

P
5
2

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 22, 2011**

The sixth regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 22, 2011, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

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 [January 25, 2011](#) were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Reyes (Biology), Shinpaugh (Physics) and Van Willigen (Sociology).

Alternates present were: Professors Luczkovich for Scemama (Biology), Hegde for Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations), Bashinski for Fogarty (Education) and Roper for Gilliland (Medicine).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has rescinded his earlier rejection of Faculty Senate Resolution #10-62 and approved it with an editorial change (noted in bold) so that the approved resolution reads:

10-62 Request to change the name of the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Education and Promotion to Bachelor of Science in Public Health Studies.

The Chancellor has acted on the following resolutions from the December 2010 Faculty Senate meeting:

10-87 Curriculum matters contained in the [November 11, 2010](#), University Curriculum Committee minutes.

10-90 [Formal Faculty Advice](#) on proposed Faculty Workload Regulation.

10-91 Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses.

10-92 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection X. Student Conduct.

10-94 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, [Section III. Curriculum Development](#).

10-95 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section III. Institutional Services Available to Faculty, Subsection R. Tuition Privileges for Faculty.

10-97 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection A. Substance Abuse Policy.

The Chancellor has acted on the following resolutions from the January 2011 Faculty Senate meeting:

11-01 Curriculum matters contained in the [December 9, 2010](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes.

- 11-02 Three foundation curriculum courses for humanities, entitled RELI 2400 Religion and Film, RELI 3796 Paul and His Letters and RELI 3896 Life and Teachings of Jesus. [Link](#) to information on all three courses).
- 11-03 Proposed revisions to [Spring 2012 University Calendar](#).
- 11-04 Request to establish a [Distance Education Master of Arts in Education](#) in Physical Education, Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance.
- 11-05 Request to establish a [Certificate in Physical Education Clinical Supervision](#), Department of Exercise and Sport Science, College of Health and Human Performance.
- 11-06 Request to [discontinue the BA in EXSS](#), Department of Exercise and Sports Sciences, College of Health and Human Performance.
- 11-07 Request for authorization to establish a new B.A. in [Religious Studies](#), within College of Arts and Sciences.

More budget forums with the Chancellor for faculty, staff, and students have been scheduled including:

Arts and Sciences – Monday, April 4, at 3:00 p.m. in 1032 Bate

Human Ecology - Tuesday, April 12, at 4:00 p.m. in 102 Rivers

Health and Human Performance - Wednesday, April 27, at 3:00 p.m. in 1501Belk

A Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Proposal Convocation is scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2011 from 3:00 - 4:30 pm in the Hendrix Theatre. All faculty, staff and students will be invited to attend. At this convocation, the finalist proposals for the University QEP topic will be presented. Information on the guidelines are available online where noted below. Following this event, the Faculty Senate will be asked to rank order and vote on the topics during their March 29, 2011 Senate meeting.

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

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

A preliminary call for nominations for the *Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching*, *Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award*, *East Carolina Alumni Association Outstanding Teaching Award* and *Robert L. Jones Teaching Award* will be distributed soon to all academic unit heads. Nomination materials will be due September 1 and portfolios due November 1. Information on the different award nominating procedures are available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/aa/academicawards.cfm>.

Please note that the annual Founders Day and University Awards Day celebration will take place on Tuesday, April 26, 2011, at 9 am in the Hendrix Theater. Additional information will be forthcoming.

Last year Chancellor Ballard directed that a committee be formed to study the current SOIS instrument. The SOIS II committee has been working the past year and a half to develop an approach to obtaining student opinion of instruction as well as providing faculty members with feedback that may be useful to improving instruction. A small number of faculty members were randomly selected by IPAR to provide written input on a set of potential questions for a revised

form. The SOIS II committee will be holding two open discussions on Friday, February 25 for all faculty members about potential questions for a revised SOIS form. The times and locations are noted below: Open Discussion - Friday, February 25 from 11:00-12:30 in Flanagan 265 and 2:00-3:30 in Health Sciences Bldg. 1410 (Allied Health side). The purpose of the discussion is to share potential items for a revised SOIS that will be proposed to the University Academic Standards Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration later this year. This meeting is not to propose a revised survey, but to share the committee's work and solicit feedback for the consideration of the SOIS II committee. Please attend one of these open discussions if you are able. For more information contact the SOIS II Committee Chair Michael Brown at brownmi@ecu.edu.

Linked is a list of the funded 2011/12 Teaching Grants supported financially by Provost Marilyn Sheerer.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard stated that as of March 22nd no one should take anything regarding the budget as a given. Once the Governor's budget is finalized, it will set some framework or guidelines for what we think may or may not happen, but this will only be the beginning of the negotiations. He stated that the news is mostly good compared to everything heard in December and January. The Governor has proposed 9.5% budget cuts for the University of North Carolina system, and the Chancellor stated that he would be very happy with this compared to many of the worse case estimates previously discussed previously. The reason for the reduction in the proposed cuts from previous estimates is based on a difference in new revenue forecasts that reduce the anticipated state budget gap from \$3.7 to \$3.1 billion as well as the recommendation, by the Governor, to extend $\frac{3}{4}$ of the current 1% percent sales tax until next year. However, the Chancellor stated that he did not feel that the legislature would pass the sales tax extension. The third factor is that the Governor is projecting a budget gap that that would be smaller by the end of the fiscal year because on savings from this year would be rolled over to help the budget gap next year. In essence, the Chancellor concluded, the Governor is creating her own North Carolina stimulus package in hopes that the economy would continue to improve next year to the point that there will not be additional base budget cuts. The current thinking is that the gap will be closer to \$3 billion than \$3.7 billion, since the economic trends look positive at this time.

In addition, the Governor is supporting half of enrollment growth funding; the proposal was for \$45 million and she has agreed to only include funding for faculty positions, which are critical in the Chancellor's opinion. The only difficulty, he said, is that infrastructure improvements, such as library funding or other academic support, that forms the other half of enrollment growth formula, was not yet approved. In his opinion, receiving full funding for the positions creates some budget flexibility but also carries with it "unwelcomed pressure" on the University. Many parts of ECU's infrastructure are at the "tipping point" regarding information technology and financial services as well as other functions that are "getting pretty thin" at ECU, according to the Chancellor. He also forecasted that the whole question of enrollment growth might change dramatically over the next three months. ECU administrators are happy that the Governor realized that there could not be budget cuts every year along with reductions in enrollment growth funding

The other positive news for ECU is that \$11 million, or 25% in state support, was cut from the University of North Carolina (UNC) Hospital without any loss of any funding to the Brody School of Medicine. The Chancellor explained that this is because Brody School of Medicine receives very little state support for at this time. Most the funding of the ECU medical school is from the Practice Plan. This may mean that the School of Medicine will be affected by future cuts in the social services budget as well as Medicare and Medicaid funding.

The Chancellor warned that the other budget question is whether F & A funds will be absorbed into the state budget. These funds are a tremendous help to the research efforts of the university; however, Dr. Ross believes that these funds are under scrutiny by the legislature. The other budget reduction idea that is being currently discussed in the legislature, is a salary reduction for all state employees. The Chancellor stated that, in his opinion, this was the single worst way to balance the budget. There are also concerns about not having any "repair and renovation" funds in the available year, a particular problem when unfunded mandates such as sprinkler installation, are required without funding to pay for the improvements. Research equipment funding is also under scrutiny. Loss of any of these funding sources would create a gap that would have to be made up with other sources of income. The Chancellor concluded his remarks about the budget by stating that there was a long way to go, but that the Governor's approach to the budget was positive and that he remained hopeful.

Relative to the UNC system-wide program duplication committee, there are more questions than answers at this point. The Woodward committee has not met yet so there are many questions and very few answers regarding the system wide duplication committee. The Chancellor predicted that this committee would focus on graduate programs.

The Chancellor reported that Dr. Ross, President of UNC, had just visited the campus the previous week and had a good visit. We had a chance to tell the ECU story, and the President saw how significant ECU is to the state and the region. The feedback from the visit was very positive. There were seven different sessions with Dr. Ross; the two that left the greatest impression on the President were the meetings with nine faculty members and the eight students. The faculty members all "hit home runs" individually and collectively by showing President Ross the passion that we have for the work that we do. Professors Alderman, Cistola, Akin, Ebendorf, Landre, Overman, Covington, Wheeler and Velde met with the President. The Chancellor concluded by saying that the President enjoyed his time at ECU and asked many great questions.

Chancellor has asked the EPPC committee to help with guidelines for program prioritization and consolidation. The committee's guidelines, which will help ECU in planning to reduce expenses without reducing faculty lines, are due in late March.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if the Chancellor had an opportunity to speak with Governor Perdue when she was on campus about the State budget and how she thought her deliberations with the legislature would go. Chancellor Ballard replied that Governor Perdue knows that the deliberations with the legislative will be different than in the past. She also knows that administrators at ECU are happy with the general outline of her budget and that the negotiations with legislature will be tough.

Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his acknowledgement of the Faculty Senate in his remarks during the State of the University and for his continued efforts on behalf of the faculty.

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

Dr. Mageean thanked Chair Walker for the opportunity to address the faculty senate and said she would discuss export control and the effect of the budget on graduate programs.

VC Mageean stated that the first topic would be how the budget is a reservoir. ECU depends on several income streams. VC Mageean referred to the handouts distributed to the senators and indicated that state funding in the Research and Graduate Studies division is around \$17.26 million and about 42% of that money funds graduate assistantships. Therefore, most funds provide income to people and any cut in state funding will affect employment. The Graduate School has been completing budget scenarios and under the 7% and 10% budget cut of permanent state funding, there could be a loss of \$200,000. There are also around \$2.7 million in non-recurring state funds that are generated by vacant positions with this money providing start up funds and research development awards. This is the money that helps researchers who are just coming to ECU get started with setting up laboratory equipment and starting the new faculty members off right by putting them in a position to get outside grant funding. If many positions are given back, the lapsed salary money will be reduced. This means there will not as much funding for start-up money.

Currently there is an income of around \$5.5 million from research grant F & A funds that goes back to the colleges and is divided between the college, department, and the researcher. VC Mageean stated that the indirect (F & A) rate is 42% but that the actual overhead rate is around 12% of the amount of grant funding. The difference of 30% goes back to the college in a division of 10% for the college, 10% for the department and remaining 10% to the principle investigator. VC Mageean referred to her handout to describe the money that is committed to complete the top floors of the Heart Center and the Science and Technology Building. She also pointed out that F & A funds would be spent on installation of the new linear accelerator and that \$200,000 had been allocated for research scholar awards. VC Mageean concluded by saying that if F & A money is imperiled, while state and federal grant support is declining, that the only source of funding available is for more external grants to be written by the faculty.

In addition, Vice Chancellor Mageean discussed the new [Export Control Policies Rules and Regulations](#) including [Export Control Management Plan](#) and [Frequently Asked Questions](#) on Restricted Party Screening for Export Control Purposes. She stated that very few members of the faculty senate may have even heard of the issues related to export controls. State and Federal laws regulate the transfer of technology abroad; most of the regulations are from the Homeland Security Agency and the Department of Commerce. This embargo affects ECU due to our international scholars and new technology under development at the University. VC Mageean indicated that this could be problematic since it is not clear what knowledge or technology is included in the definition and that universities have more and more research contacts with other nations. For example, dual use technology is defined "as devices that can be used for civilian and military reasons"; this definition could even include the lasers used in the surveying transits by our undergraduates. Most universities are relying on a policy known as

"research and education exclusion". Different universities within the state system are dealing with export controls in different ways. ECU, as well as other universities, is evaluating grant proposals for any concerns relative to information or technology transfer. UNC Charlotte is doing ad hoc screening of individuals; such profiling identifies the screening for employees with green cards or other individuals that may be at the greatest risk of violating the intent of the export control ban. UNC Charlotte has three persons to do this work while ECU has part time effort of one compliance officer. UNC-Chapel Hill is considering batch screening all employees. ECU is already conducting batch screening relative criminal background checks or traffic violations for employees to who want to drive state vehicles. VC Mageean concluded that the real question for ECU is what level of risk can be tolerated if export control rules are violated. Currently the efforts are to educate the faculty about the regulations so they do not find themselves personally liable or create problems as an agent or employee of the university. The discussion at this point is what mechanism is to be selected to do the screening that is needed.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) asked if the export control exercise was for non-US citizens only? VC Mageean replied no that everyone (faculty, EPA non faculty, staff and students) would be included in the batch screening. She stated that the University could profile and just check particular people due to their disciplines, etc. or decide to include all University personnel.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked if the decision for export control screening had already been decided. VC Mageean stated that no, the academic council was still talking with the University Attorneys, Faculty Governance Committee members, chief research officers and counterparts in UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC Charlotte. She stated that the export control screening could begin whenever the University leadership wanted it to begin; however, federal penalties might result if there was a violation of the export control laws. She concluded that some Universities are able to live with a higher risk than others. VC Mageean asked rhetorically: "At what level does ECU want to set the scrutiny versus getting false positives?" Professor Given replied that he saw a potential problem when something comes up, and no one is notified. VC Mageean agreed that computer databases are only as good as the data that goes into it. She stated that all would be handled delicately and with confidentiality. The administration is aware of the problems that this could create and are trying to talk with others before implementing anything. It is a fine balancing act when trying to protect the University as well as individual rights.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked, for example if his name came up on the screening, what would happen? Would he be notified? Would his Department Chair? VC Mageean replied that he would be safe because he is a US citizen. Professor Wilson asked if the faculty member would be fired if he/she was not a US citizen and was identified from the screening? VC Mageean replied "no" and gave an example of a student from out of the country being flagged in the review. She stated that administration would need to explore the particular situation to see if there was a reason to be concerned. Incoming students would not be screened as part of the application process; only those within the University would be screened. The screening would also include vendors of computer databases and equipment.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that given our budget situation and need to maintain funding for the academic core, how did this new export control screening and cost affect the University's ability to attract grant funding? In essence, what is the

immediate need for this request and should we wait for other universities to establish the compliance procedures given the current budget cutbacks? VC Mageean replied that export control screening is a General Administration and Federal government requirement. At present, ECU is trying to decide the level and mechanism to be used in screening. In reference to the current budget situation, the export control screening process being considered does not particularly affect to ECU's ability to attract research funding.

Chair Walker thanked Vice Chancellor Mageean for her report on important matters relating to faculty.

E. Bill Koch, Associate Vice Chancellor with Campus Operations

Mr. Koch briefly discussed the [Annual report](#) on Parking and Transportation Services and the request from the [Faculty Senate Resolution](#) requesting this annual report. He noted that the University had hired a new Parking and Transportation Director named Debbie Garfi who could be reached at 328-6294. She comes to ECU from the University of Chicago. No questions were posed to Mr. Koch. Chair Walker thanked him for his efforts on behalf of the University community.

F. David Weismiller, Associate Provost, Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research

Professor Weismiller briefly discussed the [written report](#) on SACS Reaffirmation – Quality Enhancement Plan Topic Proposals that was provided earlier to all faculty via email. He also discussed the [material](#) recently distributed to the SACS Leadership Council including [various updates](#) on SACS, and the work thus far on the selection of ECU's peer institutions.

Dr. Weismiller stated that he wanted to discuss two issues that he would like the faculty senators to discuss with their departments/units. First SACS does not visit us; our peers visit us, and they are considering three questions: 1) What is ECU doing? 2) How well are we doing it and 3) How do we know how well we are doing it? Dr. Weismiller stated that the focus of SACS is on the institution and the students, which means that the university, as a whole must respond successfully and consistently to these questions.

Dr. Weismiller continued that there are currently 230 faculty and staff members working on the SACS Compliance Certificate, which is one of two documents that ECU must provide to SACS in September of 2012, including the narratives for 70% of 73 principles on this first draft. IPAR will be working with the faculty since this is an institutional process.

The "federalization issue" is also involved with accreditation. There are currently \$100 million in student loans, in addition to \$34 billion in Pell Grants, contributed to by federal tax dollars, and the national graduation rate at six years is about 54 percent. There is concern at the national level about whether students will earn a diploma given the \$134 million in financial support. The "return on the investment" is being questioned. It is estimated that 40% of the students who are entering college cannot read, write, or do math at a college level. This is the conversation that is being held at the federal level, and for that reason SACS accreditation is no longer an event, it is an ongoing process. According to Dr. Weismiller, it is not just about doing the report.

Thanks to Rita Reeves, who is chairing the efforts of the group writing the compliance certificate, the effort is currently on schedule. Dr. Weismiller stated that the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is the second document that ECU must provide to our peers who are coming to campus to observe the University. This QEP is a five year internally funded grant that looks at one aspect of student learning. This aspect must be important to all four university constituencies: the faculty, staff, students and administration. On September 27, 2010 a dialogue was started on campus to define this aspect of learning, and ten brief proposals were submitted. Three of the submitted proposals were selected to go forward unchanged, and three similar proposals were combined into a single proposal to go forward. Therefore, there are currently four proposals that have been transmitted electronically to the ECU community. On March 17, 2011 there will be a convocation where these proposals will be discussed and afterward a QEP topic will be selected. There have been questions asked whether the faculty have and will be involved. Dr. Weismiller asked the Faculty Senators to encourage their units to send as many faculty representatives to this meeting as possible, since drafting the Quality Enhancement Plan will begin in September 2011. The QEP will make statements regarding the need for new faculty, spaces, and initiatives; it is important that the faculty be involved in the writing of the QEP. ECU faculty and administrators will spend a year writing the proposal. In March the topic will be selected, and the faculty need to be involved in this selection, according to Dr. Weismiller.

There is also a conversation among administrators regarding our current peer institutions and who our "apparitional peers" should be. This effort also needs the input of faculty, Department Heads, and Deans to provide a list of who they think their peers are in terms of colleges and at the division level. The Deans have also provided their list of peers which is available on the SACS website and will be presented to the Chancellor on May 1.

Chair Walker thanked Professor Weismiller for providing this important information to the Faculty Senate.

G. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate:

"In the past month, we have been infused with information about the NC state budget and how NC's budget deficit will affect our university. As you know, Chancellor Ballard has been holding open forums for faculty, staff, and students within each academic unit and we both have involved standing University academic committees in budget discussions and have requested those committees to report to the Faculty Senate on a regular basis including both the University Budget Committee and Educational Policies and Planning Committee who are reporting to you today. We know that while the administration is planning for possible budget reduction scenarios, they do not know what the final budget cuts will be or what the legislature will decide relative to the UNC system. So, in the interim, we speculate, anticipate, and cautiously listen to the many sources of information about what might happen. In these times, the general public, who really does not understand about the academy or the culture of the university, often devalues our profession and calls us "elitists". Many of our taxpayers, outside the university, speculate and provide public statements about the university relative to the "easy" life of a university professor, who only teaches 3 or 4 classes a semester. Little do they know about scholarship of our disciplines, the time it takes to teach our courses, the time involved in

research, all activities that involve more than just "going to class" and providing grades and student credit hours for our students. We impart knowledge, stimulate new knowledge, and challenge students to do the same. As university faculty, we design curriculums that provide crucial background knowledge in a variety of disciplines. We conduct research, whether federally funded or not and publish in peer-review journals. We create art, music, dance, and theatre productions and challenge and mentor our students to do the same. We treat in medical and clinical settings, providing both academic experiences for our students at the same time that we provide valuable services to our community. We relate our coursework to these clinical and research experiences.

I have a recent example of why we need to be clear about what a University faculty member does. In the recent edition of East Magazine, you'll note a story about the Faculty Manual and yes, the Faculty Senate is mentioned there. While it was fairly accurate, my original intent in contacting the editor and seeking this media coverage was to showcase the Faculty Senate and its 45th anniversary. I educated the editor, provide written documentation, including Henry Ferrell's book, but the result was a story about the Faculty Manual and the University Policy Manual. While several of us attempted to edit the draft before going to print, the final published copy did not accomplish my goal of recognizing the Faculty Senate and its 45 years of shared governance. So... it is not only the general public that may misunderstand the vast responsibilities of university faculty.

Another aspect of the budget is to examine the efficiencies on campus to determine where the university may be able to save money. In accomplishing this task, we will need to examine our own units/colleges, etc. since UNC will be asking us to look for cost savings. We also need to be aware of the efficiencies on campus that allow us to do our business in an efficient and consistent matter. I believe that one of the best values for the money is the Faculty Senate and its standing university academic and appellate committees. While the Faculty Senate budget is minimal, look at what happens that allows the university to provide a consistent process for the approval of curriculum, tenure and promotion processes, unit code development, and academic policies and procedures that involve both faculty and students! While you, as a senator, devote over 3 hours monthly to the legislative body of the faculty (Faculty Senate), the committees are meeting at between two and nine hours a month (or more) with committee work that provides valuable resources to the university (at no cost to the university) in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This committee involvement is in addition to the faculty members' other teaching, research, and service responsibilities within their units. Our Faculty Senate and its committees are examples of the efficiency of our process and of the dedication of its faculty to engage in university service. This shared governance process has worked for the past 45 years with faculty providing a consistent and collaborative approach in discussing, researching, editing, vetting, and providing recommendations on the many academic issues/charges in one formal voice from the Faculty Senate to the Chancellor. Again, this process is tried and true and the formality and structure of this process allows for campus-wide input and vetting to take place.

Of course, faculty cannot stop the emergence of new issues on campus that have an effect on the University faculty's teaching and scholarship. Contemporary issues often call for adaptation of our existing process/structure. It is the collaborative efforts on both the faculty and administration that make the University effective when addressing these issues. For example,

we are now exploring how to incorporate online teaching requirements affecting the curriculum, peer reviews, and other policies into the existing committee structure of the faculty senate. This year, many of our university committees have worked with the graduate school and GSAB on university wide issues involving online teaching standards and the academic integrity policy. As you will note on the Agenda, we have been looking at the structure of our committees, to accommodate and truly represent the faculty and appropriate administrators on each of our committees. As you will hear during the committee reports, there is current discussion about the relationship between the graduate school and the Faculty Senate. According to Robert's Rules of Order, the first reading of changes to committee charges provides senators with the opportunity to declare their intent to propose revisions to committee charges.

I welcome your thoughts on this important relationship. I encourage all of us to be reflective, forward thinking, and open-minded, to engage in discourse that is civil, respectful and productive, and to keep the best interest of the entire university in mind. I will not support fragmenting the faculty. The Faculty Senate is the legislative body representing both graduate and undergraduate faculty. This governance structure has worked for the past 45 years. We do not need to fragment the faculty, but to remain a unified strong body that provides outstanding leadership and education at many levels and to remain scholars and mentors. Together we can preserve our rich history and build on the many accomplishments as we move forward."

H. Election of Faculty Officers Nominating Committee

According to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, [Section VIII](#), the following Faculty Senators were elected by acclamation to serve on the Faculty Officers Nominating Committee: Professors Teal Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance), John Howard (Communication), Britton Theurer (Music), Nelson Cooper (Health and Human Performance), and Charles Boklage (Medicine). The committee will meet soon to begin their work and provide a slate of Faculty Officer nominees to the Faculty Senate on April 26, 2011.

I. Question Period

Professor Christian (Business) asked Mr. Koch about the gravel parking area near the Slay Building that is opened for anyone after 7 p.m. He noted that unfortunately those without "A" parking permits were filling the spaces by 5:30 or 6:00 pm and making it hard for faculty to find needed parking when they return to campus to teach evening classes. He asked Mr. Koch what could be done to stop this from happening. Mr. Koch replied that Parking and Transportation Services had tried in the past to allow students more access to main campus at night due to safety issues by opening up more parking lots after certain hours. He had also reminded students that parking lot restrictions are limited until certain times and that the parking staff would ticket those parking prior to the allotted time without proper permits. He agreed that the particular gravel parking lot should be monitored more closely in order to have everyone abide by the rules in place and that he look into the details of this situation.

IV. Unfinished Business

Faculty Governance Committee, Purificacion Martinez and Faculty Welfare Committee, Katrina DuBose

Professors Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) and DuBose (Health and Human Performance) jointly presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding (attachment 1). It was noted that in November 2010, the Faculty Senate tabled action on this report (#10-85) until members of the Faculty Governance Committee were consulted. This has now taken place and the below proposed revisions was ready for formal Senate action.

Remove from Faculty Manual and place elsewhere in University Policy Manual with a link to the Board of Governors policy (see item 300.5

<http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>).

There were no questions and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-08

V. Report of Committees

A. Faculty Governance Committee, Purificacion Martinez

Professor Martinez (Foreign Languages and Literatures) presented faculty advice on Administrator Evaluation of Chancellor. It was noted that the [UNC Policy](#) on Assessment Process for the Chief Executive and Governing Boards of The University of North Carolina details the approval process on this matter. She noted that the Administrator Survey will be conducted April 4-15 and that Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research (IPAR) conducts the Administrator Survey each spring in which faculty rate their upper administrative officers: the Chancellor, their academic vice chancellor, and their deans. The results are then reviewed by the immediate supervisor of the administrator.

For the past several years, there have objections that the words "effectively" and "equitably" were both used in the same item, item 5, on the Chancellor's survey. The current item 5 is "Allocates the resources of the institution effectively and equitably." Survey research literature supports avoiding "double barreled" survey items, since they may cause confusion.

IPAR asked that the Faculty Governance Committee provide faculty advice on the possibility of splitting that particular question into two: the new item 5 would be "Allocates the resources of the institution effectively." and new item 6 would be "Allocates the resources of the institution equitably" ([NEW survey form](#)). Professor Martinez stated that the Faculty Governance Committee supported the plan to split item 5 as described.

There were no questions and the faculty advice on Administrator Evaluation of Chancellor was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-09**

B. University Curriculum Committee, Jonathan Reid

Professor Reid (History) presented the curriculum matters contained in the [January 13, 2011](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes. There was no discussion and the curriculum

matters contained in the [January 13, 2011](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-10**

C. University Budget Committee, Scott MacGilvray

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) first provided the Senators with an update regarding input on Budget Prioritization and stated the Chancellor has provided a very complete review of the more positive budget situation than was reported last month. There will still be a substantial budget deficit and for that reason a substantial cut to ECU's current budget and we may not know what the real amount will be until July or even later. At this point the Governor will send her budget to the legislature; a very important section of the Governor's budget will be enrollment funding. The Chancellor has made a commitment that faculty would be involved in all aspects of how the budget cuts will be structured, starting with involvement of the University Budget committee.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that the UNC Faculty Assembly had been discussing the budget situation and wondered if the University Budget Committee had begun to discuss what could be cut that did not involve faculty and curriculum? She asked if the Budget Committee had starting making a list of items involving cuts that do not threaten the academic core? Professor MacGilvray replied that the Committee had not done that specific task yet; however, the committee can begin to collect suggestions.

Chair Walker asked that Professor MacGilvray work with Interim Vice Chancellor Niswander to put together a request for budget ideas submission process to allow members of the University community to submit suggestions for ways to address the budget situation. Professor MacGilvray agreed.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked if the Committee would be meeting over the summer to address the ongoing budget situation and how would faculty, who had left for the summer, be informed and involved of last minute budget changes? Professor MacGilvray replied that at the present time, no special summer meetings had been agreed upon but the Committee was aware of the need to be prepared to do whatever was necessary to address the budget situation. Chair Walker stated that the faculty appreciated the commitment of the Committee to stay involved in addressing the budget situation.

Professor MacGilvray then presented a resolution on Budget Matters which stated:

Whereas, Enrollment at East Carolina University has increased by 42% since the 2001/02 academic year, while total faculty at ECU has only increased 34.8% during this same time period; and

Whereas, State Appropriations as a percentage of total revenue for East Carolina University have declined from 38% in 2001/02 to 34% this year. Over the same time period the percentage of total revenue derived from Grants and Contracts rose from 12% to 13%, Patient Care Revenues rose from 18% to 21%, and Student Tuition and Fees rose from 12% to 17%; and

Whereas, There has been a permanent reduction in the State appropriations to East Carolina University in each of the past 10 fiscal years, resulting in a total decrease of \$55 million. In addition, non recurring reductions in State Appropriations over this same time period have been nearly twice as large; and

Whereas, The financial well-being and solvency of the University are in the best interest of all parties; including the State, Students, Staff, Administration, and Faculty. Only with this financial well-being can the University continue providing the high quality education ~~for which it is recognized for~~. Furthermore, continued reductions in State Appropriations in the face of continued enrollment growth in the absence of alternative means to fund the University are untenable and detrimental to the long-term economic and societal interests of the State, and

Whereas, Resolution of these issues will require the collective action of faculty, administration, students, parents, and the State of North Carolina.

Therefore be it resolved, that in order to maintain the mission of excellence in teaching, research, service and patient care ~~for which the University is recognized for~~, additional sources of funding will need to be approved to mitigate any further decreases in State Appropriations. It is imperative that any increases in tuition and fees remain at the campus level to cover the costs of providing the education of students at East Carolina University and at other state-supported institutions of higher education. It is also imperative that further growth in enrollment be accompanied by enrollment growth funding from State Appropriations at levels adequate to cover the increased costs, and that campus-based decisions on the allocation of funding remain with the University.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the Chancellor to communicate this resolution to the UNC President, UNC Board of Governors, and the North Carolina General Assembly.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University respectfully asks its Faculty Assembly Delegates to present this resolution to the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina System for its endorsement and adoption.

VC Horns offered an editorial revision to move "for" around in the first "Therefore" statement. Professor Spurr (Mathematics) offered a similar editorial revision to the fourth "Whereas". Both editorial revisions were accepted (see notations above in red).

Following discussion the resolution on budget matters was approved as editorially revised.
RESOLUTION #11-11

D. Admission and Retention Policies Committee, Joseph Thomas

Professor Thomas (Academic Library and Learning Resources) presented proposed revisions to

the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Subsection During Schedule Change Period. He noted that the proposed revisions were to take effect First Summer Session 2011.

The proposed revisions are to take effect First Summer Session 2011.

Revisions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

"During Schedule Change Period

During the first five days of classes (Mondays through Fridays) of the fall and spring semesters, a student may drop or add a course or courses to his or her schedule. The student should discuss schedule changes with his or her advisor prior to making the changes via the web. ~~On the day following the five-day schedule change period, a student may make final additions to his or her schedule.~~ **Course drops during this drop/add period do not count against a student's course drop allocation. (See course Drop Allocations, below.)** ~~See below for instructions on requesting schedule changes after the scheduled change period.~~

During the summer, the schedule change period **when students are allowed to drop or add a course or courses** is limited to the first two days of classes each term. ~~On the day following the two-day schedule change period, a student may make final additions to his or her schedule in accordance with the policies outlined above for the regular semesters.~~ Course drops during this drop/add period do not count against a student's course drop allocation. (See course Drop Allocations, below.)

See below for instructions on requesting schedule changes after the scheduled change period. "

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Subsection During Schedule Change Period were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-12**

E. Academic Standards Committee, Linda Wolfe

Professor Wolfe (Anthropology) first presented a report on Activities of Online Quality Council and stated that the peer review instrument for on line instruction standards has been submitted to the Academic Standards Committee for their review. There is discussion about addition a section on Sedona where faculty can record the Distance Education professional development activities for the year can be recorded. The next question related to on line quality control in D.E. education is how well and how do we know how well students are learning from their distance education classes.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked why were there a specific number of minutes for faculty who meet with students face-to-face but not with faculty who teach online courses? Professor Wolfe replied that that was one of the issues that the Committee would address in the peer review instrument that would be brought forward to the Senate later this Spring. She noted that the

current expectation for faculty who teach online courses was for faculty to respond to student emails, etc. in a timely manner.

Professor Wolfe then presented a request for approval of Foundation Curriculum Course for Arts, [THEA 2015](#). There was no discussion and the request for approval of Foundation Curriculum Course for Arts, [THEA 2015](#) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-13**

Professor Wolfe then presented additional proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior noting that the proposed text was first approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2010 (Resolution #10-27) and held by the Chancellor in order to allow the University Attorney time to review the proposed revisions. A review had now taken place and a footnote suggested by the University Attorney (noted in **bold** print) was added to the proposed revisions. She noted one additional revision to include a (1) in the second line under Procedure for Instructors as a reference to the footnote and add a "1" to the actual footnote at the bottom. The footnote was added to alert faculty to the possibility of medical situations with students who may be causing a disruption in class.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"Disruptive Academic Behavior

East Carolina University is committed to providing each student with a rich, distinctive educational experience. Disruptive academic behavior impedes the learning environment and hinders other students' learning. The course instructor has original purview over his/her class and may deny a student who is unduly disruptive the right to attend the class. Students who repeatedly violate reasonable standards of behavior in the classroom or other academic setting may be removed from the course by the instructor following appropriate notice. Students removed from a course under this policy will receive a "drop" according to university policy and are eligible for tuition refund as specified in the current tuition refund policy.

This policy does not restrict the instructor's prerogative to ask a disruptive student to leave an individual class session where appropriate or to refer the student to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities for violation of the Student Code of Conduct.

Disruptive Academic Behavior

Disruptive academic behavior is any behavior likely to substantially or repeatedly interfere with the normal conduct of instructional activities, including meetings with instructors outside of class. Examples of such behavior include, but are not limited to, making loud or distracting noises; using cell phones and other electronic devices without prior approval; repeatedly speaking without being recognized; frequently arriving late or leaving early from class; and making threats or personal insults. A verbal expression of a disagreement with the instructor or other students on an academic subject matter discussed within the course, during times when the instructor permits discussion, is not in itself disruptive academic behavior.

Procedure for Instructors

A student who does not follow reasonable standards of academic decorum should first receive a private verbal warning from the faculty member. **(1)**. The instructor should describe the behavior of concern to the student, explain that it is inappropriate, and ask the student to stop the

behavior. If the behavior continues, the instructor should give the student a written warning indicating that the student will be removed from the course if the behavior does not cease. If the behavior persists, the instructor should discuss the situation with his/her department chair. If it is decided to remove the student from the course then the instructor should schedule a meeting with his/her department chair and the student to inform the student that s/he is being removed from the course. This decision must be communicated in writing to the student with a copy promptly forwarded to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The department chair must promptly communicate the decision in writing to the Office of the Registrar so that the student's schedule will be adjusted accordingly. Instructors should keep written documentation of all actions taken during this process.

If the behavior is threatening in nature or is likely to result in immediate harm, the faculty member should contact the East Carolina University Police Department for immediate assistance.

Student Appeals

The student may appeal the decision of the instructor and department chair to the academic dean of the college in which the course is located. The appeal must be received by the dean, in writing, within three working days of the date of the decision to remove the student from the course. The dean or dean's designee will review the appeal and the documentation, will discuss the appeal with the faculty member and, after discussion with the student and instructor, can affirm, reverse or modify the decision made by the instructor and department chair. The student, instructor and department chair will be notified of the appeal decision no later than three working days after receiving the appeal. The dean will provide written notification of the appeal decision to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and also, if the original decision is overturned, to the Registrar's Office. If the decision is made that the student is to return to the course then the student will be allowed to immediately return to the classroom without academic penalty and the chair will work with the student and instructor to facilitate the completion of any missed work. The dean's decision is final."

Footnote

1 "ECU provides reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. When communicating a warning to a student, faculty should ensure the discussion is private and refer any student who discloses a disability to Disability Support Services."

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked why was the information a footnote and not a part of the policy? Professor Wolfe responded that that was all that was perceived as necessary.

Following a brief discussion, the additional proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-14**

Professor Wolfe then presented a proposed New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit. She noted that in January 2011, the Chancellor approved a Faculty Senate resolution (#10-91) detailing a new

policy to remove Foundation Curriculum Credit from Courses (see below). The Committee's goal was to make this information readily available to the faculty, so in addition to asking that this be placed in the *ECU Faculty Manual* along with other academic policies currently located in Part V, a link had been added to both the Academic Standards and University Curriculum Committee websites. The Committee would also like to include the below links (noted in **bold print**) with the policy to aid faculty in locating additional information relating to this issue.

Revise and place in the Faculty Manual.

"Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit

Units wishing to remove Foundation Curriculum credit from a course must send a memo to the Academic Standards Committee by email attachment stating the requested action and a list of the courses for which Foundation Curriculum credit should be removed. The list should include the name of the person requesting the action, and the prefix, number, and name of the course. If the course is cross-listed with another unit or is otherwise a cognate in another unit, a letter of approval from the cognate department must be submitted with the request to remove Foundation Curriculum credit. The Academic Standards Committee will consider the request and, if approved, will take the request to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

Revised Goals of the Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum Foundations Assessment Guidelines Request For Foundations Credit"

There was no discussion and the proposed New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-15**

Professor Wolfe then presented a proposed New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations. She noted a slight change in the wording to move "including graduate level courses" to earlier in the sentence of the 2nd paragraph.

Revise and place in the Faculty Manual.

"Part V. Final Examinations

The normal expectation is that the completion of both face to face and online courses will include a final examination or an alternate method of evaluating student progress. Final examinations are required at the discretion of the faculty member and must be scheduled in the course syllabus made available to students.

If a final examination is not given during the final examination period, **the faculty member must consider that date and time as a regular instructional day.**

~~meet with the class during the scheduled examination time and use the allotted time for an appropriate instructional activity.~~ **The chair of the unit is responsible for monitoring adherence to scheduled examination requirements.**

The University establishes a final examination schedule each semester to reduce conflicts in course final examination and to meet the UNC established course hour requirements. There will

be no departure from the printed schedule of examinations **including graduate level courses except for clinical and non-traditional class schedules.** Changes for individual student emergencies of a serious nature will be made only with the approval of the instructor. A student who is absent from an examination without excuse will be given a grade of F for the examination. An incomplete (I) for the course will only be given in the case of a student absent from the final examination who has presented a satisfactory excuse to the instructor.

No test intended to substitute for the final exam may be given during the week preceding the final examination period. Faculty may not give an examination or an assignment in lieu of an examination on Reading Day."

Professor Howard (Communication) said that he understood the spirit of the policy was to make sure that we hold graduate course final exams to the same schedule and standard for undergraduates. This would not apply to clinical and distance education courses due to their schedule differences. Professor Wolfe confirmed that this was the case.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked for the definition of a "nontraditional class"? Professor Wolfe indicated that his had not been fully determined.

Professor Christian (Business) stated that a nontraditional class within his College was a block scheduled course that involved a class that lasted only 3 weeks with a final exam then another class that did not meet the regular semester schedule. Thus the class does not extend for the full semester.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) following up on the definition stated that since distance education courses did not meet on a regular schedule, she moved that the wording be changed to "If a final exam is not given during the final examination period, the faculty member must consider that date and time as an regular instructional day." The motion was seconded by Professor Roberts. Professor Wolfe replied that before the Faculty Senate attempted to revise this policy on the floor she asked that it be returned to the Committee because it was not the Committee's intention to allow faculty any alternatives in relation to not giving a final exam.

Professor Howard (Communication) replied currently the policy states there would be no departure from this policy and agreed that this may need to go back to the Committee to clear it up instead of trying to attempt it during the Senate meeting. Professor Wolfe agreed because she was hesitant to revise this on the floor since there are other statements about the final examination in other University publications which might interfere with currently published information.

Professor Sprague (Physics) moved to return this report to the Committee for further consideration. Chair Walker stated that the motion on the floor was under discussion and had to be acted upon prior to a new motion being considered.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) pointed out that the only difference in what she was proposing and what currently exists was that it changed the day not time.

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) asked for a point of order (clarification): if Professor Sprague's motion to return the report to the Committee would stop the discussion? Parliamentarian Killingsworth (Business) replied yes

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) moved then to table the discussion on Professor Glascoff's amendment. Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked for a point of clarification on what item was being tabled. Chair Walker clarified that the motion on the table was to table Professor Glascoff's amendment.

Professor Brown raised a point of order. Parliamentarian Killingsworth stated that the motion to table the amendment was not appropriate at the moment because the current motion being considered was to return the report to the Committee and not to stop the discussion on the amendment. Chair Walker asked for a vote on Professor Glascoff's amendment.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked that her amendment be withdrawn expressing full confidence that the Academic Standards Committee could work out the issues when they met next.

Professor Sprague then again moved to return the report to the Committee for further consideration. The final vote to send the section back to committee carried.

Following discussion, the proposed New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations was returned to the committee for further review.

RESOLUTION #11-16

Finally, Professor Wolfe presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection B. Application for Graduation.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"Application for Graduation

Advisers should remind students that **an** application ~~to graduate~~ **for graduation** must be **submitted** ~~to made on a form provided by~~ the university registrar not later than two semesters before the completion of the requirements for an undergraduate degree or one semester for a graduate degree. ~~The graduation fee must accompany the application.~~"

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection B. Application for Graduation were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-17**

F. Faculty Welfare Committee, Katrina DuBose

Professor DuBose (Health and Human Performance) first presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection E. Orientation of New Faculty.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"New Faculty Orientation

New faculty are encouraged to attend the East Carolina University New Faculty Orientation Program. The program offers a variety of resources, including information on benefits, parking, technology, research, and tenure: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/facultyorientation>. Additional faculty orientation activities may be required by academic units. **AS PART OF THE ORIENTATION, New faculty members are invited to serve in shared governance of the university.** Orientation of new faculty will be continued throughout the year by key administrators and faculty leaders to assist the faculty in becoming acquainted with the practices and procedures of the university. Ongoing programs, including information on mentoring, are available through the Office for Faculty Excellence: <http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/>

New faculty are encouraged to attend the annual Faculty Convocation, which is scheduled at the opening of each academic year, for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the chancellor, chair of the faculty, key administrative personnel and their responsibilities, and with the relationship between faculty and administration."

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that he was in total agreement with the intent of the statement. He understood that shared governance should be a part of new faculty orientation but thought the one sentence about new faculty and shared governance was just stuck in there and perhaps needed to be rewritten. Professor DuBose agreed that new faculty should be "encouraged" to participate in shared governance and that the sentence could be written better.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) offered an editorial amendment to add "As part of the orientation" new faculty members are invited to serve in shared governance of the university. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Brown stated his understanding of the clarifications provided by Professor's Boklage and DuBose.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that there were restrictions on how involved new faculty can be within academic units and wanted to make sure that this was clear in the text. Professor DuBose replied that sharing in governance does not relate to just serving on committees but participation in open forums, discussions on important issues, etc.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) offered an editorial amendment to Professor Boklage's earlier amendment so that the sentence read: "As part of the orientation process, new faculty members are informed about the University system of shared governance and invited to serve in shared governance of the university." There was no objection.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that he liked Professor Rigsby's editorial amendment because it made sense. He then suggested that "shared governance" be added to the list at the start of the document so that it would read "The program offers a variety of resources, including information on benefits, parking, technology, research, tenure, and shared governance. Professor DuBose replied that the committee thought that shared governance was very important and she brought this policy forward as a way to make the Faculty Senate happy so she was not opposed to anything the Senators offered.

Chair Walker then clarified the only proposed editorial amendment that had been agreed upon would read as follows: "As part of the orientation process, new faculty members are informed about the University system of shared governance and are invited to serve in shared governance of the university". There was no objection to the change in language and the motion carried. The proposed overall amendment carried as well.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection E. Orientation of New Faculty were approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #11-18**

Professor DuBose then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection L. Travel and Expense Allowances.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"Travel and Expense Allowances

Paid Travel

Depending on the fiscal situation, business related travel may be covered by the university using department funds. Business related travel can also be covered through grant funds. All travel must have written authorization. All travel must be approved in advance as requested by either the academic department or college. Full documentation and explanation are required for all travel out of state and out of country. All reimbursement requests shall be filed for approval and payment made within thirty days after the end of the travel period for which reimbursement is being requested.

The mode of transportation for travel could be completed by the following methods: private car, state car, rental car, airplane, bus, taxi, or railroad. For more information on travel approval and reimbursements, refer to the following Financial Services websites:
http://ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/indextraveloffice.cfm
http://ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/accountspayable/TravelApprovalandReimbursement.cfm

Un-paid Travel

If a faculty member is traveling for business reasons, but is not going to be reimbursed for travel expenses the pre-approved travel authorization forms still need to be completed. This process helps with the authorization of workers' compensation should an accident occur during the travel period."

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) moved to delete the sentence: "The mode of transportation for travel could be completed by the following methods: private car, state car, rental car, airplane, bus, taxi, or railroad." She stated that because if in London for example a subway would be less expensive than anything listed here and faculty would not want to go against the policy. Professor DuBose responded that the words "could be" allowed for other modes of transportation and that the referenced link to actual policy would aid faculty when making decisions.

Chair Walker called for a vote on removing the first sentence in the second paragraph.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) offered an editorial revision to delete the hyphen between "un paid". The editorial revision was accepted.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection L. Travel and Expense Allowances were approved as editorially revised. **RESOLUTION #11-19**

Finally Professor DuBose presented the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection B. Weapons Policy.

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"Weapons Policy

It is a violation of University policy for a member of the faculty to possess and/or use a weapon on any university owned or controlled property, including at extracurricular events sponsored by the university. Any faculty member who violates this policy may be subject to serious sanctions imposed by the university in accordance with due process as outlined in the university's tenure and promotion policies and procedures, as well as, punishment in accordance with state criminal law. For further details and certain exceptions, see North Carolina General Statute 14-269.2 located online at

http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_14/GS_14-269.2.html"

Professor Theurer (Music) asked about adding the word "carry" in the first sentence so that it would read: It is a violation of University policy for a member of the faculty to possess, **carry** and/or use a weapon on any university owned or controlled property, including at extracurricular events sponsored by the university. Professor DuBose responded that there were rules that related to carrying a firearm and that if someone were "carrying" a weapon lawfully there would not be a penalty.

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) asked if members of the ROTC were allowed to carry weapons on campus? Professor DuBose replied yes that falls within the exceptions category of the policy.

Professor Brown (Psychology) stated that since this policy should affect all University personnel it should be addressed by the University Policy Committee and not just be included in the *ECU Faculty Manual*. Professor Brown questioned why it is necessary to have a statement in the Faculty Manual that only applies to faculty and not students, staff or administrators?

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that weapon is ambiguous and wondered if a person would be penalized if they possessed a knife. Professor DuBose stated that what constituted a weapon was defined by the State of North Carolina general statutes and not the University or this policy.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) noted that he had recently seen a campus student interview stating a proposed policy (not yet in North Carolina) that allowed students on campus to carry guns. He stated he supported the notion to have a clear weapons policy included in the

University's policy manual in addition to the *ECU Faculty Manual*. Professor DuBose agreed that this policy was important and should be kept in the *ECU Faculty Manual*.

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) pointed out that there was an overarching policy for all the university campuses and that there is State policy had been referenced in the proposed policy before the Senate.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that she thought the policy should be clear that students cannot carry weapons either and moved to change the word "faculty" to "University community" so that the sentence would read "It is a violation of University policy for a member of the ~~faculty~~ **University community** to possess and/or use a weapon on any university owned or controlled property, including at extracurricular events sponsored by the university. Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) agreed that the proposed amendment worked better. The motion to amend was approved.

Professor Luczkovich (Biology) stated that underwater archaeologists found weapons in shipwrecks, i.e., cannon balls and even unexploded ordinance and he wondered if this fell under the exceptions. Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that the statute has a provision for weapons "used in a school approved program conducted under the supervision of an adult whose supervision has been approved by the school authority" and that this provision addresses Prof. Luczkovich's concern.

Professor Jenks (History) replied that the State law refers to weapons with felonious intent. He also agreed with Professor Wilson that he was aware of several States where it was being debated to allow students the right to bear arms. He spoke against the idea of removing this policy from the *ECU Faculty Manual* since the entire university community is involved

Professor Henze (English) offered an editorial amendment to change "statue" to "statute". Professor Boklage (Medicine) also offered an editorial amendment to delete the comma after "as well as." Both editorial amendments were accepted.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII. Other Policies, Subsection B. Weapons Policy were approved as revised. **RESOLUTION #11-20**

G. Committee on Committees, Catherine Rigsby

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated this is a first reading of the standing academic committee charges noting that this is being done in order to gain input from colleagues within academic units and administration. There were some simple changes removing some committees' oversight of the undergraduate catalog. Other changes involved increasing the number of faculty members on various committees, adding the VC for Research and Graduate Studies as an ex-officio member with vote on some committees, and asking that faculty who serve on the Faculty Governance Committee be tenured faculty. She also stated that these various revisions were being offered at the request of both the Chair of the Faculty and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) asked if this was for discussion only and the body was not being asked to vote at this time. Professor Rigsby replied yes no formal action was required at this time.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked why all standing University Academic Committees were being increased to eight faculty members. Professor Rigsby replied that this not a change and was needed to keep the majority of faculty on these committees.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated his initial instinct was not to limit the activities of faculty governance to only tenured faculty because there were a lot of clinical faculty who were not tenured but should be given an opportunity to participate in the activities of the Committee.

Professor Rigsby then discussed the inclusion of administrative members of committee while maintaining a proper balance between faculty and administrative members.

Professor Brown (Psychology) asked in reference to the Student Academic Appellate Committee would, once the revised charge was approved, the Committee begin to hear graduate student appeals. Professor Rigsby replied that the change in the Committee's responsibilities and goal of the Committee on Committees and Chair of the Faculty was to have all student appeals go through the same academic committee. Although currently there are slightly different processes for students, there should be a similar process and one committee for both graduate and undergraduate appeals. It would take time to draft a policy on this before the Committee would begin to address both graduate and undergraduate student appeals.

Professor Sprague (Physics) stated that there was much discussion when these proposed committee charges were announced. It seems that there has been a lot of discussion due to the misperception that the Faculty Senate was trying to take control of all graduate catalogue. He stated that he did not think that this was the overall goal of the body. There were several senate committees that have developed unified policies for graduates and undergraduates. In Professor Sprague's opinion, Academic Standards has done a good job in developing such policies this year and admissions and retentions policy proposals offer another example of the faculty working collectively on issues affecting graduate as well as undergraduate education. Also, the new academic integrity policy will be included both graduate and undergraduate catalogues. The current faculty leadership hopes to build on these working relationships to create unified policies. He wanted to clearly state that it was not the intention of the faculty leadership nor the Faculty Senate to take over anything but actually to combine forces to work together more to build a stronger unified faculty voice. The leadership of the Faculty Senate wants to build on the idea of working together and developing unified policies. He understood that the Faculty Senate should remain the formal voice for all faculty for both undergraduate and graduate matters. In that way, there can be unified policies and procedures across various groups and the goal is to improve the working relationship among all faculty groups and bring more consistency and faculty involvement into the inner workings with all academic matters. Professor Sprague asked that when these charges come forward again that they are reworded to make it clear that the senate committees are to coordinate with the other committees and administrators who make the policies for graduate matters, so it does not give the impression that the Faculty Senate is trying to assume new powers.

Professor Rigsby replied that she understood what Professor Sprague was saying.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) suggested that for those committees that would be charged to review and act on both graduate and undergraduate policies and procedures that a certain number of graduate and undergraduate faculty be appointed to the committees. Professor Rigsby agreed and stated that this was something that the Committee would consider.

Chair Walker stated, as she stated in her remarks, discussions would be ongoing with both the faculty leadership and Academic Council and that the second and final reading of these proposed revisions to the academic committee charges. She encouraged Faculty Senators to provide feedback to the Committee on Committees once they had talked with colleagues within their respective units. This is an important discussion and needs to be given the time required for everyone to be heard.

Professor Gemperline (Dean of the Graduate School) thanked the Chair Walker for speaking privileges and began by acknowledging the important role that the Faculty Senate played in shared governance and that he wished to work together. He called the attention of the senators to several changes in the charge to committees considering admission and recruitment policies and procedures. Sections 4 A and 4 B of the graduate catalogue discuss matters related to undergraduate and graduate recruitment, admission, advising, and retention. This section sets policy related to recruitment of graduate students. He noted that what was being proposed in today's meeting was a substantial change to how graduate matters were currently dealt with at ECU and he would have preferred that this matter be discussed more informally first with the Graduate School before being presented now to the Faculty Senate for a first reading.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) replied that this was the first step in formalizing some of the issues that had already been discussed among faculty groups, faculty leadership, Academic Council, and the Chancellor over several years and that change would happen slowly. The desire of the Academic Standards Committee was to make the easy changes now and more substantial and detailed changes would be discussed next semester. Inclusion of graduate matters in the standing University academic committee structure was just the first step. She also understood that there would continue to be discussion and review of the various changes as the University moved forward.

Chair Walker thanked Professor Gemperline for his remarks and the Committee on Committees for continuing the discussion and beginning the process of revising the standing University academic committee charges.

H. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Scott Gordon

Professor Gordon (Health and Human Performance) first presented an update regarding input on Budget and Academic Program Prioritization and stated that committee has been charged and has had its first meeting with the Provost, Chancellor and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Chancellor Ballard stated in this meeting that he is looking for cost reductions in the coming year focusing on ways of reducing administrative cost so that the cost is not only to academic

programs. The specific charge is to define criteria for potential program prioritization including curtailment and elimination of programs. Program consolidation is also to be considered and the report is due next month. Consolidation of units will potentially reduce administrative costs. The report of this committee may not mean that any of the suggestions will occur, and Professor Gordon said that he hoped that it does not, but the Chancellor needs recommendations in place when the budget cuts are finally determined.

Professor Spurr (Mathematics) wanted to understand if and when units would be notified that they are being considered for consolidation. He asked how open would these meetings be to faculty across the University? Professor Gordon stated that all EPPC meetings were open meetings and that any reports to the Chancellor on their evaluation criteria would be presented to the Faculty Senate. Anyone who wants to be involved is welcome to attend the committee meetings.

Professor Glascoff (Health and Human Performance) clarified that the Chancellor wants the Committee's recommendations for criteria to be used to evaluate programs and not for a list recommendation of programs to be combined or eliminated.

Chair Walker clarified that EPPC was being asked to only provide the criteria for how to handle the review and that there would probably be a Task Force that is charged to actually recommend the changes. The Chancellor wants EPPC to provide suggestions on how to do the review. Chair Walker also reminded the Senators that in the event that an academic program was eliminated, the formal process located in Appendix D of the *ECU Faculty Manual* would apply. None of the processes in place would be eliminated. She then thanked the Committee for taking on this additional responsibility and agreeing to meet more often to adhere to the imposed deadline.

Professor Gordon then presented a request to rename the [Department of Counselor and Adult Education](#) to Department of Higher, Adult, and Counselor Education, within the College of Education. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #11-21

Professor Gordon then presented a request to rename the [Lean Six-Sigma Certificate](#) to Lean Six-Sigma Black Belt Certificate, within the Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-22**

Professor Gordon then presented a request to establish an [Interdisciplinary Minor in Linguistics](#), within the Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Brown (Psychology) asked why this was interdisciplinary given this is a minor in English? Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) replied that this was work between the Departments of English, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Philosophy and Communication.

Following discussion the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-23**

Professor Gordon then presented a request to rename SPED-MAEd Licensure Certification in Mental Retardation Program to SPED-MAEd Licensure Certification in Intellectual Disabilities Program, within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-24**

Professor Gordon then presented a request for a new Health Information Technologies Concentration in the Bachelor of Industrial Technology Degree, within the Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-25**

Professor Gordon then presented a request for Discontinuation of the Pathology Assistant Certificate Program, within the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, School of Medicine. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-26**

Finally Professor Gordon presented a request for Discontinuation of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Studio Art, within the School of Art and Design, College of Fine Arts and Communication. There was no discussion and the request was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-27**

VI. New Business

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 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 FEBRUARY 22, 2011, MEETING

- 11-08 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection C. Employee Involvement in Political Candidacy and Office Holding, as follows:

Remove current text from Faculty Manual and place elsewhere in University Policy Manual with a link to the Board of Governors policy (see item 300.5 <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>) .

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-09 Faculty advice on Administrator Evaluation of Chancellor to split question #5 of the current Administrator Evaluation of Chancellor into two questions as noted below:

1. Allocates the resources of the institution effectively.
2. Allocates the resources of the institution equitably.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-10 Curriculum matters contained in the [January 13, 2011](#) University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-11 Resolution on Budget Matters, as follows:

Whereas, Enrollment at East Carolina University has increased by 42% since the 2001/02 academic year, while total faculty at ECU has only increased 34.8% during this same time period; and

Whereas, State Appropriations as a percentage of total revenue for East Carolina University have declined from 38% in 2001/02 to 34% this year. Over the same time period the percentage of total revenue derived from Grants and Contracts rose from 12% to 13%, Patient Care Revenues rose from 18% to 21%, and Student Tuition and Fees rose from 12% to 17%; and

Whereas, There has been a permanent reduction in the State appropriations to East Carolina University in each of the past 10 fiscal years, resulting in a total decrease of \$55 million. In addition, non recurring reductions in State Appropriations over this same time period have been nearly twice as large; and

Whereas, The financial well-being and solvency of the University are in the best interest of all parties; including the State, Students, Staff, Administration, and Faculty. Only with this financial well-being can the University continue providing the high quality education for which it is recognized. Furthermore, continued reductions in State Appropriations in the face of continued enrollment growth in the absence of alternative means to fund the University are untenable and detrimental to the long-term economic and societal interests of the State, and

Whereas, Resolution of these issues will require the collective action of faculty, administration, students, parents, and the State of North Carolina.

Therefore be it resolved, that in order to maintain the mission of excellence in teaching, research, service and patient care for which the University is recognized, additional sources of funding will need to be approved to mitigate any further decreases in State Appropriations. It is imperative that any increases in tuition and fees remain at the campus level to cover the costs of providing the education of students at East Carolina University and at other state-supported institutions of higher education. It is also imperative that further growth in enrollment be accompanied by enrollment growth funding from State Appropriations at levels adequate to cover the increased costs, and that campus-based decisions on the allocation of funding remain with the University.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the Chancellor to communicate this resolution to the UNC President, UNC Board of Governors, and the North Carolina General Assembly.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University respectfully asks its Faculty Assembly Delegates to present this resolution to the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina System for its endorsement and adoption.

Disposition: Chancellor and ECU's Faculty Assembly Delegates

- 11-12 Revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Academic Regulations, Subsection During

Schedule Change Period, as follows:

The proposed revisions are to take effect First Summer Session 2011.

(Revisions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.)

~~"During Schedule Change Period~~

~~During the first five days of classes (Mondays through Fridays) of the fall and spring semesters, a student may drop or add a course or courses to his or her schedule. The student should discuss schedule changes with his or her advisor prior to making the changes via the web. On the day following the five-day schedule change period, a student may make final additions to his or her schedule. Course drops during this drop/add period do not count against a student's course drop allocation. (See course Drop Allocations, below.) See below for instructions on requesting schedule changes after the scheduled change period.~~

During the summer, the schedule change period **when students are allowed to drop or add a course or courses** is limited to the first two days of classes each term. ~~On the day following the two-day schedule change period, a student may make final additions to his or her schedule in accordance with the policies outlined above for the regular semesters. Course drops during this drop/add period do not count against a student's course drop allocation. (See course Drop Allocations, below.)~~

See below for instructions on requesting schedule changes after the scheduled change period. "

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-13 Approval of Foundation Curriculum Course for Arts, [THEA 2015](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-14 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection Y. Disruptive Academic Behavior, as follows:

(Revisions are noted in **bold** print.)

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual, deleting the old text.

"Disruptive Academic Behavior

East Carolina University is committed to providing each student with a rich, distinctive educational experience. Disruptive academic behavior impedes the learning environment and hinders other students' learning. The course instructor has original purview over his/her class and may deny a student who is unduly disruptive the right to attend the class. Students who repeatedly violate reasonable standards of behavior in the classroom or other academic setting may be removed from the course by the instructor following appropriate notice. Students removed from a course under this policy will receive a "drop" according to university policy and are eligible for tuition refund as specified in the current tuition refund policy.

This policy does not restrict the instructor's prerogative to ask a disruptive student to leave an individual class session where appropriate or to refer the student to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities for violation of the Student Code of Conduct.

Disruptive Academic Behavior

Disruptive academic behavior is any behavior likely to substantially or repeatedly interfere with the normal conduct of instructional activities, including meetings with instructors

outside of class. Examples of such behavior include, but are not limited to, making loud or distracting noises; using cell phones and other electronic devices without prior approval; repeatedly speaking without being recognized; frequently arriving late or leaving early from class; and making threats or personal insults. A verbal expression of a disagreement with the instructor or other students on an academic subject matter discussed within the course, during times when the instructor permits discussion, is not in itself disruptive academic behavior.

Procedure for Instructors

A student who does not follow reasonable standards of academic decorum should first receive a private verbal warning from the faculty member (1). The instructor should describe the behavior of concern to the student, explain that it is inappropriate, and ask the student to stop the behavior. If the behavior continues, the instructor should give the student a written warning indicating that the student will be removed from the course if the behavior does not cease. If the behavior persists, the instructor should discuss the situation with his/her department chair. If it is decided to remove the student from the course then the instructor should schedule a meeting with his/her department chair and the student to inform the student that s/he is being removed from the course. This decision must be communicated in writing to the student with a copy promptly forwarded to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The department chair must promptly communicate the decision in writing to the Office of the Registrar so that the student's schedule will be adjusted accordingly. Instructors should keep written documentation of all actions taken during this process.

If the behavior is threatening in nature or is likely to result in immediate harm, the faculty member should contact the East Carolina University Police Department for immediate assistance.

Student Appeals

The student may appeal the decision of the instructor and department chair to the academic dean of the college in which the course is located. The appeal must be received by the dean, in writing, within three working days of the date of the decision to remove the student from the course. The dean or dean's designee will review the appeal and the documentation, will discuss the appeal with the faculty member and, after discussion with the student and instructor, can affirm, reverse or modify the decision made by the instructor and department chair. The student, instructor and department chair will be notified of the appeal decision no later than three working days after receiving the appeal. The dean will provide written notification of the appeal decision to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and also, if the original decision is overturned, to the Registrar's Office. If the decision is made that the student is to return to the course then the student will be allowed to immediately return to the classroom without academic penalty and the chair will work with the student and instructor to facilitate the completion of any missed work. The dean's decision is final."

1 "ECU provides reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. When communicating a warning to a student, faculty should ensure the discussion is private and refer any student who discloses a disability to Disability Support Services."

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-15 New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit to read as follows:

Revise and place in the Faculty Manual.

"Policy to Remove Foundation Curriculum Credit

Units wishing to remove Foundation Curriculum credit from a course must send a memo to the Academic Standards Committee by email attachment stating the requested action and a list of the courses for which Foundation Curriculum credit should be removed. The list should include the name of the person requesting the action, and the prefix, number, and name of the course. If the course is cross-listed with another unit or is otherwise a cognate in another unit, a letter of approval from the cognate department must be submitted with the request to remove Foundation Curriculum credit. The Academic Standards Committee will consider the request and, if approved, will take the request to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

Revised Goals of the Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum
Foundations Assessment Guidelines
Request For Foundations Credit"

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-16 New Section to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, entitled Final Examinations was returned to the Academic Standards Committee for further review.

Disposition: Academic Standards Committee

- 11-17 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Academic Information, Section I. Academic Procedures and Policies, Subsection B. Application for Graduation, as follows:

(Revisions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.)

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

"Application for Graduation

Advisers should remind students that **an** application to graduate **for graduation** must be **submitted to** ~~made on a form provided by~~ the university registrar not later than two semesters before the completion of the requirements for an undergraduate degree or one semester for a graduate degree. ~~The graduation fee must accompany the application.~~"

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-18 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection E. Orientation of New Faculty, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual, deleting the old text.

"New Faculty Orientation

New faculty are encouraged to attend the East Carolina University New Faculty Orientation Program. The program offers a variety of resources, including information on benefits, parking, technology, research, and tenure: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/facultyorientation>. Additional faculty orientation activities may be required by academic units. As part of the orientation process, new faculty members are informed about the University system of shared governance and invited to serve in shared governance of the university. Orientation of new faculty will be continued throughout the year by key administrators and faculty leaders to assist the faculty in becoming acquainted with the practices and procedures of the university. Ongoing programs, including information on mentoring, are available through the Office for Faculty Excellence: <http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/>

New faculty are encouraged to attend the annual Faculty Convocation, which is scheduled at the opening of each academic year, for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the chancellor, chair of the faculty, key administrative personnel and their responsibilities, and with the relationship between faculty and administration."

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-19 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection L. Travel and Expense Allowances, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual, deleting the old text.

"Travel and Expense Allowances

Paid Travel

Depending on the fiscal situation, business related travel may be covered by the university using department funds. Business related travel can also be covered through grant funds. All travel must have written authorization. All travel must be approved in advance as requested by either the academic department or college. Full documentation and explanation are required for all travel out of state and out of country. All reimbursement requests shall be filed for approval and payment made within thirty days after the end of the travel period for which reimbursement is being requested.

The mode of transportation for travel could be completed by the following methods: private car, state car, rental car, airplane, bus, taxi, or railroad. For more information on travel approval and reimbursements, refer to the following Financial Services websites:

http://ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/indextraveloffice.cfm

http://ecu.edu/cs-admin/financial_serv/accountspayable/TravelApprovalandReimbursement.cfm

Unpaid Travel

If a faculty member is traveling for business reasons, but is not going to be reimbursed for travel expenses the pre-approved travel authorization forms still need to be completed. This process helps with the authorization of workers' compensation should an accident occur during the travel period."

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-20 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section VII.

Other Policies, Subsection B. Weapons Policy, as follows:

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual, deleting the old text.

"Weapons Policy

It is a violation of University policy for a member of the University community to possess and/or use a weapon on any university owned or controlled property, including at extracurricular events sponsored by the university. Any faculty member who violates this policy may be subject to serious sanctions imposed by the university in accordance with due process as outlined in the university's tenure and promotion policies and procedures, as well as punishment in accordance with state criminal law. For further details and certain exceptions, see North Carolina General Statute § 14-269.2 located online at:

http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_14/GS_14-269.2.html

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-21 Request to rename the [Department of Counselor and Adult Education](#) to Department of Higher, Adult, and Counselor Education, within the College of Education.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-22 Request to rename the [Lean Six-Sigma Certificate](#) to Lean Six-Sigma Black Belt Certificate, within the Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-23 Request to establish an [Interdisciplinary Minor in Linguistics](#), within the Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-24 Request to rename [SPED-MAEd Licensure Certification in Mental Retardation Program](#) to SPED-MAEd Licensure Certification in Intellectual Disabilities Program, within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-25 Request for a new [Health Information Technologies Concentration](#) in the Bachelor of Industrial Technology Degree, within the Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-26 Request for [Discontinuation of the Pathology Assistant Certificate Program](#), within the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, School of Medicine.

Disposition: Chancellor

- 11-27 Request for [Discontinuation of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Studio Art](#), within the School of Art and Design, College of Fine Arts and Communication.

Disposition: Chancellor