Lee, Lori

From: Sprague, Mark

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 6:18 AM

To: Walker, Marianna; McKinnon, Hunt; Killingsworth, Brenda; Lee, Lori Subject: Fwd: Proposed changes to Faculty Senate committee charges

Attachments: FS 3-29-2011 attachment 16.doc; ATT00001..htm

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Gemperline, Paul" < GEMPERLINEP@ecu.edu>

Date: March 23, 2011 11:05:27 PM EDT

To: Graduate Assembly < GA@ECU.EDU>, Graduate School Administrative Board

<GSAB@ECU.EDU>

Cc: Graduate School Administrative Board Guests < GSABGUESTS@ECU.EDU>

Subject: Proposed changes to Faculty Senate committee charges

March 23, 2011

Dear Members of the Graduate Assembly and Graduate School Administrative Board,

I write with a summary of a controversial issue that was discussed at yesterday's Graduate Assembly meeting. The controversial issue involves changes to certain Faculty Senate committee charges proposed by the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Senate. This matter is to receive a second reading and probably a vote before the Faculty Senate at its March 29, 2011 meeting next Tuesday. The charges to five Faculty Senate Committees have been proposed to be changed to expand their scope to cover graduate issues. Five Faculty Senate committee charges have been expanded to include a review at least annually of relevant sections of the Graduate Catalog, and one committee charge has been expanded to include "policies and procedures governing ... graduate recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and readmission" (see attachment).

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

In the discussion that took place at yesterday's Graduate Assembly meeting, members noted the following points:

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.

I am writing to ask that you:

- A) consider these matters carefully
- B) formulate your own opinion on the issue either for or against
- C) discus these issues with your department's graduate faculty
- D) seek to form a consensus opinion in your department prior to Tuesday's Faculty Senate meeting next week

E) ask your department's faculty senator to represent the will of your department's graduate faculty on this issue, either for or against, at next Tuesday's meeting.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Paul J. Gemperline, Ph.D.
Dean of Graduate Studies
113 Ragsdale Hall, Mail Stop 570
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858