

**East Carolina University  
FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2011**

The fourth regular meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, December 6, 2011, in the East Carolina Heart Institute.

**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 November 1, 2011, were approved as distributed.

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

**A. Roll Call**

Senators absent were: Professors Christensen (Biology), Henze (English), Miller (Geological Sciences), Carolan (Mathematics), Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance), Mageean (VC for Research and Graduate Studies), and Rigsby (Geological Sciences/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Tisnado for Godwin (Art and Design), Reyes for Stiller (Biology), Eble for Bauer (English), Benson for Shlapentokh (Mathematics), and Mitchell for Edwards (Sociology).

**B. Announcements**

The Chancellor will host a reception for Faculty Senators, Alternates and University Academic and Appellate Committee members on Tuesday, February 28, 2012, from 5:00 to 6:30 pm in the Spilman Gallery (lobby). Formal invitations will be forthcoming.

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the October 4, 2011, and November 1, 2011, Faculty Senate meetings:

- 11-70 Curriculum matters contained in the September 8, 2011, University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- 11-71 Revisions to Standing University Academic Committee Charges, including Academic Awards Committee, Unit Code Screening Committee, University Budget Committee, and University Curriculum Committee.
- 11-72 Revisions to *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Section IV. Academic Advisement, Progression and Support .
- 11-74 BIOL1150 course for approval as a Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Science.
- 11-75 Request to change the name of the Department of Hospitality Management to the School of Hospitality Leadership within the College of Human Ecology.
- 11-76 Request for discontinuation of Applied Economics Graduate Certificate within the Department of Economics within the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 11-77 Request to offer a new concentration in Occupational Health Psychology within Health Psychology Doctoral program offered by the Department of Psychology within the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 11-78 Request to offer a new concentration in Electrical Engineering offered by the Department of Engineering within the College of Technology and Computer Science.
- 11-79 Request to offer a Graduate Certificate in Marketing within the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management within the College of Business.
- 11-80 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I.



Employment Policies, Subsection E. Orientation of New Faculty.

11-83 Approval of Fall 2011 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Special thanks are extended to Vice Chancellor Phyllis Horns for providing the additional food for today's meeting.

Letters concerning unit elections for 2012-2013 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit code administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

The Committee on Committees has been charged to seek volunteers to serve on the various 2012-13 academic, appellate, administrative, Board of Trustees, and student union committees. A faculty member may complete the volunteer preference form available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/callforvolunteers.htm> and forward it to the Faculty Senate office at [faculty senate@ecu.edu](mailto:faculty senate@ecu.edu). Deadline for submission is February 15, 2012.

The Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee will host their annual ECU Scholarship Awarding Workshop on Monday, January 23, 2012, from 11 -12 noon in room 244 of the Mendenhall Student Center. This workshop is for all faculty interested in the annual awarding of student scholarships. No registration is required to participate in this event. Questions may be directed to Professor Judy Wagner, Chair of the Committee at [wagnerj@ecu.edu](mailto:wagnerj@ecu.edu).

Call for Faculty Profiles & Faculty/Student Stories - The Faculty Officers are requesting written profiles on faculty and faculty-student collaborations to use in showcasing the excellence of our academic programs, faculty, and student education. We would like to have at least five stories from each college. Profiles could include examples of excellence in teaching, scholarship (research, creative activity, engagement, outreach), and service (public service, clinical service, service in discipline/region/university). Our goal is to provide the Chancellor and other senior level administrators with profiles that can be used with the media, legislators, public, and other public agencies. Please submit the profiles and stories to the Faculty Senate office (140 Rawl Annex) or to any of the Faculty Officers. Please direct any questions to Professor Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty at [walkerm@ecu.edu](mailto:walkerm@ecu.edu).

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard began his remarks to the Faculty Senate by discussing the ECU Board of Trustees latest meeting. The Board of Trustees took action on the issue of a tuition increase last week after a good deal of discussion, 12 out of 13 members supported a hefty increase in student tuition. The end results were a \$95.00 increase in fees and a total increase in tuition and fees of 9.5% increase for in-state undergraduate tuition and a 9.9% increase for out-of-state tuition, in-state graduate tuition, and out-of-state graduate tuition. If all of these increases are approved, it will bring in about \$10 million in revenues after money has been taken out for financial aid. Tuition increases of 25% is typically set aside for financial aid. ECU will be in the middle range of the UNC Schools. Still, this \$10 million is only about 20% of the \$49 million that was cut from the university's base budget; however, this is not a final decision until the UNC Board of Governors and the state legislature approve any increase. There is some concern that the UNC Board of Governors will put a ceiling on any tuition increases. Administrators at ECU will not know whether or not any new resources will be available until February 2012, but the policy is to proceed as if the increase in tuition will eventually be accepted. The new



philosophical discussion about tuition cost is based on how much additional cost can be placed on the students. The ECU Board of Trustees wants to maintain ECU's quality of academic programs; the Chancellor stated that he believes that ECU is at a "tipping point" in regarding the quality of education and that ECU must invest in more financial resources to maintain academic quality. This means that the students will have to pay more as the State of North Carolina pays less for higher education. There was an extensive discussion on whether or not this increase should be uniformly distributed between undergraduate and graduate students and how it would be distributed between in-state and out-of-state students. Two Board Members wanted higher tuition than what was recommended, but their amendment to the proposal failed to pass. No students, other than the SGA president, were present to oppose the proposal. The SGA President reluctantly supported the proposal as the lesser of two evils. The Chancellor stated that he believes that this says a tremendous amount about ECU's students.

The ECU Board of Trustees would like to see tuition increase money used to avoid any across the board cuts next year if the UNC Board of Governors and state legislature requires cuts for the universities again. The Chancellor's first priority is faculty compensation. The university needs to put money away to address this issue. The key to achieving this is the repeal of House Bill 200 that current limits faculty salary increases. A list of 14 priorities was passed around, all of which the Chancellor felt were important. Not all these can be funded. Again, we will not know if the tuition recommendations pass until February 23.

The Chancellor reported that Ron Mitchelson made a presentation of the progress made by the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees and that they seemed, impressed with the PPC's process. Chancellor is encouraging the committee to continue the current process. The Woodward Report was also distributed to help define what the term "unnecessary duplication of programs" meant. This report did not indicate any system-wide duplication. ECU's Board of Trustees had demanded a systematic evaluation and comparison of academic units almost two years ago. The Chancellor reported that the process has been slower than the Board would have liked, but the PPC wanted a longer process to ensure accuracy. Recommendations from the PPC will probably be presented to the BOT in late Spring 2012. Recently, the Chancellor mentioned that he attended a meeting of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities, where program prioritization was the main topic of conversation. Of these members, 96% responded that they were doing something similar to ECU's PPC process. Many universities have completed their reviews, but they spent much less time and fewer resources than ECU's review entails. The Chancellor said ECU has paid more attention to the nuances of doing this review, with the possible exception of the University of Arizona who he said is doing a very comprehensive review process. The Chancellor applauded the PPC's efforts, while noting that there are still a lot of questions, concerns, and ideas to be evaluated.

The Chancellor offered assurance that all revenue resources are being investigated in an effort to balance budgets without eliminating programs. He said that the University still needs to be prepared to find these financial resources. The University is doing well in nearly every other resource category, including Facilities & Administrative costs. ECU has more money than ever before from federal grants to improve research spaces. Mickey Dowdy completed the Capital Campaign exceeding the initial goal of \$200 million by \$20 million. This is just the start of a bigger campaign for the new year.

UNC Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Suzanne Ortega, notified the Chancellor that four more endowed professorships were awarded to ECU, bringing the total to 34 endowed



professorships for the University. Although this number is still low in general, the total has doubled since the start of the Capital Campaign and during a rough time during the economy. The Chancellor concluded his remarks by saying that In terms of efficiency and administrative cost, ECU has been an exemplar in both categories, and that this cost has grown very slowly in comparison to the university's peers.

There were no questions posed to Chancellor Ballard at this time. Chair Walker thanked Chancellor Ballard for his remarks and continued advocacy for the faculty, especially in these tough budget times.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The first topic discussed by Provost Sheerer was the funding of summer school courses. She stated that there are two funding categories for summer courses: receipts funding (face-to-face) and formula funding (distance education). Last year ECU's distance education numbers went down, significantly, for both summer sessions. The on-campus numbers have gone down because students prefer the distance education courses. In response to this demand, ECU is trying to create more summer courses with FTE funds. There is the same amount money available to offer courses this summer as there was last summer. The minimum enrollment for on-campus classes is 15 for Graduate courses and 20 for Undergraduate courses. To get these numbers back up, funding is being pulled back from new positions received, and the deans and chairs were asked to present proposals for distance education growth this summer. Four colleges have submitted proposals thus far including Arts & Sciences, Business, Technology & Computer Science, and Human Ecology. Fourteen other proposals were also received from individual departments. Faculty are paid 8.2% of their nine-month salary per course for the summer sessions. The Provost concluded by saying that faculty should talk directly to their chairs to see what summer teaching opportunities are available.

Next, the Provost addressed the topic of faculty searches. Presently, there are 39 faculty searches underway. Some searches are being postponed pending the outcome of the PPC Report. After the results of the report in January, these positions will be immediately examined so that the final searches for tenure-track positions may be completed.

The next topic discussed by the Provost was UNC General Association's Faculty Workload Committee. Dr. Ortega had asked Provost Sheerer to join a subcommittee of the UNC Board of Governors. They met to address their questions regarding faculty workload. ECU's Faculty Workload Policy was referenced, as well as the data from the Delaware Report, which has been used across the board, but relied solely on teaching. The Provost tried to explain that faculty roles include much more than just teaching. Dr. Ortega mentioned felt that they made progress and is working hard to continue to expand the Board of Governors' understanding of all the roles faculty have within the university.

Provost Sheerer announced the new Associate Dean of the Honors College would be Katie O'Connor. There were 7 applicants, narrowed down to 3 phone interviews, and then to 2 final interviews.

The final topic addressed by the Provost was academic catalog management system. ECU is one of the last large universities that manage its online academic catalogs in-house. There are 2 full-time people and one part-time person who work on the catalog. There is a committee looking at



Commercially available catalog management systems to determine the best option for ECU. Currently, 3 vendors are coming to campus December 13-15 to make presentations to materials management.

Professor Russell (History) asked the Provost why she was waiting on the final results of the PPC report before making any decisions on faculty searches. If ranked underperforming or low performing, the units could use the infusion of new blood to help them. Professor Russell noted that within the History Department, she felt they needed an infusion of new blood in order to combat the low performing ranking.

Provost Sheerer replied that she was not prepared to address the outcome of the PPC report at this point. The PPC spent a long time looking at whether or not they should add new information, and then spent more time interviewing deans. The committee has to put this new information back together before making recommendations that will be passed along to the Chancellor. Their recommendations will address what programs need to be invested in and which ones to reduce. The reason not to hire at this point was to await the recommendations of the PPC committee in order to hire new faculty in areas where programs will expand.

Chair Walker thanked Provost Sheerer for her remarks.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty  
Professor Walker provided the following comments to the Senators.

Academic Accountability – Numbers or people?

We are all aware of the recent initiatives, questions, and challenges relating to faculty accountability and the many types of responsibilities and activities that we are engaged in on an annual basis. Every academic year, we complete an annual report to showcase and objectify our quality and creative aspects of teaching, development of new courses and labs, in a variety of levels (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral), quantify research productivity, often within the context of student mentoring (at many different levels), indicate grants and journal articles submitted and accepted or/funded, and indicate our service within the many categories. For many of us, our creative activity is documented in various ways including juried exhibitions, performances, and creative works.

Now that the budget situation has plagued our state, legislators are questioning the average workload of university faculty members. Many do not understand the various responsibilities and number of hours that are spent on activities other than holding class on designated days.

Many ask about how often the professor is in the classroom? Actually define "the classroom". The connotation of the classroom is different today than it was 15 years ago. Whether through the distance education mode, the art or dance studio, science laboratory, clinic, or field-based work, the student receives and participates in learning. What is the effect of this teaching and learning in various venues? The general public is not aware that student mentoring is an important part of a professor's work. Many do not understand the impact of a professor's contribution to the region via creative activity, research, or clinical activities. What wouldn't exist if it were not for the faculty and its academic programs?

As I have said before, we need to tell our story. If you don't want to tell your own story or profile, consider telling someone's story. I'd like to provide you with an example of such an effort, by one of



Our very own senators – Professor Christine Zoller (Art and Design), who shared her excitement over one of her colleagues, and the story that must be told. I will now read to you, Professor Zoller's account of this faculty member in the School of Art and Design.

'Holly Garriott was a graduate student... at ECU here getting her MFA in Ceramics approximately 9 years ago. During that time she and another student wanted to have a gallery that would be for ECU students run by ECU students. She worked with a member of the community to obtain space in one of the buildings on Evans. She was successful in doing this and Emerge Gallery was born. Since that time, Holly has remained the Director of this gallery, but so much more has come from this. The gallery runs many different types of programs for the community including adult and children educational programs. National, regional, local and solo exhibitions are showcased throughout the year. This is a working gallery, which sells and supports student work with a sales shop and student senior exhibitions.

Pitt County used to have an arts council years ago, which was disbanded. Through the efforts of Holly and others in the community (including Nancy Ballard) Emerge Gallery is now the Pitt County Arts Council at Emerge. Many community programs are evolving every day. They are becoming a model for other communities within eastern North Carolina.

On top of all of this, Holly Garriott is also a full-time fixed term faculty member here at ECU. Through her efforts the School of Art and Design now has a course in Community Arts Management. This course prepares our students in the many professional ways needed to be successful in running art related businesses both personal and commercial. All of this is connected to the School of Art and Design and our Director Michael Drought is working with Holly and other community business members to support numerous events and communities opportunities. A recent major alumni exhibition was showcased at the Gray Gallery in the School of Art and Design and at the Greenville Museum of Art and Emerge Gallery. This is an example of a bond that has been created between our community and our alumni, which could lead to future support of our programs. All of this raises East Carolina University's connection with our community and makes it a model for other Universities to follow. Holly Garriott is a fundamental part of this and needs to be recognized for the contributions she has made to our school and to the greater community. This is an important story to tell. It shows the difference one person can make because there is an arts program at ECU. Holly Garriott and other former students like her bring the arts to our students and the greater community on local, national and international levels, which has an impact on the growth our community culturally, artistically and financially.'

Now, we need to tell more stories and share more profiles of our faculty and faculty-student relationships. Please share the call for papers request, with your faculty in your respective units and colleges. Now let's get the word out!!!!!"

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) thanked Professor Walker for bringing this outstanding faculty's activities to light and encouraged her colleagues to get involved and tell their stories.

F. Mark Sprague, Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Sprague (Physics) provided a report on the November 4, 2011, Faculty Assembly Meeting on behalf of Professor Catherine Rigsby who was out of town.



Professor Popke (Geography) asked for more details about "Academic First" and "SSP" referenced throughout the report. Professor Sprague replied that last year there was a meeting regarding academic policies and problems, and one of the terms discussed was Satisfactory Academic Progress. A number of recommendations were reached and given to the Board of Governors. Several of these recommendations were then acted upon, and together, that group is known as the Academic First.

Professor Sprague was thanked for presenting the report on behalf of Professor Catherine Rigsby.

#### G. Question Period

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked Provost Sheerer about distance education and what she saw as the potential growth for UNC Online.

The Provost replied that at the last Chief Academic Officers (CAO) meeting, two hours were spent discussing distance education. UNC Online is one of the pieces surrounding the complaints about how difficult it is to take an online course. It was been made a priority by UNC General Administration, but the program needs to become more user-friendly for students to use and for universities to understand what credit hours have been earned. Provost Sheerer believes that it is on the table for discussion, but stated that she did not know what will be done with it.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked about the plus/minus grading system and stressed that colleagues and students were not aware of the upcoming changes. He wanted to know from Provost Sheerer what was being done in preparation for the new system going into place Fall 2012.

The Provost replied that she had not thought about it recently.

Professor Taggart (Music) added that while he was Chair of the Faculty, the Senate and administration thought it best to ease into this new policy over a period of three years, so many may not be as aware of the upcoming change in the system. He agreed that there was a need for the University community to be better aware of the plus/minus grading system as of Fall 2012.

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that he sees two things going on in reference to the current activities of the PPC and the broader discussions across the country: assessment of low performing instruction programs and reallocation of resources. The low performing instruction programs are classes that are bundled together so limiting them does not save money. He then asked the Chancellor what the Board of Trustees was originally interested in regarding program prioritization.

Chancellor Ballard replied that he felt both of these issues were on the minds' of the ECU Board of Trustees. One of the things on their minds was that ECU minimize across the board cuts. The Chancellor stated that he agreed with this concept and that ECU should not reduce the quality of everything uniformly. The effort is to try to invest in those things that make the most difference for the institution when a university is able to determine what it is. When UNC President Tom Ross talks about program prioritization the General Administration is looking at low performing instruction programs and the Delaware Study. Long before President Ross's installation, ECU's Board of Trustees thought a philosophy that determined support based on performance and quality of the



Program was needed. The Chancellor concluded that he feels that our Board wants to be prepared for all three of the things discussed: productivity, quality and centrality.

Professor Brown thanked Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Virginia Hardy for providing the Overview of Student Affairs to the senators.

#### IV. Unfinished Business

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

#### V. Report of Committees

##### A. Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of October 5, 2011, which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, Department of Economics, and College of Nursing. Chair Walker reminded the Senators that the function of the Graduate Council was to consider policy and make recommendations to be passed to EPPC and Faculty Senate in addition to the alternate route to the Director of the Graduate School, Academic Council and eventually to the Chancellor for approval.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of October 5, 2011, which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, Department of Economics, and College of Nursing were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #11-96**

Professor West also briefly discussed ways in which the Graduate School had improved the services for students discussion of a graduate enrollment action plan to regain lost graduate admissions includes marketing more effectively, equipment improvement, media promotion of student and program accomplishments, and simplifying the application process. There were catalog revisions in regards to intellectual property rules for graduate students; they want to implement a compliance mechanism and means to formally agree to intellectual property rules. There was also discussion about transfer credits; they wanted compliance between degree and certificate programs. Agreement upon a maximum of 20% of total credits being transfer credits was reached, and the addition that exceptions may be made with the permission of the program director and the dean of the graduate school. Next will be a discussion of Appendix F, Section 2 on December 13.

Professor Perry (Anthropology): Stated felt that we lose more graduate students to other graduate programs. She would like to see Graduate Assistantships and tuition remissions addressed to keep current graduate students, more than marketing or advertising to gain new ones.

##### B. Agenda Committee

Professor Kimberly Heidal (Interior Design and Merchandising), Chair of the Agenda Committee presented the proposed 2012-2013 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates.

Agenda Committee will meet:	Faculty Senate will meet:
August 28, 2012	September 11, 2012
September 25, 2012	October 2, 2012
October 16, 2012	November 6, 2012



November 13, 2012	December 4, 2012
January 15, 2013	January 29, 2013
February 12, 2013	February 26, 2013
March 5, 2013	March 19, 2013
April 2, 2013	April 16, 2013
	April 23, 2013 (2013/14 organizational mtg.)

There was no discussion and the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-97**

C. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum matters contained in the October 27, 2011 and November 10, 2011 University Curriculum Committee minutes, which included (1) Curricular actions within College of Health and Human Performance, Department of Biology, and College of Allied Health Sciences and (2) Approval of UCC Curricular Action Table (modeled on GCC table) and changes to *University Curriculum Committee Curriculum Package Submission Helpful Hints and Checklist*, *Undergraduate Curriculum and Program Development Manual*, and *Undergraduate University Curriculum Committee Course Banking Form*.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked what the purpose of banking a course was. He asked if the courses that were not being taught have been banked for a long time. Professor Cain stated that it would be the particular academic unit's choice whether a course is banked and that banking courses was used to reserve the specific course number. Making a course inactive still allows students to see it in the catalog. When you un-bank a course, you have to do new paperwork. All courses are listed in the university catalogs, with a notation if banked and not taught at this time. The Committee is interested in working with units to clean up the catalog and update current listings of banked courses. It will be an opportunity to say that a unit still wishes to keep a course even it has been banked.

Following a brief discussion, the curriculum matters contained in the October 27, 2011 and November 10, 2011 University Curriculum Committee minutes, which included (1) Curricular actions within College of Health and Human Performance, Department of Biology, and College of Allied Health Sciences and (2) Approval of UCC Curricular Action Table (modeled on GCC table) and changes to *University Curriculum Committee Curriculum Package Submission Helpful Hints and Checklist*, *Undergraduate Curriculum and Program Development Manual*, and *Undergraduate University Curriculum Committee Course Banking Form* was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-98**

D. Committee on Committees

Professor Nelson Cooper (Health and Human Performance), Secretary of the Committee, first presented the second reading of the charge for a proposed new Standing University Academic Committee entitled Service Learning. Chair Walker noted that the Academic Council provided counsel and support to the Committee on Committees on the proposed charge, which will serve to review and recommend Service Learning designations for both undergraduate and graduate courses.

Second Reading of Proposed New Standing University Academic Service Learning Committee Charge (First reading held April 19, 2011)

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



2. Name: Service Learning Committee

Membership:

**The committee membership, including ex-officio members, should encompass a wide variety of disciplinary expertise.**

78 elected faculty members

Ex-officio members (with vote): The Chancellor or an appointed representative, the Provost or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences or an appointed representative, **the Vice Chancellor for Research & Graduate Studies or an appointed representative**, the Chair of the Faculty or an appointed representative, one Faculty Senator selected by the Chair of the Faculty, ~~the and one~~ student member from the Student Government Association, **and one member from the Graduate and Professional Student Senate.**

**Ex-officio (without vote): The administrative leader of the Volunteer and Service Learning Center or an appointed representative.**

The chair of the committee may invite resource persons as necessary to realize the committee charge. The chair of the committee may appoint such subcommittees as he or she deems necessary.

3. Quorum: 4 elected members exclusive of ex-officio.

4. Committee Responsibilities:

**A. The committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding proposed changes in the service learning requirements and regarding the service learning designation for individual courses. The committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding individual courses carrying service learning designation and reports those recommendations to the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.**

**B. The committee serves as a liaison between the Volunteer and Service Learning Center office of Service Learning and the Faculty Senate, reviews the activities of the Volunteer and Service Learning Center that program, and advises the administrative leadership of that center about service learning in the Service Learning Program.**

**C. The Committee reviews at least annually those sections within the *University Undergraduate Catalog* and *University Graduate Catalog* that correspond to the Committee's charge and recommends changes as necessary.**

**D. The committee sponsors and coordinates the annual ECU Service-Learning Conference and promotes and advocates for service learning across the curriculum, including learning outcomes and development of service learning courses.**

5. To Whom The Committee Reports:

The committee reports to the Faculty Senate its recommendations of policies, procedures, and criteria cited in 4, above. The committee recommends curricular changes to the university's service learning requirement to the Faculty Senate.

How Often The Committee Reports:

The committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and at other times as necessary.



Power Of The Committee To Act Without Faculty Senate Approval:

The committee is empowered to advise the **Volunteer and Service Learning Center** ~~office of the Service Learning Program~~ as described in 4.B. above.

8. Standard Meeting Time:

The committee meeting time is scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month.

Professor Ballard, (Child Development and Family Relations) moved to replace the two paragraphs in Section 4. Committee Responsibilities A & B with the following text.

"The committee promotes service learning and recommends policies for service learning courses; reviews proposals for service learning designated courses; makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding proposals carrying the service learning designation and reports those recommendations to the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee; and extensively collaborates with the staff and administration of the Volunteer and Service Learning Center."

She noted that the new paragraph eliminated redundancy, was aligned with other academic committee charges, and articulated what the committee currently does, i.e. reviews proposals. She stated that the responsibility ended with collaboration with the VSLC which better captured the relationship noting that the committee currently does not "review the activities" of the center as this is what the administrative leadership would do. She thought that the proposed amendment strengthened the charge and would not be controversial. The vote to amend the committee charge with the proposed replacement paragraph failed.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) moved to return the proposed charge of a new Standing University Academic Committee entitled Service Learning to Committee on Committees in order to address Professor Ballard's proposed revisions. **RESOLUTION #11-99**

Professor Nelson then presented additional revisions to the Standing University Academic Educational Policies and Planning Committee charge, noting that the Faculty Senate had approved the proposed revisions to this committee charge in April 2011 (#11-62). Following a review, the Chancellor requested additional revisions as noted in this report.

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

1. Name: Educational Policies and Planning Committee

2. Membership:

8 elected faculty members.

Ex-officio members (with vote): The Chancellor or an appointed representative, the Provost or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies or an appointed representative, the Chair of the Faculty, one faculty senator selected by the Chair of the Faculty, and one student member from the Student Government Association.

The chair of the committee may invite resource persons as necessary to realize the committee charge. The chair of the committee may appoint such subcommittees as he or she deems necessary.

3. Quorum: 4 elected members exclusive of ex-officio.



Committee Responsibilities:

- A. The committee considers the adequacy, balance, and excellence of all of the University's undergraduate and graduate programs relative to accepted academic standards. This consideration shall cover the undergraduate and graduate programs as problems or concerns arise.
- B. The committee advises the Chancellor on the educational policies and organizations, goals, standards, and procedures of the University following such consideration, as outlined in Section 4.A., or as requested otherwise by the Chancellor or the Faculty Senate.
- C. The committee reviews information concerning proposals for all new curricula, programs, and academic policies, or for revisions in all existing policies, prior to the implementation of such proposals in the long-range planning of academic programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, the various professional schools, the Graduate School, and the Division of Continuing Studies. The Committee uses **information regarding university academic standards and resources** ~~the University Academic Standards and Resources~~ as the basis for its reviews.
- D. The committee acts upon requests for permission to plan and establish all new degree programs and requests for permission to establish new minors. The committee shall use **information regarding university academic standards and resources** ~~the University Academic Standards and Resources~~ as the basis for its review.
- E. The committee advises the Chancellor of action to be taken if the University experiences financial exigency, or in the event that a major curtailment of an existing teaching, research, or public service program is considered (*ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures).
- F. The Committee reviews at least annually those sections within the *University Undergraduate Catalog* that corresponds to the Committee's charge and recommends changes as necessary.

5. To Whom The Committee Reports:

The committee advises the Chancellor through their report to the Faculty Senate as described in 4.B. above. The committee reports to the Faculty Senate concerning requests it has received from the Chancellor. The committee reports to the Faculty Senate the action it has taken on requests for permission to plan and establish new degree programs and requests for permission to establish new minors.

6. How Often The Committee Reports:

The committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and at other times as necessary.

7. Power Of The Committee To Act Without Faculty Senate Approval:

The committee is empowered to advise the Chancellor as described in 4.B above.

8. Standard Meeting Time:

The committee meeting time is scheduled for the second Friday of each month.

There was no discussion and the proposed additional revisions to the Standing University Academic Educational Policies and Planning Committee charge was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-100**

Faculty Governance Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, first presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection II. Vision, Mission, and Strategic Plan of East Carolina University. He noted that the First change removes some things from the



Administrative Part of the Faculty Manual, specifically the mission and strategic planning statements, and including a statement where these were expressing the need to review these guiding documents. (~1:08:00)

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

Revise and keep in the Faculty Manual.

## II. Vision, Mission Statement, and Strategic Directions of East Carolina University

The effective formulation of East Carolina University's vision and mission demands the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion among the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Administration, and the Faculty. Each should have a voice in the determination of ECU's vision and mission. Therefore, because of their educational, research, service, clinical, and other functions, the faculty should participate in the creation of ECU's vision, mission, and other strategic planning documents.

### A. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Vision

~~East Carolina University is a public, doctoral institution distinguished by excellence in teaching and research and is committed to serving the people of North Carolina and beyond.~~

### B. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Mission

~~The university mission statements express the purpose and character of the university. The statements are the basis for all university strategic planning. They guide the actions of the university and direct the development of evaluation criteria.~~

~~East Carolina University, a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina, is a public, doctoral university committed to meeting the educational needs of North Carolina. It offers baccalaureate, masters, specialist, and doctoral degrees in the liberal arts, sciences, and professional fields, including medicine. East Carolina University is dedicated to educational excellence, responsible stewardship of the public trust, and academic freedom. The university values the contributions of a diverse community, supports shared governance, and guarantees equality of opportunity. East Carolina University's motto is "Servire," meaning "To Serve," and it seeks to meet that obligation through the following interrelated components of its mission.~~

#### ~~*To Serve Through Education*~~

~~The educational mission of East Carolina University is to provide students with a rich, distinctive undergraduate and graduate educational experience. The university is committed to developing each learner's ability to discover, evaluate, and communicate knowledge; to make informed decisions; and to recognize a decision's ethical dimensions. The university also is committed to imparting a sense of citizenship and personal responsibility, fostering lifelong learning, and nurturing an understanding of the interdependencies of people and their environments.~~

#### ~~*To Serve Through Research and Creative Activity*~~

~~The research mission of East Carolina University is to advance knowledge, to encourage creative activity, to solve significant human problems, and to provide the foundation for professional practice through the support of basic and applied research. The university is committed to integrating research and creative activities in the educational experiences of students. It also is committed to enriching culture and being a leader in innovative research applications.~~

#### ~~*To Serve Through Leadership and Partnership*~~

~~The service mission of East Carolina University, as an institution with a tradition of strong regional ties and public outreach, is to provide leadership and to engage in partnerships supporting public education, health care and human services, cultural activities, and regional development.~~

### C. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Strategic Planning Goals for 2000-2005

- ~~• Expand the educational opportunities provided on and off campus by 20 percent.~~
- ~~• Enrich the learning environment for students.~~
- ~~• Increase the productivity of faculty, staff, and students in research and creative activity.~~
- ~~• Extend external leadership and partnership roles in eastern North Carolina.~~



- Be a leader in the development and application of information technology in higher education.
- Improve the quality and efficiency of its services and operations.

Faculty are encouraged to review the University's long range goals and objectives by reading *Strategies for Distinction, University Directions 2000-2005*, available through the office of Planning and Institutional Research.

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection II. Vision, Mission, and Strategic Plan of East Carolina University were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-101**

Professor Bailey then presented formal faculty advice on Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Policy. He stated the second issue is an example of the Senate being asked to provide advice in regards to latest aversion of the University's conflicts of interest and commitment in external activities and trade policy. The text is responsive to rapidly changing federal and state laws, as well as the Board of Governors Policy. It is not the final version, but the federal government and everyone else is becoming more proactive in determining exactly what we have to report. He would call the appropriate office if you have any questions.

Donna Payne (University Attorney) noted that what was before the Senators was almost exactly like what was currently Appendix I in the Faculty Manual, with only minor changes with different paragraph breaks and new headings in order to go into the PRR format. The revised document was presented to the Committee to avoid confusion where Appendix I states that this would go to the University Policy Manual. By August 2012, there will be additional changes from General Administration on this policy, so this document has very few substantive changes as a PRR.

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked if it was safe to do as we have done in previous years Mrs. Payne stated that the fact that you were doing something before does not make it less legal than 10 years ago. Greater level of details will be provided and applying the policy to the form is beneficial to all. This policy pertains to both faculty and EPA non-teaching personnel.

Following brief discussion, the proposed formal faculty advice on Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Policy was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-102**

F. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Scott Gordon  
Professor Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee, presented Curriculum and Academic Program matters included in the November 11, 2011 meeting minutes, including a Request to establish a Master of Science in Health Informatics and Information Management (Distance Education Format) within the Department of Health Services and Information Management in the College of Allied Health Sciences.

There was no discussion and the Request to establish a Master of Science in Health Informatics and Information Management (Distance Education Format) within the Department of Health Services and Information Management in the College of Allied Health Sciences was approved as presented.  
**RESOLUTION #11-103**

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that he has read several past EPPC minutes and is in the process of preparing for a unit review. He asked what was the process for academic program review within EPPC. Chair Gordon responded that the committee reviews what is presented to them from Associate VC Linner Griffin and requests additional information if necessary when revising the



materials in light of EPPC's Unit Program Review Criteria. He offered to talk about this further with Professor Popke following the meeting.

G. Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee, Britton Theurer  
Professor Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on a proposed Allocation of Research Space Regulation. The suggested additions are noted in **bold print** and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Research and graduate education are central to the mission of East Carolina University (e.g., *ECU Strategic Action Plan, 2010-13*). These activities require substantial infrastructure, including research space (Code 250 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd) and research support space (Code 255 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd). Research space is intended to promote the scholarly activities of faculty members and students in support of ECU's mission.
- 1.2. This regulation and its foundation principles explicitly align with ECU's REG 07.30.01, *Allocation of University Space*. The Chancellor has delegated full authority to the University Space Committee (USC) to approve all allocations and reallocations of existing University-owned and leased research space. In addition, ECU's REG 07.30.01 specifies that issues regarding the use of space in the Brody School of Medicine (BSOM) will first be considered by its Space Allocation and Reallocation Committee (SPARC) with recommendations made to the USC for final approval.

## 2. Guiding Principles

- 2.1. Research Space. Research space (Codes 250 and 255 of the *Space Classification Manual*, USDoEd) is a valuable resource and is the property of the State of North Carolina and is allocated to, and managed by, ECU as noted above. The USC, with administrative support from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research (IPAR), is ultimately responsible for the allocation and/or reallocation of all space (including research space) to colleges, schools, departments, and other units.
- 2.2. Research Portfolio. Research space allocations are not permanent. Research space is allocated to individuals and groups of individuals in order to engage research activities. Thus, research space may be reallocated as the University's portfolio of research activities changes. Since that portfolio is reasonably expected to change over time, research space also is expected to be reallocated in response to the changing environment and institutional priorities.
- 2.3. Research Space Management Levels. While possessing authority to allocate and reallocate all ECU research space, the USC recognizes and appreciates the knowledge of programmatic space needs and disciplinary expertise that is held at the unit level and grants relative autonomy to departments, schools, colleges, and centers/institutes. Departments, schools, colleges, and centers/institutes are expected to manage research space effectively so that it aligns with university priorities (see 2.4) and is used efficiently (see 2.5). Research space management levels are:
  - Level I allocations and reallocations occur within departments/units (i.e., between researchers within a department or a unit) and are typically managed by a chair/director;
  - Level II allocations and reallocations occur within colleges/schools (i.e., between departments and units within a college or school) and are typically managed by a dean;
  - Level III allocations and reallocations are less frequent, occur between colleges, schools, and divisions and these are managed by IPAR with direction and approval from the USC.



- 3.4. New allocations or reallocations will consider associated one-time and recurring costs. If subsidies are necessary, funding sources will be specified by end-users.
- 3.5. New allocations or reallocations will consider opportunities to co-locate similar types of research activity in order to share core or common space and equipment.
- 3.6. New allocations or reallocations will consider the effects of space assignments (including equipment and other infrastructure) on health, fire, environmental, accessibility, and safety compliance.
- 3.7. New allocations or reallocations will consider the primary reasons for a research space request and any possible secondary issues (indirect effects) that might result.

#### 4. Research Space Productivity

To insure that space is efficiently and effectively utilized, IPAR (as directed by the USC and assisted by units) will conduct biennial research space audits. Possessing quantitative and qualitative metrics, along with appropriate benchmarks, assists all management Levels (I-III) to ~~allocate, reallocate, and~~ optimize the use of research space. Productivity measures and benchmarks for research space are expected to vary ~~between~~ **among** disciplines. ~~Factors may be weighted or un-weighted within departments and colleges. However,~~ Financial measures **should be expected to** be one part of the overall assessment of research space productivity. Financial measures may include but are not limited to: total external research award dollars / **per** net assignable square foot (NASF), total external research expenditure dollars / **per** NASF, and indirect cost recovery dollars / **per** NASF. Non-financial measures of research productivity may include but are not limited to: number of refereed publications and books **completed or in process**, number of citations of published research **publications in process**, number of graduate students engaged, number of undergraduate students engaged, and other metrics as deemed relevant. **These and other factors may be weighted or un-weighted within departments and colleges.** Because of expected inter-annual variability in research productivity, a five-year moving average will be employed as the unit of research observation.

#### 5. Allocation/Reallocation Procedure

- 5.1. Initial (and subsequently altered) productivity measurement schemes at Level I (unit/department) must be communicated to and approved by the Level II (college/school) administrator and the USC. Productivity measurement schemes at Level II (college/school) must be approved by the USC. This process is intended to provide effective communication and reasonable alignment of approaches. IPAR will assemble, aggregate, maintain, and communicate all necessary research space/productivity data. A 5-year report of productivity of individual research spaces (for Level I analysis by chairs and directors), departmental/unit research spaces (for Level II analysis by deans), and college research spaces (for Level III analysis by the USC) will be prepared by IPAR with assistance from Levels I and II.
- 5.2. All research space requests for allocation or reallocation are initiated through IPAR's existing Space Allocation Request Portal. These entries can include space requests for new research programming or a change of existing use (to/from research). These requests typically are initiated by Level I or Level II administrators and provide necessary communication of space use in order to keep the inventory current and accurate. The USC must approve Level III (between colleges and/or divisions) requests. The key considerations for space managers at each level are included above (see 3).
- 5.3. Whenever a research space **is deemed unproductive** ~~falls below the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile of productivity among similar facilities~~ at any space management level (I-III, see 2.3) as a result of the 5-year audit, it will **become eligible to** be reviewed for possible reallocation at



- 3.4. New allocations or reallocations will consider associated one-time and recurring costs. If subsidies are necessary, funding sources will be specified by end-users.
- 3.5. New allocations or reallocations will consider opportunities to co-locate similar types of research activity in order to share core or common space and equipment.
- 3.6. New allocations or reallocations will consider the effects of space assignments (including equipment and other infrastructure) on health, fire, environmental, accessibility, and safety compliance.
- 3.7. New allocations or reallocations will consider the primary reasons for a research space request and any possible secondary issues (indirect effects) that might result.

#### 4. Research Space Productivity

To insure that space is efficiently and effectively utilized, IPAR (as directed by the USC and assisted by units) will conduct biennial research space audits. Possessing quantitative and qualitative metrics, along with appropriate benchmarks, assists all management Levels (I-III) to ~~allocate, reallocate, and~~ optimize the use of research space. Productivity measures and benchmarks for research space are expected to vary ~~between~~ **among** disciplines. ~~Factors may be weighted or un-weighted within departments and colleges. However,~~ Financial measures **should be expected to** be one part of the overall assessment of research space productivity. Financial measures may include but are not limited to: total external research award dollars / **per** net assignable square foot (NASF), total external research expenditure dollars / **per** NASF, and indirect cost recovery dollars / **per** NASF. Non-financial measures of research productivity may include but are not limited to: number of refereed publications and books **completed or in process**, number of citations of published research **publications in process**, number of graduate students engaged, number of undergraduate students engaged, and other metrics as deemed relevant. **These and other factors may be weighted or un-weighted within departments and colleges.** Because of expected inter-annual variability in research productivity, a five-year moving average will be employed as the unit of research observation.

#### 5. Allocation/Reallocation Procedure

- 5.1. Initial (and subsequently altered) productivity measurement schemes at Level I (unit/department) must be communicated to and approved by the Level II (college/school) administrator and the USC. Productivity measurement schemes at Level II (college/school) must be approved by the USC. This process is intended to provide effective communication and reasonable alignment of approaches. IPAR will assemble, aggregate, maintain, and communicate all necessary research space/productivity data. A 5-year report of productivity of individual research spaces (for Level I analysis by chairs and directors), departmental/unit research spaces (for Level II analysis by deans), and college research spaces (for Level III analysis by the USC) will be prepared by IPAR with assistance from Levels I and II.
- 5.2. All research space requests for allocation or reallocation are initiated through IPAR's existing Space Allocation Request Portal. These entries can include space requests for new research programming or a change of existing use (to/from research). These requests typically are initiated by Level I or Level II administrators and provide necessary communication of space use in order to keep the inventory current and accurate. The USC must approve Level III (between colleges and/or divisions) requests. The key considerations for space managers at each level are included above (see 3).
- 5.3. Whenever a research space **is deemed unproductive** ~~falls below the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile of productivity among similar facilities~~ at any space management level (I-III, see 2.3) as a result of the 5-year audit, it will **become eligible to** be reviewed for possible reallocation at



that level. **Each level must document and communicate expectations and measures for productivity.**

5.4. ~~At Level I, this~~ **Reallocation at Level I will** normally involves a chair's reallocation between researchers within a department or unit. At Level II, this normally involves a dean's reallocation of research space between departments. Given its authority, the USC will hear and reconcile any disputes that are not negotiated successfully at Levels I and II. Level III (between colleges/schools/divisions) reallocations by the USC must consider financial and non-financial measures of research productivity. Before any Level III allocation/reallocation is accomplished, a site visit and hearing of affected units will be conducted by the USC. Current research space occupant(s) will be provided with at least a six month notice of intended reallocation.

There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice on a proposed Allocation of Research Space Regulation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-104**

#### H. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Patrice Morris (Criminal Justice) presented several reports for information only. She began with the Key Improvements in the New Academic Integrity Policy, then the Online Form to Report an Academic Integrity Violation and finally the suggested syllabus inserts reflecting the new Academic Integrity Policy.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) asked if there was a mechanism whereby faculty are able to find the wording for placement in the syllabus. Professor Morris replied yes and directed him to attachment 9 of the agenda. She also noted that Syllabus Inserts Reflecting the Academic Integrity Policy was available on the committee's website.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked, in reference to attachment 7, Key Improvements in the New Academic Integrity Policy, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet noting faculty members' duty to report violations and aren't they against the policy suggested by this change? Professor Morris replied that she would take this question back to the Committee for an answer.

#### I. University Budget Committee

Professor John Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures), a member of the Committee, provided a brief economic view of the current budget situation and referred to information at everyone's seat outlining budget cuts/situation for each University Division.

Professor MacGilvray (Medicine) added that one reason for the increase in the budget for Academic Affairs at the division level was because they knew that there was a very large amount of money to be returned, with enrollment held the same. The budget cut came from certain areas, some of these positions were held centrally as it made no sense to distribute them only to take them back. Budget increases for academic allocations were low.

#### VI. New Business

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures), stated that in response to last week's PPC open forum, he and colleagues within his Department met and wished to express to the Senate their concerns and ask for their support. He then asked that he be allowed to offer a resolution as new



business. The Senators agreed to hear to the new business. Professor Given then provided a resolution regarding the Program Prioritization Committee's Draft University Self-Study.

Professor Roper (Medicine) asked the meaning of the final sentence: "...the Faculty Senate strongly urges the PPC to publish the corrected department data spreadsheets and the pre-adjusted department scores for productivity, quality and centrality." Professor Given replied that this would mean that the PPC would publish this information on its website as the current data templates are.

Professor Malek (Medicine) stated that all of these items should be done with or without the Faculty Senate's support. Professor Christian (Business) stated that he did not see that PPC was not doing these things. Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) agreed that a preamble would be important and necessary for inclusion in the final report.

Professor Given stated that the resolution was an attempt for a unified faculty voice to PPC with suggestions, which were not a part of the preliminary self-study report, to be addressed and included in the final report being presented to the Chancellor around January 15, 2012.

Following discussion, the resolution regarding the Program Prioritization Committee's Draft University Self-Study was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #11-105**

Professor Roper (Medicine) moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 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 DECEMBER 6, 2011, MEETING**

11-96 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of October 5, 2011, which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, Department of Economics, and College of Nursing.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-97 2012-2013 Faculty Senate and Agenda Committee meeting dates, as follows:

2012/13 Agenda Committee Mtgs.	2012/13 Faculty Senate Meetings
August 28, 2012	September 11, 2012
September 25, 2012	October 2, 2012
October 16, 2012	November 6, 2012
November 13, 2012	December 4, 2012
January 15, 2013	January 29, 2013
February 12, 2013	February 26, 2013
March 5, 2013	March 19, 2013
April 2, 2013	April 16, 2013



April 23, 2013 (2013/14 organizational mtg.)
---

**Disposition:** Faculty Senate

11-98 Curriculum matters contained in the October 27, 2011 and November 10, 2011 University Curriculum Committee minutes, which included (1) Curricular actions within College of Health and Human Performance, Department of Biology, and College of Allied Health Sciences and (2) Approval of UCC Curricular Action Table (modeled on GCC table) and changes to *University Curriculum Committee Curriculum Package Submission Helpful Hints and Checklist*, *Undergraduate Curriculum and Program Development Manual*, and *Undergraduate University Curriculum Committee Course Banking Form*.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-99 Returned proposed charge for the new Standing University Academic Committee entitled Service Learning back to the Committee on Committees for further review.

**Disposition:** Committee on Committees

11-100 Additional revisions to the Standing University Academic Educational Policies and Planning Committee charge.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-101 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual, Part II. University Organization*, Subsection II. Vision, Mission, and Strategic Plan of East Carolina University.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-102 Formal faculty advice on Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Policy.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-103 Request to establish a Master of Science in Health Informatics and Information Management (Distance Education Format) within the Department of Health Services and Information Management in the College of Allied Health Sciences.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-104 Formal faculty advice on a proposed Allocation of Research Space Regulation.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

11-105 Resolution regarding the Program Prioritization Committee's Draft University Self-Study.

**Disposition:** Chancellor, Program Prioritization Committee