

Lee, Lori

From: Martinez, Purificacion
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 12:19 PM
To: Taggart, Mark Alan; Rigsby, Catherine; Bauer, Margaret; Reyes, Enrique; Sharer, Wendy; Van Willigen, Marieke; Walker, Marianna
Cc: Lee, Lori
Subject: RE: Committe Charges -- suggestion for the next step

I am very disturbed about the polarization between faculty members that it has been created. This polarization has nothing to do with the issue at hand, but with the use of the issue by people. I am equally disturbed by the really bad reputation that the Faculty Senate in general and the Committee on Committees in particular have gotten because of it. I think that a strong statement from the Faculty Officers should be made to the appropriate administrators that this practice is not acceptable.

In one of the e-mails, it says that FS overseeing graduate programs might jeopardize accreditation. I have been hearing this for quite some time. If that is the case, could someone please provide the specifics (what programs will be affected, where does that appear in the accreditation documents, ...). Otherwise this will amount to a smoke screen.

As I indicated in a previous e-mail it is surprising to me that this issue has been on the table for 4 years, and despite the numerous approaches that different faculty officers faculty have tried in getting an understanding on this, nothing has worked. I cannot believe that all those very capable faculty could never come with a good proposal, I tend to believe that it has to do with an unwillingness of certain parties at the university to change their ways. Societies (or institutions) do not advance this way.

All that said, let's withdraw the changes. And go back, once again, to square one.

Purificacion Martinez, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Hispanic Studies
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures East Carolina University Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-6522
martinezp@ecu.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: Taggart, Mark Alan
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 12:03 PM
To: Rigsby, Catherine; Bauer, Margaret; Martinez, Purificacion; Reyes, Enrique; Sharer, Wendy; Van Willigen, Marieke; Walker, Marianna
Cc: Lee, Lori
Subject: RE: Committe Charges -- suggestion for the next step

Greetings:

I agree that we should step back and withdraw for now, but it is important that discussions continue between the affected constituencies.

(I have some personal views in response to some of the comments I have read in the thread below, but will keep these to myself.)

Mark

Mark Alan Taggart
Professor of Music Composition
East Carolina University
Fletcher Music Building 366
Greenville, North Carolina 27858
252 328 4278

From: Rigsby, Catherine
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:28 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

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

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 department's 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/customcf/fsagenda/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
>>
>> "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 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

> -----

>>