

Lee, Lori

---

**From:** Rigsby, Catherine  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 12:59 PM  
**To:** Walker, Marianna  
**Cc:** Committee on Committees  
**Subject:** RE: Committe Charges -- suggestion for the next stepBauer, Margaret

Marianna,

By a majority committee vote, the CoC has decided that the time is not right to go forward with the committee charges involving the graduate school. Hence, during my report to the Faculty Senate on Tuesday, I will explain the current state of affairs (using my very best diplomacy . . . ☺) and the withdraw the committee's support for the following charge revisions:

*Academic Standards Committee*  
*Admission and Retention Policies*  
*Calendar Committee*  
*Educational Planning and Policies Committee*  
*Student Academic Appellate Committee*

The other charges do not involve the graduate school (although some of them DO include adding the VCR!), so the committee will proceed with those proposed revisions.

Please note that the committee will revisit the Academic Standards and EPPC charges for the April Faculty Senate meeting. But, it cleanest way to handle things at this time is to simply withdraw the proposals now and restart later.

As you already know, I do think that this is the best way to deal with things at this time. I also think that it is important that the Committee on Committee explain this issue (and the withdrawal) to the Senate. Hence, I don't think we need to remove the items from the official agenda. I simply need to withdraw them at the time of the report and explain why they are being withdrawn. I think works procedurally (especially because we do still have some charges that are not being withdrawn). In my remarks to the Senate, I will emphasize that the grad education part of the discussion is NOT closed; that, in fact, we hope it will be expanded considerably and think that much of the confusion about this issue will clear up as a result of that expansion.

I hope you agree with the committee's decision,  
Catherine

---

**From:** Rigsby, Catherine  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:29 AM  
**To:** Bauer, Margaret; Martinez, Purificacion; Reyes, Enrique; Rigsby, Catherine; Sharer, Wendy; Taggart, Mark Alan; Van Willigen, Marieke; Walker, Marianna  
**Cc:** Lee, Lori  
**Subject:** Committe Charges -- suggestion for the next step  
**Importance:** High

Dear CoC Members,

I'm writing to ask your permission to withdraw (at Tuesday's Faculty Senate meeting) the CoC's proposed charge revisions that deal with the graduate school and the VC Research. If a majority of the committee agrees to this, I would simply begin my report on Tuesday by explaining the situation and formally withdrawing the relevant segment of the committee's report.



As we discussed at our last formal meeting (last week), we made the disputed changes ONLY because we were requested to do so by the Chair of the Faculty. At the time, she thought she had an understanding/agreement with the VC Research (who has, on numerous occasions expressed a strong desire to be on these committees). That understanding is no longer valid. Further, the entire issue has been blown so out of proportion that it seems to me that nothing good can come from the discussion – which being conducted, at least by some, in a both non-collegial and uninformed manner.

The easiest solution at this point, in my opinion, is for the committee to (1) acknowledge that the time for this kind of change has not arrived; (2) to make it clear that the discussion is still on-going (between the Faculty officers, the administration, and the graduate school), but needs to continue for a while before these changes are made; and (3) to remove those specific changes from the charges that will be discussed in the Faculty Senate on Tuesday.

In summary, I suggest that any proposed charge change that includes both new position(s) related to the VCR and the addition of the words “graduate” and/or “graduate catalog” be edited to remove those particular suggested changes. The relevant charges are for committees for which at least a part of the charge deals with programs and/or curricula and which have responsibility for oversight of charge-related sections of student catalog(s). Importantly, for this set of committees, the *only* recommended charge changes are related to both the VCR and the grad school. Hence, if you agree to my suggestion, we would simply withdraw the following proposed charge changes from consideration at this time:

*Academic Standards Committee* (we do, however do need to make some other changes to this committee charge, so we will be back to this at our next meeting)

*Admission and Retention Policies*

*Calendar Committee*

*Educational Planning and Policies Committee* (but other issues exist here, so we will need to discuss this charge in our next regular meeting)

*Student Academic Appellate Committee*

Note that the proposed new position for the VCR will remain for the following committees (because those committee charges have no relationship to programs, curricula, catalogs, etc. (the things that the graduate school seems to be most worried about), hence the recommended charge changes for these committees will remain as proposed:

Faculty Governance Committee

Faculty Welfare Committee

Teaching Grants Committee

Unit Code Screening Committee

Please let me know your position on this suggestion as soon as possible. If the committee agrees that this is a reasonable course of action, I will discuss it with the CoF and will report to the Faculty Senate accordingly.

Thank you,  
Catherine

P.S. In case you are not aware of the debate about this around campus, I append below a couple (of the *many* – and not all so mild!) e-mails that have been circulating about the issue. You will note that the GSAB has spoken out against the proposed changes, that the Graduate Assembly passed a resolution against the proposed changes on Monday, and that some deans are urging their faculty to vote against the proposed changes. It seems clear to me that this issue simply needs more and wider discussion before the committee charges are changed.

---

**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 8:41 AM

**To:** CHE

**Subject:** Proposed changes to Faculty Senate committee charges

**Importance:** High



>> "As authority for Graduate Programs lies with the Graduate Faculty, the Graduate Assembly, and the Graduate Administrative Board, we reject the authority of the Faculty Senate to oversee graduate programs as proposed in the suggested revisions to Faculty Senate Committee charges."

>>

>> We are asked to bring this to the graduate faculty for discussion and talk to our senators and alternates. It turns out that most senators did not read the report (which has 64 pages) and think these are only editorial changes. What is your opinion?

>>

>> Best,

>> Michael.

>>

>>

>> -----

>> Dr. Michael Dingfelder

>> Associate Professor

>> Assistant Chair for Graduate Studies

>>

>> Department of Physics

>> East Carolina University, Mailstop 563

>> Greenville, NC 27858, USA.

>>

>> Tel: +1-252-328-0882; Fax: +1-252-328-6314

>> Email: dingfelderm@ecu.edu; Web: <http://personal.ecu.edu/dingfelderm>

> Date: March 24, 2011 10:47:09 AM EDT

> Subject: Re: Faculty Senate - Committee on Committee Report - Graduate Education

>

> Physics Faculty:

>

> A lot has been said about the proposed changes to the charges of some Faculty Senate Committees to allow them to discuss and recommend changes to items in the Graduate Catalog. Many of these statements are incorrect or gross exaggerations. I would like discuss these proposed changes to reassure you that they do not represent a major shift in responsibility for graduate curriculum matters.

>

> This year, two Faculty Senate committees, Academic Standards and Admission and Retention Policies, have worked with the Graduate School Advisory Board (GSAB) and the Dean of the Graduate School to develop new unified policies for the revised Faculty Manual that applied to both undergraduate and graduate matters. These new policies include the policy on the duties of academic advisors, the proposed Academic Integrity Policy (which will be presented to the Senate next month), the grade appeal policy, and the policy on final examinations. For each of these policies, the appropriate Senate committee (each of which consists of almost all graduate faculty members) wrote the initial draft of the unified policy and sent it to the Dean of the Graduate School and the GSAB for suggested changes. Once all bodies were in agreement about the policies, they were taken to the Faculty Senate for approval. After Senate approval, the policies went to the Chancellor for final approval.

>

> After these successful collaborations between Faculty Senate committees and the graduate bodies, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies (VCRGS) asked the Chair of the Faculty for representation on several key Faculty Senate academic committees. The Committee on Committees, which is responsible for Senate committee charges, responded by proposing the addition on a representative of the VCRGS on the Academic Standards, Admission and Retention Policies, Calendar, Educational Policies and Planning, and Student Academic Appellate Committees. In addition, the Committee on Committees has proposed including review of the



Good Morning all

The Faculty senate will take up certain changes in the Faculty manual that will give a number of faculty senate committees jurisdiction over both **graduate** and under graduate matters. My personal opinion is that such changes will cause problems with accreditations as well as graduate program development and processes. I concur with the discussion and consensus of the Graduate Assembly discussion yesterday which is summarized below by Dean Paul Gemperline.

"Graduate Faculty exercise autonomous control over their respective graduate programs. This matter of autonomy is given significant consideration by many accreditation agencies and is written into many unit codes. Revisions to the committee charges of the kinds proposed by the Committee on Committees may indirectly put accreditation of some programs at risk.

It was questioned as to whether or not the proposed changes amount to a significant problem for the University. In response, it was noted that the proposed changes would create an enormous level of ambiguity as to what body has authority to recommend changes to policy with respect to the Graduate Catalog and graduate admissions policies, and therefore was viewed very negatively by the Graduate Assembly.

During discussion an overwhelming consensus emerged that resulted in the following motion which was unanimously approved by the Graduate Assembly.

**As authority for Graduate Programs lies with the Graduate Faculty, the Graduate Assembly, and the Graduate Administrative Board, we reject the authority of the Faculty Senate to oversee graduate programs as proposed in the suggested revisions to Faculty Senate Committee charges.**

Please make sure that you consider how these changes will affect your graduate programs and the development of graduate programs and that you as a faculty member (graduate or otherwise) seek to make you faculty senator aware of your opinion or the opinion of your department faculty so that your senator can represent the will of the department (especially the graduate faculty of your departments graduate programs at the Faculty Senate meeting next week.

The full March 29, 2011 Faculty Senate Agenda may be found here: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcfsagenda/fsa311.pdf> (See pgs 51 through 59)

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. These decisions are likely to influence graduate programs substantially.

Margie

College of Human Ecology

Enriching Lives. Enhancing Communities.

Margie Lee Gallagher, PhD

RW 238 Rivers Building

Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies

Mail Stop 505

[gallagherm@ecu.edu](mailto:gallagherm@ecu.edu)

College of Human Ecology

---

> On Mar 23, 2011, at 8:55 PM, Dingfelder, Michael wrote:

>

>> Dear all,

>>

>> Yesterday at the Graduate Assembly the Faculty Senate Committee on Committee Report and its proposed changes was discussed. It was concluded that the proposed changes to the charges of several of the faculty committees represent a major change in the way faculty are involved in the governance of the graduate programs. For example, the policies and procedures for the recruitment, admission, advising, retention, and readmission of graduate students is moved from the Graduate School Administrative Board (GSAB) and Graduate Assembly and added to the Faculty Senate. Both the GSAB and Graduate Assembly take their responsibilities very seriously. This change does not seem to be in line with best practice. The Graduate Assembly therefore passed the following resolution yesterday

>>



Graduate Catalog in the charges of these committees so the VCRGS representative could have reason to be on the committees.

>  
> The reason for the addition of Graduate Catalog sections to the committee charges is so the Senate committees can communicate, collaborate, and coordinate with the GSAB and other bodies charged with graduate matters, not to take control. The changes to the charges do not do anything to change the responsibilities of the GSAB or the Graduate Assembly. The GSAB will continue to be the body charged with considering graduate policy, and the Graduate Assembly will continue to be a forum for discussion of graduate issues, just like they are today. The only real change is that these bodies would coordinate with Senate committees on University-wide matters. This has happened in an ad hoc basis this year, but there is no group with a charge to coordinate policies between undergraduate and graduate matters.

>  
> The Faculty Senate and its committees represent the entire ECU faculty. There are many matters that apply to the entire faculty, and the Senate is the appropriate forum for the discussion of University-wide issues. Does it make sense that the Senate cannot discuss graduate matters at all? The Faculty Senate recommends academic policies to the Chancellor, who can approve or disapprove of them. The Senate has no authority to act without the Chancellor's approval. Do you think the Chancellor would even consider approving a Senate recommendation on graduate policy that was not approved by the GSAB and supported by the Dean of the Graduate School? Absolutely not!

>  
> There has been a lot of miscommunication about the proposed changes to the charges of the Faculty Senate committees. These changes are about better communication, coordination, and cooperation for the common good. The proposed changes are about discussing University-wide policies in a University-wide forum so that everyone has a voice. There is nothing in the charges that changes the way the GSAB, Graduate Assembly, or the Graduate School functions or recommends policies on graduate matters. I would be happy to discuss these matters in more detail, and I look forward to hearing your opinion on what should be done.

>  
> -Mark

> -----  
> Mark W. Sprague, Ph.D.  
> Vice Chair of the Faculty  
> Associate Professor  
> Dept. of Physics, Mail Stop 563  
> East Carolina University  
> Greenville, NC 27858  
> spraguem@ecu.edu  
> http://personal.ecu.edu/spraguem  
> 252-328-1862

> -----  
>>