

P  
30

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2010**

The second regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 5, 2010, 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 September 7, 2010, were approved as presented.

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

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Scemama (Biology), Novick, Willson and Schenarts (Medicine), and Niswander (Business/Academic Deans' Representative).

Alternates present were: Professors Walker-Bailey for Godwin (Art and Design), Hegde for Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations), Dotson-Blake for Voytecki (Education), Russell for Jenks (History), Swinker for Gilliland (Medicine), Roper for Fletcher (Medicine), and Moore for Larson (Nursing).

**B. Announcements**

The following people were granted speaking privileges for the meeting: David Weismiller, Donna Payne, Puri Martinez, Virginia Hardy, and Scott Buck.

Faculty are reminded that most of the speeches given by the Chair of the Faculty are posted online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/speeches/Speeches.cfm>.

The Committee on Committees is seeking nominees from the faculty for the election of two delegates and two alternates to the 2011-2012 UNC Faculty Assembly. Nominees should be full-time faculty, holding no administrative duties outside his/her department. The names of those nominated to the Committee on Committees will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in January 2011. Following elections, the new delegates and alternates will begin their terms in August 2011. Information will be distributed to all faculty and nomination forms will be due in the Faculty Senate office by Monday, November 1, 2010. A list of the current Faculty Assembly delegation is available online at: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-cad/fsonline/customcf/rosters/facultyassembly.htm>.

Faculty members not located on main campus and who serve on various academic standing committees are reminded of special courtesy parking permits available from the office of Parking and Transportation Services. Special Courtesy Permits allow faculty members attending meetings, etc. to park in "A1/B1" lots on main campus. These permits are issued to unit heads at no charge and are to be used in conjunction with a paid parking permit. Additional information is available from Parking and Transportation Services at 328-1961.

In an effort to keep faculty members informed of campus activities, Board of Trustees meeting agendas and schedules are distributed electronically to all faculty and available anytime online at <http://www.ecu.edu/bot/>. Faculty are welcome to attend these open meetings.

Information on how to import the ECU Academic Calendar into Outlook, Entourage or iCal is available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-ecu/academic-import.cfm>. Because the Academic Calendar can change,



they will be made available approximately one month before each semester. Information in these downloaded files are as accurate as we can make them at the time of creation. Always be sure to check the official Academic Calendar page for the latest updates. Any changes that are made after you import the calendar will have to be updated in your calendar manually by you.

Reminder of social at Winslow's after the faculty senate meeting. Please come and encourage your faculty colleagues to attend as well. We will be having these socials the rest of the academic year. It will be a good way to informally interact with each other each month, to get to know faculty from across campus, and to interact with the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Chancellors on an informal basis. All are eligible for 15% off all food purchases.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard began his remarks by discussing the budget; he said that there is a much that we do not know since it is only October. The Chancellor made an analogy to landing a jet fighter, at 600 miles an hour, on the deck of an aircraft carrier in a storm; he said the target is moving and you cannot see a thing. He also mentioned that there was a huge difference between the scenario now being requested by the State Office of Management and Budget (OSMB) and the amount of money that the University is holding for budget reductions. The funding available to the University and the required budget scenarios are related but they are significantly different. For example, OSMB guidelines indicate that the budget scenarios cannot include tuition increases. Therefore, the required 10 percent budget reduction must come from other sources of revenue. Tuition increases have already been approved for ECU. Thus the response to OSMB scenario exercise will identify cuts that the university has no intention of cutting. These items would only be considered under a 15% or higher budget cut.

The Chancellor indicated that the next biennium would be the worst so far. ECU is planning how to make cuts and generate income carefully, and the OSMB budget scenarios should be considered as satisfaction of a mandate. There is a strong policy framework passed by the Board of Trustees that mandates protection of the academic core. The second thing to keep in mind is that ECU can meet a 10% budget cutback, based on current financial planning, without touching the academic core. Academic services may have to be cut, but there will be no reductions in faculty lines and faculty salary lines. ECU is well positioned for the budget reductions that we have now been informed of; however, much is yet to be determined since it is only October. The size of the revenue gap and which party controls the legislature will determine what we are ultimately told will be the required reduction in state funding as April 15 approaches.

The Chancellor also mentioned that there were continual difficulties with funding for the Medical School. The University will protect the Medical School in every way possible, but there are reductions state support and in the federal reimbursement rates. Negotiations with contracts with the hospital are also causing funding concerns. State support for the Medical school has declined from 53% to 21% in the last decade. The other eighteen Universities that have Medical Schools that focus on Family Medicine are in the same situation.

Tuition increases are still being considered based on assessment of campus needs. The Chancellor indicated that ECU could easily ask the students to pay from 5%- 20% in additional tuition and fees to offset needs that are not controversial. The legitimate reasons for such a tuition and fee increase would include meeting the 10% overall budget reduction shortfall, additional money for financial aid, and merit based scholarships. The educational technology fee needs to be increased steadily over



the next few years. The Chancellor indicated that he was reluctant to approve a 20% tuition increase since this did not support or agree with the values of the University. Instead, he indicated that 10% or a little more would be more reasonable, but some substantial increase will probably be needed to meet the projected budget cuts without cutting the academic core. About six weeks remain before the determination of what will be sought in tuition increases. The Chancellor asked for feedback from the faculty on the topic of tuition increases.

The Chancellor concluded his remarks on the budget by discussing the expansion budget. There are really three budgets: the capital budget, the continuation budget and expansion budget. The continuation budget indicates whether the university will continue to get the funding that has been available for repairs and renovations and enrollment growth money. The expansion budget includes any new initiatives. Some legislative leaders have indicated that there is no need to consider any items for an expansion budget since revenue income is not expected to increase. ECU has continued to request money, from the expansion budget, to finalize the Dental School and support for the Brody School of Medicine. The first priority will be the Dental School. ECU continues to seek capital improvements funding for deferred maintenance and the Bioscience Building.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his remarks and continued support of the faculty and asked if there were any questions for the Chancellor.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Science) thanked the Chancellor for his comments on the budget situation and asked how he defined the "academic core." Specifically, she asked, where, in reference to proposed budget cuts within the academic core, would the cuts be made? Chancellor Ballard replied that the core the ECU Board of Trustees has defined academic core as anything that affects student learning. He indicated that he must pay attention to how General Administration defines "academic core." He stated that the budget would affect the core only in a worst case scenario and if the cuts reach a 12%-15% level then there will probably be cuts across the board to the colleges, program reductions, or not filling vacancies and other things that the university administration does not want to do. Too many variables are changing to forecast if we will be faced with a budget reduction exceeding 10% since a clear estimate of revenue may not be available for five months.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs  
Provost Sheerer stated she would begin with the most difficult topic: a report from UNC –GA on low productivity programs. The reports from General Administration are largely quantitative; the universities can respond qualitatively by discussing strategies for improving the number of students taking the courses and the significance of the programs. Alan Mabe, who is a Vice President at GA, told the Provosts that each year campuses suggest programs that are cut; mostly these are programs that had outlived their usefulness, but these cuts have had little overall financial impact. For example, the programs that were identified by ECU last year would have had no significant cost savings if eliminated. A task force will be formed that will be named the Program Discontinuation Task Force; this will be a direct response to the UNC Board of Governors policy that when they approve new programs that other programs be cut so that revenue can be used for the most viable programs. This committee has met and the attorney for GA reported that there is a very long process to reappoint tenured faculty to other programs and the conclusion was that there would be no short-term savings. For example, if someone asked what contribution could be made by discontinuing programs towards a 10% budget reduction the response would be none since it would take two to three years to realize any return for discontinuing programs. There is still interest from the Board of Governors to pursue this there is concern that decisions about low performing programs might be made by the



legislature if not made by the campuses. Neither the Board of Governors or the Board of Trustees, both of which are composed of attorneys and business leaders, understand the tenure process since there is no parallel in the corporate structure. A white paper is being considered to educate board members on the process of tenure and appointment.

Another implication of this concern is collaboration with other campuses. If there is a center of excellence for a topic then resources might be shared between programs; but there is no information on where the best programs are located. Faculty involvement is being sought in view of finding areas of duplication across campuses and eliminating small numbers of students in existing programs.

There are also three general areas of undergraduate education that the Provost discussed: ECU narrowly missed complying with the retention rate requirement last year. Dr. Fletcher, our recently hired enrollment manager, has indicated that on census day, for the present academic year, the ECU rate was 81.3%; this is an improvement due additional advising and efforts by the faculty. Secondly, the university made statements in UNC Tomorrow about general education, which related to global perspective. The General Administration has now asked ECU what has been accomplished and what changes are being considered relative to accomplish this goal. An example of this would be more exposure of our students to foreign languages. Consideration is being given to requiring more foreign languages as part of the course of study would prepare our students for a global economy since they would have a second language as part of their skill set. Finally, a Foundations of Excellence (FoE) program is an initiative that focuses on our new students has begun. The University of South Carolina (USC) has done an excellent job in increasing freshman retention and John Gardner, who helped develop this program at USC, will be working with ECU to offer an improved program to assist freshmen in their first year of college. Faculty will be recruited to help with this initiative.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked the Provost to elaborate more on UNIV 1000 (currently COAD 1000) and about what process would be followed in order to revise the course. Would a committee will be established to study the revision of the program with participation of members of the faculty? Provost Sheerer responded that the course would reflect the idea of no one area owning the course. All academic units should consider participating in it and thus receiving academic payment and credit for teaching students in the revised program.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked, in reference to Provost Sheerer's remarks on faculty collaborating with faculty from other State universities, what would happen to the collaborating faculty member? Would they lose their jobs or share one position? Could the faculty member be asked to teach at another institution if tenured at another institution? Provost Sheerer replied that there is currently no answer to these questions. Collaboration may be more likely to be for masters programs being delivered jointly; for example UNCW and the College of Education at ECU jointly provided a Masters program in Onslow County. General Administration is also looking at the UNC Online initiative and other ways that for interested faculty could collaborate between universities.

Professor Givens (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked what programs might be included in the collaboration? He stated that he would like to see the expansion of foreign languages within UNC Tomorrow and asked how the University would balance the low productivity based programs with programs that offer service to other academic units. He stated that faculty within Foreign Languages and Literatures want to be more than a service unit and wish to increase the number of service courses and credit hours and to increase the number of majors in the department. The Provost



Responded that Foreign Languages were not alone in that dilemma. For example, how many languages does a university need to offer, four, six, or twelve in a global economy? The discussion needs to be more fluid when student credit hours are considered for service courses such as physics and foreign languages.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that from his experience, that not every freshman gets COAD 1000 and asked how does ECU encourage all students to participate in the course and who will teach the courses? Provost Sheerer responded that students sign up during orientation, and often they are encouraged to do so by their parents. Students in academic difficulty are automatically placed in the course during the second semester of their freshman year. At present most of the instructors for the COAD 1000 courses are taught by EPA-non faculty personnel; this includes academic advisors and other staff within the Division of Student Life. There are some instructors who are faculty members, but not all course instructors are presently members of the faculty.

Professor Bauer (English) asked about the roster of those students in academic difficulty and stated that students not attending her classes have not contacted her nor dropped the courses. She asked if the new academic difficulty roster was being compiled in relation to retention and wondered why the students could not be dropped if not attending since keeping them on the class roll could possibly provide opportunities for financial aid fraud. The Provost suggest that this question could best be answered by Dr. Fletcher since it relates to specific financial aid regulations.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked, following up on the COAD 1000 discussion, if the Provost thought that it would be a good idea to maintain the course and that it should come from faculty. Professor Glascoff stated that she was not condemning the current situation but felt strongly that courses should always come from the bottom up with faculty in control of curriculum. Did the Provost think it was a good idea to have faculty involved from the start and participate fully in the revision of the course? Provost Sheerer agreed. Chair Marianna Walker stated that she was closely involved in the discussions on this important matter and would make sure that a large group of faculty stay involved all along the way.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that he interacts with 500 freshman each year and wondered what happens when faculty designate a student as having academic difficulty. The Provost replied that the Division of Student Life "kicks into gear" to work with the freshman and emphasize tutoring, improving study habits, etc. The Pirate Tutoring Center would definitely become involved according to the Provost.

Chair Walker thanked the Provost for her remarks and support of the faculty and university.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty  
Professor Walker stated the following:

"Opportunities - My comments will be rather brief, but I will discuss the many opportunities that we have this year to get involved and to make a difference in many endeavors across the university.

There are many challenges and initiatives this year that should involve the faculty at East Carolina University. While these many endeavors present the university with challenges, these various issues/initiatives provide opportunities for faculty, administrators, students, and staff to collaborative, each with a special and unique role.



Here are some of the greatest endeavors where faculty need to serve, especially on these newly formed university wide committees.

- What do I need? I need names of volunteers (yourself, faculty in your unit/faculty out of your unit) who would be good representatives of the unit, the faculty senate (if applicable) and the university as a whole. Please take note of these opportunities and email me (or have the faculty member email me) as soon as possible so the committee memberships can be formed.

Opportunities – Why now? Many changes, updates, new policies, self-study, accreditation, curriculum changes, distance education standards, new policies involving these and dissertations and research mentoring affecting publishing, and copyright are in place, which faculty may or may not be aware.

Opportunities for involvement are here now and faculty must be aware of changes, involved, and set up to the opportunity to have a voice in present and future policies, rules, and regulations.

Are we all know, there are often limited opportunities to be involved and to have a voice in change.

Need to involve younger and less involved faculty so transitions will occur when current involved faculty are no longer at the university, or involved in shared governance.

Often, when enough faculty are not involved, faculty interests may be ignored and “best practices” may be adopted from other universities. Remember, best practices are not always at a different institution. ECU often has the best and most representative shared governance model, especially in the UNC System.

So, what are the opportunities and what could you do?

- 1) Inform faculty in your unit about the contemporary issues at play at ECU and UNC System. If you want to have a forum and facilitate discussion, let the Faculty Senate Office and the Faculty Officers know. We will have someone there, if possible.
  - a. Make sure to let all your faculty know that the faculty manual will be different next year. Let them know, especially all T & P Committees that the manual will look differently, but will function in the traditional manner.
  - b. Send updates to your faculty, including important issues voted on the senate, Chancellor approved resolutions, faculty manual updates, University Policy Manual Updates, and request for faculty from your unit to participate in university service.
- 2) Be involved with all your committee work. Make sure to represent the faculty senate, if that is your role, and try to bridge overlapping issues. Bring new issues to the attention of the Chair of the Faculty and request meeting with committees who have similar charges.
- 3) Stimulate discussion on important key issues with fellow senators. Informal communication, as at Winslows, may facilitate these important conversations!
- 4) Take your role as a faculty senator very seriously. Ask important questions at the senate meetings, and get involved with important forums and make sure to represent your unit.
  - SACS - There are many Councils that are beginning their work. If you would like to be involved as a faculty senate representative on any of these councils, please let me know.
  - Quality Enhancement Plan – David Weismiller will be able to answer questions about this initiative in the Question/Answer period.



Opportunity – to be able get to know faculty from across campus, and to work to obtain reaffirmation of accreditation and learn the process.

- 1) Foundations of Excellence – An university self study involving both faculty and student affairs personnel who have an interest in working with freshman and transfer students.

Opportunity – to work with Student Affairs and participate in a university self-study and make recommendations for change.

- 2) UNIV 1000 - A revision/change to COAD 1000 involving the development of a university wide committee, who will be appointed by the Provost and Chair of the Faculty. Who do we need? Faculty who are interested in development of a course and syllabus for a course designed for the first semester freshman.

Opportunity – to develop the syllabus and course framework for a university wide course aimed at increasing retention and academic success. Can use faculty skills to suggest and develop modules for course.

So, please get involved, make sure your unit is represented, nominate faculty who may otherwise never heard or hear of such opportunities.

Who needs to be involved? Faculty with experience, faculty who want to be involved but who have never been involved. Faculty who have an interest in service to the university, college, and unit, but who did not get elected to a university committee this year. We need you!!! We need your faculty! We need you to nominate faculty who could contribute to the many needs we have this year!

Thanks for all your support and consideration of the many requests we have this year.”

There were no questions posed for Chair Walker at this time.

F. Anthony Britt, Director of Admissions

Mr. Britt began his remarks by characterizing the freshman class in this way: Most of this freshman class was born in 1992. Few of the class know how to write in cursive. Text messaging is preferred because e-mail is too slow; therefore, they seldom use e-mail. They do not wear wristwatches, and they have already had a chance to do community service to earn money for college.

The statistics, on the ECU Freshman class of 2010 provided by Mr. Britt are as follows:

Total Freshman	Applications	19,491	+ 3.8%	an increase from last year
	Admitted	11,233	+ 2.2%	
	Enrolled a freshman class of	4,193	+ 6.2%	

**4,193** Freshman Students were enrolled on the official Census Day, 7 September 2010

Freshman SATs	Applicants	1,014	- 5	(a decrease compared to Fall 2009)
	Admitted	1059	-11	
	Enrolled	1038	-8	

Last year ECU led the UNC system in a single point increase in SAT scores by raising he score by 21 points



85.5 % North Carolinians 14.5 % Out-of-State

This ensures that ECU will be under the 18% restriction for freshmen from out of state.

58% Female

42% Male

9 Freshman Students were home-schooled 0.2% of the freshman population

18 were international students from outside of the US 0.4%

1,055 were dually enrolled while completing high school 25.1%

This means that almost a quarter of the freshman class had taken a college level course before entering ECU. However, funding has now declined for enrollment to support of advanced high school courses other than in the STEM programs of science and mathematics

568 earned AP credit while completing high school 13.5%

103 were identified as athletes 2.4%

Voluntary, self-reported racial background per Federal classifications

White, not of Hispanic origin 72% an increase in 8% from last year

Black, not of Hispanic origin 15% and increase in 50% " "

Hispanic 4% an increase of 200% " "

Top Five Counties Providing Freshman Enrollment

Wake	707	19.5% of the entering class
Mecklenburg	307	8.5% (an increase of 2% over last year)
Pitt	210	5.8% (an increase in 1% over last year)
Cumberland	153	4.2%
Guilford	112	3.2% (Last year this was Fairfax, Virginia)

Top Five High Schools Providing Freshman Enrollment

Junius H. Rose	58	Pitt County
Wakefield	54	Wake County
Apex	50	Wake County
Leesville Road	47	Wake County
Providence	46	Mecklenburg County

After presenting an annual breakdown including nine home-schooled admissions for Fall, Mr. Britt also provided a report on home schooled students, noting 58 home schooled admissions over the past 10 years. The retention rate for home schooled students was 79.3%, which is higher than their peers, and the graduation rate was 56.2% among this group. This is also higher than the student body average, and 83.9% of all home schooled students remaining in good standing throughout their time at ECU.

Professor Taggart (Music) asked, that with 19,000 applying for admission and only 11,000 being admitted, does that mean they were accepted? What was the percentage of those admitted students that did not come to ECU? Professor Taggart said the reason for his question is that it seems that ECU has an unusual high number of students accepting admission this year within the School of



Music. Mr. Britt stated that the percentage of acceptance was not overinflated and that the yield rate did not shift too much but maybe shifted within different academic units or majors. The yield rate was 1% higher for in state student and for out of state was down 1% over the previous year. Mr. Britt complemented the popularity of the music program since the university statistics on yield rates were essentially unchanged.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked if ECU received many student applications from Onslow and Craven counties and how far down the list were out of state schools? Mr. Britt replied that both the top out of state high school and Onslow County would be in the top 20 of high schools feeding into ECU

Professor Wilson (Sociology) thanked Mr. Britt for the information.

Mr. Britt took a moment to recognize Claudia McCann within Enrollment Management for putting the data together in order to be able to maintain continuity on the facts. He also thanked members of the faculty in their way of interacting with the students, returning their phone calls, and saying kind and encouraging words to them all helped the students to feel a sense of belonging. He had heard from students in his travels and noted that the way faculty treat students goes a long way. He also indicated that Student Affairs made the prospective students feel welcome. He also noted that the families visiting campus always complimented the grounds crew for maintaining a beautiful campus.

G. Terry Holland, Director of Athletics

Coach Holland stated that the big news in athletics this year was new coaching staff in women's basketball, men's basketball, and in football. Coach Holland indicated that almost 50% of ECU athletes were on the Commissioner's Honor Role in Conference USA; another 41% Conference USA academic medal. That means their cumulative grade average was 3.75 or better. Coaches that win the in the academic championship for grade point average within the conference are rewarded with one month's salary in bonus. This is the same reward as winning in an athletic conference championship. Men's golf and men's tennis won this year.

There are also two events that are intended to reward scholarship. The Academic Excellence Banquet recognizes athletes with a cumulative average of 3.5 or higher. These students invite a professor to attend with them. The Breakfast of Champions breakfast recognizes the student with the highest GPA on each team and is attended by the student's choice of a coach and a professor who has been most instrumental in his or her development while at ECU. The student athletes also volunteered for 6,404 hours in community service last year and represent the university well in and off the playing field or court.

In regard to the building program, seven thousand seats added to the stadium in addition to the construction of the Olympic sports complex. The debt that was required to build these facilities has been balanced against a short-term stimulus to the community during construction as well as to increase the local economy on game days.

There were no questions posed to Coach Holland at this time.

H. David Dosser, Faculty Athletics Representative

Professor Dosser stated that he represents all faculty (in athletics) and reports to the Provost and Chancellor. He stated that he has been a faculty member at ECU since 1988 and the Faculty



Athletics Representative (FAR) since 2003. As the FAR, he represents the Faculty Senate and all faculty members at ECU and reports to the Provost and Chancellor. Dr. Dosser reported that he is in an oversight and advisor role within the Department of Athletics, but does not work for the Department of Athletics. Instead, he provides a bridge between the academic side of campus and the athletic side with a focus on three main areas: academic integrity, rules compliance, and welfare of student-athletes.

Professor Dosser indicated that he would focus on three areas in his detailed comments; these areas were a discussion of the rules, compliance with these rules, and academic integrity. He stated that anyone who had been reading the newspapers might think that everyone in intercollegiate athletics is cheating. Further, they might conclude that it is not just athletes, but that it is coaches, other athletic department officials, and even athletic directors who have cheated in one way or another. There has been much written about academic integrity violations at Florida State, Georgia Southern, and even UNC-Chapel Hill. There has been much written about agents providing football players with impermissible benefits including travel expenses, rent for their families, and other substantial gifts. This has been true at Georgia, Southern Cal, Alabama, and UNC-Chapel Hill and this is only a partial list.

Professor Dosser then outlined what is in place at ECU, to detect and prevent these sorts of problems. He reported there had been one instance regarding academic integrity. Once a report of this possible violation by a tutor was received, Professor Dosser was informed, and he informed the Chancellor, the Provost, and the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Information was presented this to Chancellor Ballard, and the Chancellor appointed an investigative task force; half this task force was made up of faculty members. The task force completed a full and exhaustive investigation by interviewing 21 student athletes. Results of this investigation revealed that one tutor wrote papers for several athletes, and this was reported to the University Athletics Committee, a Faculty Senate committee. All of the parties involved were punished using our regular university procedures. And because they were student-athletes, they were subject to additional "punishment." Professor Dosser mentioned that some forms of punishment for student-athletes can be quite significant, such as removal from the team or loss of eligibility to play their sport. The NCAA is continuing their investigation.

To prevent this from happening again the task force made several recommendations to Chancellor Ballard, all of which he accepted. It was recommended that the entire Student Development Office be reassigned to Academic Affairs immediately. That has now happened and now the staff now reports to Dr. John Fletcher. Training for tutors has been increased, even though the training for tutors was substantial previously. The task force also recommended that more education be conducted with student-athletes about what types of assistance from tutors is acceptable. Professor Dosser also reported that this is being done. The NCAA may have more recommendations that we must consider.

Subsequently, the task force recommended that another compliance person be added to support our compliance efforts since ECU has one of the smallest compliance offices in Division I A. There is currently a job position announcement for an Associate Director of Athletics for Compliance who will answer directly to the Chancellor and be paid by Academic Affairs. Professor Dosser indicated that he had long argued that compliance and student development should not be part of the Department of Athletics to avoid a conflict of interest, and to protect our compliance staff members and our student development staff members from undue influence from coaches and others. He stated that he hopes this is enough to prevent another situation, but we need to monitor things better as well.



Dr. Dosser also reported that ECU has a Professional Sports Counseling Panel on campus that meets with the football players twice each year and meets with their parents once a year. The message is to avoid agents. He stated that he had learned that there are three groups of students: one who will do the right thing regardless of what you tell them; one who will do the wrong thing regardless of what you tell them, and the largest group who just need to be educated on what the right thing to do is. The Professional Sports Counseling Panel can do a better job in educating our student-athletes in this third group about agents, and Professor Dosser stated that he intended for that to happen.

The Chancellor and the Provost meet with all the coaches and make it clear that the rules will be followed. Coach Holland makes the same point. One coach was recently fired for not following the rules.

Professor Preston (Education) asked, in reference to transparency and students' rights, what actually happened to the athletes and the tutors? Professor Dosser responded that he could not say any more about the case, but he stressed transparency was important. He concluded that he wanted to let faculty know what has happened without violating the rights of the student athletes

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked if there were consequences for the tutor? Professor Dosser replied: yes she was dismissed and her case is currently being handled by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Professor Taggart (Music) thanked Professor Dosser for being proactive and looking out for the best interest of both students and faculty. On another matter, he asked if Professor Dosser felt that there were enough safety measures in place to control access to our student athletes from agents. Professor Dosser stated that some agents are good and some are bad and that the best protection that the university had is that they inform on each other. Any information ECU gets is investigated fully. He said that agents rarely deal directly with players. They send "runners", such as an attractive female or a previous teammate to try to become "friends" with the athlete. We are concentrating on greater education for the student athletes and their families. Unfortunately, it is impossible to monitor our student athletes at all times, but the coaches continue to talk with the students as much as possible.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) stated that he recalled a recent conversation where it was recalled that Coach Jim Valvano, had said that if faculty didn't care about the integrity of the university then why should anyone else outside of academics. He thanked Professor Dosser and Coach Holland for showing that faculty are concerned about these things and for working hard to keep us all on track. He also expressed his confidence that Professor Dosser was maintaining the integrity that was important to all ECU faculty.

Professor Nelson (Health and Human Performance) also shared his thanks to Professor Dosser for the way that this was handled and appreciated the time and effort put forward in this. He stated that in his personal experience, the current academic integrity policy at times was misunderstood and when issues occurred in his department, he had to help others understand the policy. Now that Professor Dosser had viewed the process from a different angle, Professor Nelson wanted to know if he had any suggestions, good or bad about the process. Professor Dosser responded that he thought for a long time that the academic integrity process was cumbersome and difficult to follow



with some faculty just bypassing the process. When he received this information about an academic integrity violation he went to those faculty members with the facts. Unfortunately, some faculty struggled with this, some handled it well, and others wanted to just ignore it. He felt that the process was cumbersome and hard to follow and that overall many faculty ignore consequences of cheating. The faculty do not ignore cheating, but they have to weigh the impact on student rights. He also stated that he believed that student athletes cheat less than the student body as a whole. Professor Dosser credited Ms. Nita Boyce and her staff for their excellent efforts.

Chair Walker thanked both Coach Holland and Professor Dosser for their untiring support and advocacy for academic excellence with our student athletes.

I. Lynn Roeder, Dean of Students

Originally, Dr. Lynn Roeder, Dean of Students, was scheduled to speak on the University's Involuntary Protective Withdrawal Policy and Faculty Guide for assisting with disruptive or distressed students. Unfortunately, Dr. Roeder was unable to be at the Faculty Senate meeting today and will speak to the faculty senate at a later date.

J. Mark Sprague, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Sprague provided a report on the September 17, 2010, Faculty Assembly Meeting. There were no questions posed to him about the report. Since the report had only been e-mail on the day of this meeting, Professor Sprague reviewed the highlights of the meeting. He then discussed the Faculty Assembly Resolution on Academic Freedom and then offered the following resolution:

**Resolution in Support of the UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution on Academic Freedom:**

Whereas, academic freedom is fundamental to the successful fulfillment of the teaching, research, and service missions of East Carolina University; and

Whereas, there is concern that the constitutional protections of faculty are being abridged so there is now a need for more institutional protection of the academic freedom of the university; now therefore

Be it Resolved that, East Carolina University Faculty Senate fully endorses the *Resolution on Academic Freedom* that passed by the UNC Faculty Assembly on September 17, 2010; and

Be it Further Resolved that the East Carolina Faculty Senate requests that the Chancellors and Chief Academic Officers of the constituent institutions, together with the UNC Board of Governors, the General Administration, legal counsel, and Faculty Assembly delegates, convene a review committee to make recommendations for changes to the UNC CODE that reflect an understanding of the "Statement on Academic Freedom" contained in the Faculty Assembly *Resolution on Academic Freedom*.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) expressed her hesitation with approving a resolution in support of something without first having read the full resolution. She then moved to table action on the resolution until the next meeting Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) asked how long the resolution and addendum were. Professor Sprague responded that it is about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a page, plus a 4 page addendum.



Professor Givens (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated his support of the motion to table stating that although he would probably have no problem with the propose resolution, he wished to first read the faculty assembly resolution before acting.

The motion to table further discussion and action on the proposed resolution on academic freedom was approved by a voice vote.

K. Question Period

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked both Chancellor Ballard and Coach Holland to consider raising athletic ticket prices to offset the budget situation. He noted that the increase in ticket prices would help students with scholarships, financial aid, etc. The Chancellor stated that he would consider every option as the budget situation progressed and would be happy to put this suggestion on the table. He stated that the Board of Trustees has asked for the athletics to increase their income goals and that athletics has to "float on their own bottom" to reach their goals. The athletics budget also got a "serious hit" with the rescinding of out-of-start tuition waivers, but that all possible savings need to be considered.

**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. Committee on Committees, Catherine Rigsby

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences), Chair of the Committee, provided names of nominees for two vacancies on the Grievance Appellate Board. There was no objection and Professors Rachel Roper (Medicine) and Mamadi Corra (Sociology) were appointed to the Grievance Appellate Board.

B. Faculty Grievance Committee, Jan Mayo

Professor Jan Mayo (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, provided an overview of 2009-2010 Committee Activities. There was no discussion and the overview was accepted as presented.

C. University Curriculum Committee, Carolyn Willis

Professor Carolyn Willis (Academic Library Services), a member of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the September 9, 2010, and September 23, 2010, University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-72**

D. Unit Code Screening Committee, Timm Hackett

Professor Timm Hackett (English), Chair of the Committee, presented the revised College of Technology and Computer Science Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the revised unit code of operation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #10-73**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 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 OCTOBER 5, 2010, MEETING**

10-72 Curriculum matters contained in the September 9, 2010, and September 23, 2010, University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

10-73 revised College of Technology and Computer Science Unit Code of Operation.

**Disposition:** Chancellor