to identify the exact site for the clinic in each of these communities and design the structures. ECU received an additional \$3M in permanent operating dollars for the Dental School in this last legislative session bringing the total to \$5.5M so far. When the School is fully operational the total budget is around \$18M so this means we have an additional amount of funding to seek from the legislature in the next 2-3 years.

During some recent conversations on campus, several folks indicated that they were unaware of the Pharmacy Services and Rapid Access program available to ALL ECU Employees and their dependents. Informational materials about these programs are at your places and we invite your participation.

Provided is a link to [Vice Chancellor Horns' full comments](#). No questions were posed to Vice Chancellor Horns. Chair Walker thanked VC Horns for supporting the faculty and in being an

advocate in all faculty matters, not only with the Health Sciences Division, but in general faculty and university matters.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker stated that in the past four months, she had learned more than she had ever imagined about the university and how to best represent the faculty. She knew that the Chair of the Faculty's responsibilities were to represent the faculty in all situations, yet she never realized in just how many situations and the number of individuals with whom she would be sharing this information.

As you are all aware, there has been initiation of some of the most important endeavors ever at the university during this academic year, including the development of the University Policy Manual, specifically the Policy on Policies, and the review and revision of the Faculty Manual. During the development and review of these two critical endeavors, it has been more imperative than ever for the Chair of the Faculty and the faculty officers to represent ALL faculty of each unit, and the Faculty Senate in the discussions taking place about these documents and procedures.

In order to accurately represent the faculty of East Carolina University, the Chair of the Faculty must know the issues of the faculty, not only from her own unit, but from each unit. In order to successfully lead the way in the review, reorganization, and revision of the entire faculty manual, she must become familiar with the current concerns and successes involving the faculty manual.

Professor Walker stated that she must understand and support the structure of the standing university committees and the faculty serving on those committees. She must facilitate and encourage open communication between faculty and administration, but among faculty as well. In the spirit of shared governance, she must share the voice of the faculty with administrators in these situations and must "be at the table" during the development of rules, policies, and procedures. The voices and perceptions of the faculty must be considered prior to the development and implementation of such policies and regulations. This voice relates to the faculty, not to my personal agenda. When she is asked, "what do the faculty think" or "what are the faculty concerns", she knows that she cannot answer the question based on her personal beliefs. Her stance must be formed based on the feedback and information she has gathered from the faculty.

Professor Walker asked what had she done this year to ensure that she was carrying out her responsibilities as Chair of the Faculty? To answer this question, she stated that she must change from first person singular to first person plural. The work of the Chair of the Faculty cannot be accomplished without support from the faculty, the senators, faculty officers, faculty on university standing and appellate committees and key administrators. This year, the faculty leadership has operated on a principle of increased and open communication in all circumstances. We have worked to increase the opportunities to collaborate, communicate, and consider all points of view in matters relating to the faculty. We have held four faculty forums, which have been broadcast and available for review at a later date. In October, the forums addressed the definition of Academic Core, which is being explored by the UNC Faculty Assembly. Catherine Rigsby and Brenda Killingsworth led these discussions. Thanks to them for their valuable information and for taking our perspectives into consideration. We also explored

the topic of Retention and Graduation, again an important GA mandate. Thanks to the faculty who attended, in addition to Provost Sheerer, Vice Chancellor Horns and Mageean, Vice Provost Bunch, the Deans, and various other administrators and staff for sharing their views in our forums.

We have encouraged dialogue through the faculty blog and committee meetings. For the first time in the history of the ECU Faculty Senate, the Chairs of the Standing University Committees are meeting monthly, with the faculty officers and having open discussions about the state of university affairs and the faculty involvement in these affairs. Ideas are being generated and themes are emerging, not only pertaining to concerns, but in how to accomplish and provide feedback in a number of issues. The Faculty Advisory Group also met with the faculty officers and discussed how to assist the university committees in reviewing the faculty manual. They are meeting with these committees and are participating in reviewing and making recommendations to the faculty senate during this year, regarding the faculty manual. Thanks to this group, George Bailey, Puri Martinez, Mark Sprague, Hunt McKinnon, Gene Hughes, Linda Wolfe, and Joseph Thomas for all their work and involvement with this enormous undertaking.

The Faculty Manual Steering Committee has completed the first round of review of the manual and has made interesting observations and suggestions for consideration by the university committees. The faculty and administrators are engaging in valuable, honest, and often controversial conversation about the Manual. The Faculty Manual Steering Committee, consisting of a collaborative group of faculty and administrators, will continue their work this month to complete the review of the manual, focus on items that could possibly be removed, and decisions about cross-referencing sections between the University Policy Manual sections and Faculty Manual. Under consideration are policies relating to Academic Integrity and Student Honor Code, Academic Policies (faculty and administrative), Advising, and Faculty Workload.

Professor Walker stated that the university committees were working diligently to carry out new charges to review and make recommendations regarding the faculty manual. She stated that she was so proud of the faculty committees in their work. She also stated that she has and will continue to meet with the committees and will do whatever she can to facilitate the review this year. Following the last meeting of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, she met with a number of the committees relative to considerations for the review, such as reorganization of Part V, as primarily undertaken by the Academic Standards Committee. In addition, the Grievance Committee is reviewing Appendix Y and the Faculty Governance will continue their review of Appendix C and D, in consultation with university attorneys, and advice of General Administration.

ECU is fortunate for the structure of these university committees; a structure that is not always present in other UNC university shared governance models. The structure of these committees, and the standard for accountability and responsibility underscores the work that they are carrying out in a timely manner.

Administrative policies are also being developed and when appropriate, Provost Sheerer was requested faculty input on such policies as "Consequences for Faculty Who Fail to Submit Grades", "Gifts Affecting the Curriculum", and "Institutional Survey Administration". Academic Standards will be reviewing these documents and will provide feedback on these policies.

Thanks to Provost Sheerer for requesting our input and for using the university Faculty Senate committee structure. This tracking of input from faculty will certainly prove to be beneficial to the university and will set the stage for future faculty advice on administrative policies pertaining to faculty matters.

She then asked each of the Faculty Senators, to truly represent the faculty in their units. She challenged them to get out and establish an active voice for their faculty, so they were able to speak for colleagues within their units, as their elected representative. There are opportunities in place that would allow Senators to accomplish this task easily. She encouraged Senators to invite their faculty to the monthly faculty forums and be a model for this venue by attending. These forums are information sessions in an informal setting for discussion about important university issues that will affect faculty, students, programs, and the visions for the university. She asked Senators to ask themselves the question, "If I am not present at these forums, will my unit truly be represented?" She noted that as she has found out, if you are not at the table, your issue may be overlooked. She reminded Senators that if they were unable to attend one of the two forums, they should send someone in their place. If they have unit faculty meetings, ask to speak as a Faculty Senator and encourage a discussion about issues currently being discussed in a forum. She asked Senators to send their ideas, thoughts, and concerns to the faculty officers to ensure that their voice was heard. She encouraged Senators to come to the Faculty Senate meetings with a clear understanding of the consensus of their unit, feeling confident that they are truly representing their unit. Review the faculty manual and when these issues are discussed at the senate relating to the revision of the manual, Senators should understand the language, organization, and controversial issues that arise.

Professor Walker stated that together we can all make a difference. She reminded Senators that she never used third person in her reference to the charges and responsibilities that we all have this year. We shouldn't think, they will do the work, they will go to the forums, and they will speak for us. WE are all in this together and we must make sure that all faculty are represented and have a voice.

No questions were posed to Professor Walker following her remarks.

F. Marsha Ironsmith, Chair of Honors College Planning Task Force
Professor Ironsmith (Psychology) provided highlights of the Task Force Report. In review she stated that the task force was commissioned by Provost in December 2008 and met weekly and furnished report in June 2008. The mission was to assess the benefits and our readiness of ECU to move have an Honor's college. It was envisioned that the Honor's College would foster interdisciplinary programs, extend the University's commitment to community engagement and fit into the strategic goals outlined in UNC Tomorrow. There is also the possibility that this would contribute to better alumni relations.

The college would be led by a Dean who would report to the Provost and would not be located in an existing unit on campus or tenure its own faculty. The committee suggested that the graduate school model be used so there would be honors faculty from different colleges teaching the honors courses. The suggestion was made to have an Honors College dormitory which would encourage stronger recruiting of academically talented students. Leadership would be seen as the key of the Honor's College. Honors community felt that there should be a strong focus on

international education including study abroad. An implementation committee and a business plan now needed to be established. Further planning will go through the normal approval process and appropriate faculty committees will be involved. In terms of a timeline the current effort is in data collection and developing a curriculum and faculty standards. The Dean should be in place in the second year and faculty submittals would be received for teaching courses. Year 3 would be opening the doors. Professor Ironsmith stated that she was available to answer questions.

No questions were posed to Professor Ironsmith or Bassman following her report.

G. Approval of the Fall 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) moved approval of the Fall 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. **RESOLUTION #09-37**

H. Question Period

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) thanked those in administration who made it possible for the H1N1 vaccine to be available for faculty in the Wright auditorium.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) stated that, in reference to Vice Chancellor Horns remarks (noted below) he wondered if the academic council would consider adopting this model for the rest of ECU faculty.

"We use the AAMC salary benchmarks for Medical Schools in the USA to determine salaries. These salary tables provide mean, median and mode data; 25%, 50%, 75% ratings; and are broken down by medical specialty, professorial rank, area of the country, and several other variables. Thus, the School can determine a salary comparable for a physician in endocrinology, general surgery, pediatric hematology, maternal fetal medicine, sports medicine, etc. Salaries for physician faculty vary greatly by medical specialty. We also get salary comparative data for life sciences faculty. The School strives to set and maintain salaries at the 50% of AAMC comparables but in reality many of the BSOM faculty fall well below this goal."

Professor Wilson summarized that the medical school has a commitment to deliver benefits to the faculty to be as good as other medical schools around the country. The benefits that we receive in the rest of the University are nowhere near as close as at other Universities.

VC Horns stated that she shared that sentiment and that this had been a problem for many years. It is a compelling problem that is debated frequently that she do not know the answer. From the medical schools perspective, they are running a business so the state of NC has not been able to keep up. She stated that she could use Professor Wilson's support in the Faculty Assembly in convincing UNC General Administration that parity in benefits is essential.

Professor Zeager (Economics) asked how the Board of Trustees had responded to the idea of an Honors College. Chancellor Ballard responded that they had been very receptive to the concept and that they would assess it after a business plan and implementation plan were submitted. He felt that they were strongly in support of the concept at this time, in part, due to the retention problems affecting those gifted students. Chancellor Ballard saw this as one way to make a difference for those students.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

A. Admissions and Retention Policies Committee

Professors Joseph Thomas (Academic Library Services) and Wendy Sharer (English), leaders within the Committee, provided a summary of last month's discussion on the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.J. Grade Appeals.

Professor Sprague (Physics) offered an editorial revision, deleting the sentence "A four-fifths majority shall prevail in the committee." from #5 in the proposal. The revision was accepted.

Professor Cooper (Health and Human Performance) addressed concerns faculty within his unit had with information in #6 and how to protect the Dean. He asked if the committee discussed this particular issue. Professor Sharer responded that the Dean would only be acting on the recommendation of the committee and he/she would not have the power, personally to act on his/her own, thereby eliminating any harm to them.

Professor Jenks (History) stated that the current policy was really a nonpolicy and that the Senators needed to understand that if the Senate created this form of policy it would create a lot of work for the Deans within the colleges and schools. He stated that faculty within his unit reacted negatively to this proposed policy and thought that the grades may be overturned outside the faculty member's purview? He asked if the department could create their own subcommittee as part of the review process? Could they handle this within the unit and without getting to step #5. Professor Sharer responded that #3 potentially allows for the chair to gather more information and then the appeal could then go to step #5 if the student wishes to pursue. The unit chair could also ask someone to investigate the problem for him or her.

Tremayne Smith (SGA Treasurer), speaking on behalf of Brad Congleton (SGA President) stated that he had talked with many students and faculty and was requesting that the student be represented by a faculty member so that he/she could attest to the student's ability. In addition, the faculty member representing the student would be more in the know of how the University system worked. He suggested that the revised policy be considered as a trial for one year and then all get together again to discuss the outcome.

Professor Kenney (Physics) spoke against the proposed revisions due to the involvement of the dean and investigations that the dean is empowered to do. There seemed to be a lot of overhead making faculty provide two different documents to justify why the grade was given. This policy also did not meet what the AAUP really endorsed in relation to how grade appeals were to be handled.

Professor Sprague (Physics) spoke in favor of that and moved to strike "This grade appeal policy generally follows that recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)." There was no objection to the motion and it passed.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that what was consistent with AAUP was that the final decision on the grade should rest with the faculty member. The proposed revised policy would add a faculty committee and not allow for the dean to handle this on his/her own. He spoke in support of the resolution.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated that the criteria was narrow which was good and asked why not note the standards found in academic unit's code of operations. Professor Niswander (Business) spoke against adding reference to the unit codes because faculty teaching multiple sections should have the privilege to change the standards. He stated that if the individual instructor decided to do things differently it would be in compliance with #2 criteria but not #3.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that the 2nd criterion was redundant to the 3rd criterion. Professor Niswander (Business) responded that if the individual instructor decided to do things differently it would still be in compliance with #2 criteria but not #3. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that standards exist different from those established and what happens if the student does average work but does not get a "C".

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that he concern was that this was a student generated appeal, so shouldn't it read that these departmental policies should bear on the grade appeal and could involve a bunch of interpretations not based on validity.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.J. Grade Appeals were approved amended. **RESOLUTION #09-38**

B. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Deedee Glascoff

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance), a member of the committee, presented three requests as noted below:

1. Request for Undergraduate Game Development Certificate within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
2. Request for Realignment of Higher Education Doctoral Concentration within the College of Education.
3. Request for Film Studies Interdisciplinary Minor within the Department of English.

There was no discussion and the three requests were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-39**

C. Faculty Grievance Committee, Jan Mayo

Professor Mayo (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, provided an overview of the 2008-2009 Committee Activities. There was no discussion.

D. Unit Code Screening Committee, Christine Zoller

Professor Zoller (Art and Design), a member of the Committee, presented the revised unit codes of operation for the Department of Geography and Department of Psychology. There was no discussion and the revised unit codes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-40**

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. Academic Standards, Linda Wolfe

Professor Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee requested approval of Geography 1000 for Social Science Foundations Credit. There was no discussion and the approval of Geography 1000 for Social Science Foundations Credit was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-41**

B. Admissions and Retention Policies Committee, Joseph Thomas
Professor Thomas (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section 5: Academic Regulations.

Professor Thomas first offered additional revisions to the first paragraph under *After Schedule Change Period* so that the sentences read: "For regular semester-length courses, the drop period is limited to the first ~~thirty~~ **thirty eight** days of classes of the semester. For five-week block courses or regular summer term courses, the drop period is limited to the first ~~ten~~ **thirteen** days of classes for the semester or summer term." There was no further discussion on the section, entitled *After Schedule Change Period*.

In reference to the second section, entitled *Grade Replacement Policy*, Professor Theurer (Music) stated he did not believe that the current policy restricts the number of times a student can take a class for grade replacement. This change would allow additional leniency so the students have a chance to try again.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked for clarification on who made these recommendations and/or who encouraged the committee to make these revisions to the policy. Professor Thomas replied that if you look at the recommendations together you will find that the overall effort is to raise standards while provide some cushioning and at the same time academic eligibility requirements would be increased. In that way the best academic interests of the student would be taken into account.

Professor Thomas stated that in March 2009, the Academic Standards Committee and Admissions and Retention Policies Committee presented a joint response to the Strategic Enrollment Management Task Force recommendations on Academic Policy Changes (section 2.8 of the SEMTF report). That was provided to the Senators at that time for information only and that now the Committees was ready to present the proposed changes to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section 5. Academic Regulations.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that a tenth of a grade point average did little for the student. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that the proposed revisions were not new since they were developed by the Strategic Enrollment Task Force and then were vetted by the Academic Standards Committee and Admissions and Retention Policy Committee. Those two committees presented their recommendations to this body in March 2009. ECU needs to increase student retention and this is an opportunity to see if we can change our policies to encourage our students not to leave ECU.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) spoke against the grading system, stating that the Task Force recommended limiting the number of times that a student could take a course. It would not benefit the student to take a course in their major four times and that this new policy would not increase retention but would affect graduation rates. She suggested that maybe the student should be advised to change their particular academic path.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that through being on the Strategic Enrollment Task Force he had learned, from Jayne Geissler, that UNC Wilmington also allowed four course drops and that this had been an advantage in eventual graduation rates. He

stated that forcing a student to go to a community college should not be the only option; however, while supporting this change philosophically he had one technical question. If the University extends the time that a student can drop a class without penalty, would that affect their financial aid?

Professor Tovey (English) stated that there would not be a problem with financial aid and that with the 10 day extension that had been provided for. She also noted that there are many times that there was not a grade until 40% of the class had met.

Professor Sharer (English) stated that one issue that came up in the discussion referred to limiting the number of grade replacements. A consideration is the number of times that a student could take a foundation course since they must be passed before graduating. English 1100/1200 was a good example.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that the first sentence was vague and that there were 4 occasions when a student could replace a grade for any course. The response was 4 total grade replacements during a student's college career.

Professor Glascoff stated clarification is needed for the foundations curriculum. College algebra is a big stumbling block for example and that this has been resolved. She asked if she were in error? Professor Sharer responded that English 1100/1200 was the only case where there was not an alternative.

Professor Tovey (English) stated Jayne Geissler, Director of Academic Advising, had asked her to inquire if it had been considered that if a student is failing one course they are often failing several and that for that reason she does not feel that repeat course grade replacement would be a problem.

Professor Theurer (Music) moved to limit the number of grade replacements for courses unless it was a foundation course and offered a motion that read: "Only foundations curriculum courses may be repeated up to 4 times for grade replacement." He is proposing this amendment since this takes up valuable seat space that could be taken by another student. Professor Stiller (Biology) stated that he did not understand, as a faculty body, the reason to micromanage the number of student's drops.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that he had concerns with the proposed amendment because the proposed language did not preclude a student from repeating a course other than a foundation course outside of their major. He asked if this language of the amendment preclude students from excluding 1000 and 2000 level course. He stated his opposition to eliminating all 1000 and 2000 level courses from grade replacement unless they are foundation courses.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that he also was opposed to micromanaging the way a student might use the four drops that are made available to them. Professor Niswander (Business) spoke against the motion stated that there were core courses within the College of Business that were really hard and that he assumed all units had minors outside of their major areas and the likelihood of taking the same course again was low but possible.

Following discussion, the motion to limit the number of grade replacements for courses unless it was a foundation course failed.

Professor Rigsby (Geology) stated, for clarification, that this policy does not say that a student can take a class and not replace the grade. After the 4th time would the grade be calculated into the grade point average?

Professor Cooper (Health and Human Performance) stated that the Chancellor had mentioned minimum GPA is problem in selecting majors. He asked how this might impact the consideration of majors

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that, although it looked like only a small percentage of changes, the University's grade replacement policy was more restrictive than all others within the UNC system. He stated that allowing for one additional grade replacement would not hurt the University and it did aid the student, if by chance they had had a terrible freshman year adjusting to college.

There was no further discussion on the section, entitled *Grade Replacement Policy*. In reference to the third section, entitled *Academic Eligibility Standards*, there was no discussion nor amendments offered to the text. Following this, the proposed revised sections to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section 5: Academic Regulations were approved as amended. **RESOLUTION #09-42**

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Deedee Glascoff
Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) first stated that she had been asked to postpone requesting approval of the proposed Sport and Exercise Psychology Concentration in the Master of Science degree in Exercise and Sport Science within the College of Health and Human Performance until an issue could be worked out. She then presented a request for authorization to establish a Master of Science in Security Studies, within the Department of Political Science and a proposed Graduate Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision, within the College of Health and Human Performance.

There was no discussion and the request for authorization to establish a Master of Science in Security Studies, within the Department of Political Science and a proposed Graduate Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision, within the College of Health and Human Performance were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-43**

D. University Curriculum Committee, Paul Schwager
Professor Schwager (Business), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the September 10, 2009, September 24, 2009 (includes revised course proposal form and signature form for curricular changes), and October 8, 2009 meeting minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #09-44**

E. Unit Code Screening Committee, Christine Zoller
Professor Zoller (Art and Design), a member of the committee, first noted that the College of Allied Health Sciences' unit code of operation was being pulled pending additional discussion by

the committee. She then presented the proposed revised unit codes of operation for the Departments of Biology and English. There was no discussion and the revised Department of Biology and Department of English unit codes of operation were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #09-45

VI. New Business

Resolution in Support of the Biosciences Building

Professor Sprague (Physics) first thanked Professor John Stiller (Biology) who helped him craft the motion before the senators. He stated that the essence of the motion was because the current Howell Science Complex building is in need of repair due to structural problems and basically that the 1970's heating and air conditioning system had given out. He stated that, in order to fix it, the building would have to be closed down for repair and do a full renovation. There had been band aids placed on the problem for years due to limited funds, but it is only a matter of time until the building has to be renovated or replaced. However, there are research projects that would need to come to a halt and moved elsewhere when the building was closed for repairs and then halted again and moved back once the building was reopened. He also stated that the Chancellor had asked him and other faculty members to assist him in getting this to the forefront by providing a resolution that would be supported by the Faculty Senate.

Professor Jenks (History) asked if passed, what were the Senators asking the administration to do? He stated that he understood there to be a list of prioritized projects and he wanted to know where this project was on the list. Was the Chancellor asking for a resolution on this building so that he could say that the faculty support this new building?

Professor Sprague stated that the Chancellor has asked for a motion of support from the faculty for design of this building to lend credibility in seeking funding from the legislature.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) stated that STEM (science technology engineering and management) should be clarified for the sake of the historical record. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Dean Niswander (Business) spoke against the resolution stating that the Faculty Senate was sending the wrong message. There were scores of capital needs such as Brewster with classes being held in Hendrix, academic units spread all over campus, and a new building for Allied Health Sciences and Nursing already filled to capacity. His concern across campus was that there were huge infrastructure needs, and that by bypassing those and in passing this resolution, the Senate was saying this is it, and those other needs or buildings do not matter. He stated that the Faculty Senate needed to represent the faculty at large and that the proposed resolution should not be passed in its current form but expanded to include other buildings and projects. Dean Niswander then moved to table this item of new business. The motion was seconded by Professor Theuer (Music). Following a vote, the motion to table failed and the discussion continued.

Professor Pravica (Mathematics) stated that the Austin building has had a big crack in the walls for the past 10 years and if the Chancellor was willing to go forward with the building of the new

Biosciences Building and had requested faculty support, we should provide support for a building with loose bricks and cracks in it.

VC Mageean stated that there was a recognized system of priorities and she understood that there were many buildings that needed work. She stated that if the Chancellor felt that having the faculty express their support would strengthen his hand in dealing with the legislature.

Professor Gilliland (Medicine) stated that having faculty spread out over several buildings was a nuisance, but they could still communicate. It was unfair to ignore the Chancellor when he had an important issue that he has asked faculty input and that adding more items to address was unfair too. She supported the resolution and the Senate providing the Chancellor with what he needed to get the job done and she characterized this resolution as a baby step.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) stated that in the past she had asked the Chancellor about the Visual and Performing Arts Center and that he had said that there were still problems with that proposal and gathering enough support. She stated that she agreed that faculty should support the Chancellor in what he was trying to accomplish.

Professor Willson (Medicine) stated his support of the resolution; however, he asked if this now set a precedent that all future building requests would come through the Faculty Senate.

Professor Romack (Chemistry) spoke in favor of the resolution and stated that if we are going to ask for something and that it is tied to economic development then the Faculty Senate should support the Chancellor's request.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) reminded the Senators that all the proposed resolution did was reassert the #1 priority that had already been assigned to this building. Following discussion, the proposed resolution in Support of the Biosciences Building was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #09-46

Prior to Professor Roberts (Philosophy) moving adjournment, Professor Estep (Academic Library Services) provided a brief announcement on an upcoming event within Joyner Library.

Following this, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 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 NOVEMBER 3, 2009, MEETING

09-37 Fall 2009 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-38 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.J. Grade Appeals.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-39 Request for Undergraduate Game Development Certificate within the College of Technology and Computer Science, Request for Realignment of Higher Education Doctoral Concentration within the College of Education, and Request for Film Studies Interdisciplinary Minor within the Department of English.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-40 Revised Department of Geography and Department of Psychology unit codes of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-41 Approval of Geography 1000 for Social Science Foundations Credit.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-42 Revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section 5: Academic Regulations.
Disposition: Chancellor

09-43 Request for authorization to establish a Master of Science in Security Studies, within the Department of Political Science and a proposed Graduate Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision, within the College of Health and Human Performance.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-44 Curriculum matters contained in the September 10, 2009, September 24, 2009 (includes revised course proposal form and signature form for curricular changes), and October 8, 2009 meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-45 Revised Department of Biology and Department of English unit codes of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

09-46 Resolution in Support of the Biosciences Building.

Disposition: Chancellor