

P
3
a

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 2012**

The special called meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, March 20, 2012, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senator absent was: Professor Carolan (Mathematics).

Alternates present were: Professors Rodriquez for Romack (Chemistry) and Levine for Terrain (Medicine).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 2010, January 2012, and February 2012 Faculty Senate meetings:

- #10-71 Revised College of Allied Health Sciences Unit Code of Operation (with edits).
- #12-01 Request that Parking and Traffic Services consider a policy to allow requests for priority "A" parking with consideration of work hours, gender, disability or other reasonable concerns.
- #12-02 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of October 19, 2011, November 2, 2011, November 16, 2011, and December 7, 2011
- #12-04 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection I. Organization of the University of North Carolina
- #12-06 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection V. Administrative Policy
- #12-07 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section III.I. Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements
- #12-08 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part X. The Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina
- #12-09 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XI. The Code, The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina
- #12-10 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of December 8, 2011
- #12-11 Curriculum matters contained in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of November 14, 2011
- #12-12 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.A. Access to Student Educational Records
- #12-13 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V. Section I.O. Privacy of Student Educational Records
- #12-14 Charge for new standing University Academic Committee entitled Service Learning Committee.
- #12-15 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the December 9, 2011 meeting minutes, including (a) Proposed Department Name Change from Department of Rehabilitation Studies to Department of Addictions and

Rehabilitation Studies within the College of Allied Health Sciences, (b) Request for authorization to establish distance education delivery of the MAEd in Reading Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the College of Education, (c) Request for authorization to establish a MS in Network Technology in the Department of Technology Systems within the College of Technology and Computer Science, and (d) Request for authorization to plan a MS in Biomedical Engineering in the Department of Engineering within the College of Technology and Computer Science

- #12-16 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the January 13, 2012, meeting minutes, including (a) Request to move and rename the Media Production (MPRD) concentration in the School of Communication to the Cinematic Arts and Media Production (CAMP) concentration in the BFA in Art Program within the School of Art and Design in the College of Fine Arts and Communication and (b) Request to establish a new concentration in the PhD program in Biomedical Physics: Integrated PhD in Biomedical Physics and MS in Physics – Medical Physics concentration within the Department of Physics in the College of Arts and Sciences
- #12-17 Additional revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix Y. Grievance Policies and Procedures
- #12-18 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of January 18, 2012 and February 1, 2012, which include curricular actions within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Human Ecology, Department of Physics, College of Education, and College of Allied Health Sciences.
- #12-19 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of January 12, 2012 and January 26, 2012.
- #12-20 Revisions to the University Undergraduate Catalog, Section 3. Admission and Readmission, Subsection Admission Requirements Nontraditional Students.
- #12-21 Approval of SOCI 1010 as a Foundation Curriculum Course for Basic Social Sciences.
- #12-24 Revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey.
- #12-25 Revisions to the standing University academic Faculty Governance Committee charge
- #12-26 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the February 10, 2012 Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including Request for Authorization to Discontinue the Pre-school Add-on licensure in the Birth through Kindergarten (BK) Teacher Education Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the College of Human Ecology, Request to add an Infrastructure Concentration in Construction Management Program in the Department of Construction Management within the College of Technology and Computer Science, Request to discontinue the Occupational Safety and Health Minor in Department of Technology Systems within the College of Technology and Computer Science, Request for Notification of Intent to Plan a Bachelor of Science in University Studies within the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and Unit Academic Program Review of the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology within the School of Medicine.

- #12-27 Formal faculty advice to move the administrator survey from paper-based to online administration in Spring 2012.
- #12-29 Formal faculty advice on the proposed Faculty Scholarly Reassignment Policy.

C. Ron Mitchelson, Chair of the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC)

Professor Ron Mitchelson provided a brief overview of the Reorganization White Paper, timeline of activities, and further considerations in the next phase of PPC regarding university organization scenarios. The White Paper contained a summary of existing academic structural elements at ECU, i.e., departments, schools, colleges, and divisions. It also included a set of possible change menus specified at three levels: divisional, collegiate, and departmental. The White Paper was authored by the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) as part of its charge from Chancellor Ballard issued in May 2011. Campus reaction to these possible elements of structural change was sought (campus electronic survey, college forums, Faculty Senate) prior to designing any integrated change scenarios. Faculty and staff within the divisions of Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies have also received an e-mail invitation to participate in a survey. A second document (due out by March 30) will highlight possible restructuring scenarios, including the existing structure. That document will form the basis of continued feedback and development of a final recommendation to the Chancellor that is due no later than April 30, 2012.

● In addition, Professor Mitchelson stated that the committee will continue to listen and thanked the committee for an opportunity for further feedback. Phase One of the committee's work was all about programs and departments and the measurement of productivity, centrality and quality of these units. The conclusion of phase one was a recommendation about recommending investment, maintenance and elimination of particular programs. Phase Two is now taking those university departmental building blocks and now the committee is looking at ways of assembling them. There has already been faculty reaction to the white paper that was distributed on February 15.

Ron Mitchelson then showed a Power point slide of the calendar benchmarks. He reported that the semester started with a series of interviews with the Deans; this took about twelve hours; the committee also looked at peer institutions to determine what the possibilities might be. No specific long range scenarios were developed in this first draft, because it was too limiting and too many variables and combinations were possible with all the variations. Instead, 57 change elements were identified and three levels were identified: division, collegial and departmental. Between February 17th and March 1st there were 12 college level forums and on February 24th the college level on line survey went live. In March this on-line survey was completed. The committee is thankful for the response to these menus of possible changes because without this feedback the outcome cannot be successful according to Professor Mitchelson.

● On March 30th from four to six scenarios will be distributed with financial estimates linked to each scenario. This is a negotiated outcome since units need to negotiate the details of these broad scenarios. The schedule has been modified so that a set of forums can be designed around each of the scenarios. The first scenario will be no change, basically "it is not broken so don't fix it"; there will then be four to five more controversial options. Since some of these scenarios will involve some colleges more than others it is expected that the faculty, administrators and staff of these colleges may attend one or more of these forums in greater

number than the general faculty. There are no dates established yet but there is a span of time in the second week in April that is now targeted for these forums. The final recommendation is due on April 30th.

There have been some complaints that there were too many items for consideration. The white paper that was distributed had five scenarios at the division level, 14 at the college level, and 38 options at the departmental or unit level. The college level forums were very valuable according to Professor Mitchelson.

About 2200 individuals attempted the on line survey and about 1000 surveys were completed. Professor Mitchelson stated that he received several hundred e-mails indicating that the survey was too long or that there were technical issues. Of those who completed the survey 34% were staff, 7% were administrators, and 59% were faculty. The "don't know" response was used frequently by respondents who were not familiar with the impact of potential changes outside their college or other working unit.

A table was discussed regarding option A-4: Reduce the number of Academic Units and create a strong Provost model. There were 1200 responses and in large part the respondents feared the disruptive nature of such a change and there were perceptions of cultural differences that 50% of the responses indicated were too great to offset expected cost. The full set of results for each of the 56 scenarios will be made available on the PPC website on March 21st.

In May 2011, the PPC committee was trying to decide if the prioritization part of the analysis should come first or if the re-organization part of the effort should come first. Professor Mitchelson indicated that he preferred that the prioritization effort go first but in May of last year no one knew how quickly the decisions would have to be made due to budget constraints. Members of the committee had been told that UNC- Greensboro had saved a million dollars by combining two colleges; the committee later learned that the real savings were almost no savings. Professor Mitchelson had the rosters and job descriptions of members of each college and when two colleges were merged and two EPA administrative positions and one SPA position was eliminated and that a Deans position could be eliminated along with two stipends for Associate Deans the savings could be in the neighborhood of \$350,000. Another combination of colleges could produce as much as \$277,000. If four colleges became two colleges the mean savings would be around \$300,000. The rule of thumb, in Professor Mitchelson's opinion, is that when you merge two colleges you could save about \$250,000. The PPC committee has worked hard to get solid roster data on all the colleges and the employment data is very good. In that way, reasonable estimates of savings can now accompany the various scenarios that will be distributed on March 30th.

Professor Mitchelson stated that the committee will be sensitive to the disruptions that are expected with any kind of merger of units or colleges. There is an institutional memory of a recent merger of departments that created a new college. The current effort is more open than when these changes occurred. Any mergers should lead to increased collaboration at the research or instructional level. The committee has learned that some programs do not want to remain where they are currently. Another principle that will be applied by the PPC committee is to not hurt the university. The pronouns of "them" and "us" are not appropriate in this effort since the planning is, according to Professor Mitchelson, all about what is best for all of us.

The floor was then open for questions.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated that he always has trouble ordering from a menu without prices so he was looking forward to seeing financial savings beside each action presented in the PPC so that he could see the savings. Professor Mitchelson responded that that information would be a part of the next round of discussion and March 30 report. He stated that using a market transaction analogy may not be fitting.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) asked what were the benchmark savings that ECU was striving to obtain, i.e. \$250,000 savings seen as real or just a drop in the bucket of what is needed. She asked what were the goals of PPC? Professor Mitchelson responded that there were no benchmarks given to PPC. He stated that he agreed that a cost savings of \$250,000 might not be enough to offset the disruption of some scenarios.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked if the proposed various scenarios and organizational changes were due to a strategic plan or financial means. He asked which had precedent? Professor Mitchelson responded that he did not think they could be uncoupled; when starting out, cost savings were the top priority but now through the process, we need a plan that might involve reducing programs and moving areas in collaborative efforts. Mergers not just to save money but to increase effectiveness are needed in the tough budget years to come.

Professor Novick (Medicine) stated that March 30 and April 30 were important dates. He asked if Professor Mitchelson expected that the number of scenarios would be reduced between March and April. How and when will the decisions be made once the recommendations go to the Chancellor? Professor Mitchelson responded that the goal of the committee would be to provide a single recommendation as the best direction for the university. Chancellor Ballard stated that he would take his time in making a final decision once receiving the report from PPC.

Professor Taggart (Music) thanked PPC for their hard work and for the reference to "do no harm". He noted his pleasure with the written faculty comments and felt as if these remarks might help narrow the choices down; he suggested all Senators read them because they will provide clear feelings of the faculty even when the opinions contradict one another.

Professor Holloway (Business) asked if PPC expected revenue from the 57 items listed in the report? Professor Mitchelson replied yes, he could imagine that happening but that was not the PPC's focus of drafting the White Paper. The focus has been on the cost savings side. There could be opportunities for external funding to be increased due to more collaboration.

Professor Stiller (Biology) asked if we were to face very large budget cuts in the future, are there additional scenarios being discussed that have not yet be publicized? Professor Mitchelson replied that the Chancellor has been given suggestions to address significant budget cuts and that cost savings increase as you move up from departmental, to college, to divisional level.

Following the discussion, Chair Walker thanked Professor Mitchelson for his presentation.

D. University Budget Committee

Professor Todd Fraley (Communication), Chair of the Committee, stated that simple questions relating to the budget could be answered in many different ways and that the committee would be involved in the process following more work by PPC. He reiterated what was noted earlier that PPC would need to provide a more definitive plan before the actual monetary savings could be compiled by the Committee. Senators were encouraged to forward to the committee any comments or questions received from their colleagues.

In addition, Professor Fraley stated that several times in the presentation of his report Professor Mitchelson's report he had stated "if you believe." Professor Fraley indicated that it was the job of his committee to provide the information so the cost figures are believable and understandable. Professor Fraley stated that what he has learned is that what appears to be a simple question, such as how much money can be saved by merging colleges, can be answered in many different ways. The relevant and accurate information needed to be transferred back to the Senators so they can inform the faculty in their units. When the scenarios are fully developed, the cost savings can be calculated. He assured the Senators that the University Budget committee is involved in the process.

Professor Howard (Communication) asked if he had an idea what was realistic to look at, i.e. reduction in force, copier contracts, etc. Professor Fraley responded that everything we have asked of Vice Chancellor Rick Niswander, Stephanie Coleman and others within the Division of Administration and Finance has been provided to the budget committee

Professor Cope (English) asked if the Faculty Senate would be involved in the process and reporting between March 30 and April 30? How will faculty be involved after school is out? Chancellor Ballard replied that worst case scenario was that in June the legislature would impose a high budget cut with a need for 4-6 million dollars by July 1 due to Medicaid expenses. Whether any money would come from the phase two recommendations seems unlikely at this point. All other sources would have to be utilized first. There are no pots of money to address any imposed budget cuts of that magnitude. The savings that PPC is looking at is more long-term and could be used later for future priorities that are seen as more central. The current year's budget cuts will not drive any decisions about phase one or two. All resource decisions should be made with phase one in mind; phase two will likely be a fall 2012 discussion and decision making process.

Chair Walker thanked Professor Fraley for his leadership on the Committee.

E. Discussion on Program Prioritization Committee's *Reorganization White Paper*.

Chair Walker stated that, this special called Faculty Senate meeting was scheduled to allow the Faculty Senators a chance to offer formal oral and written feedback relative to the PPCs reorganization White paper and potential changes in the divisional, collegiate, and departmental levels. Senators were encouraged to submit written feedback to the Faculty Senate, in support of their unit's stance and concerns for each of the separate levels of suggested change.

Senators are now able to stand and address the senate orally. She stated that she would call on each senator requesting to speak once within each level, and the senator may provide

comments, relative to their Unit's response for a three- minute period. The senator may speak again, only after all other senators have had a change to respond within each level.

She asked each Senator to stand when recognized, state your name and unit, and speak loudly enough or into the microphone so all can hear the comments. She also reminded Senators that, if they had not already done so, please email any formal unit comments to the Faculty Senate office for inclusion on the 3/20 Senate agenda which will be provided for PPC's use and consideration for the next set of scenarios, which will be released to the campus community on March 30.

Links to responses to PPC's Structural Change Analysis received from Faculty Senators:

Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Chemistry
Child Development and Family Relations
Communication
Harriot College of Arts and Sciences
Health and Human Performance
History
Interior Design and Merchandising
Music
Nursing
Nutrition Science
Physics
Political Science
Public Health
Social Work

Chair Walker then began the open discussion with the first of three levels of potential change, as proposed by PPC.

Faculty Senator comments on the Divisional Level Analysis

Professor Roper (Medicine) read from submitted comments that support keeping the Division of Research and Graduate Studies as a separate division. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Theurer (Music) asked a procedural question about how long Senators would be given to read their submitted comments. Chair Walker replied as much as 3 or 4 minutes.

There were no other comments at the Divisional Level

Faculty Senator comments on the Collegiate Level Analysis

Professor Novick (Medicine) noted that he did not that PPC took into account that a major responsibility of the School of Medicine was to educating medical students in public health. His department had just completed 2 accreditation reviews. Professor Novick stated that if the Department of Public Health was moved to the College of Nursing, their accreditation would not be in jeopardy. He stated that forming a School of Public Health with the suggested 5 disciplines as a scenario would not work. These divisions include epidemiology, biostatistics, and

recommended that the existing faculty could be simply grouped together and avoid an intermediate stage in forming a School of Public Health in the next two to three years. Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) spoke to the proposed redistribution of the various coded units within the College of Human Ecology, stating that currently the College has over a 100 year history with a shared vision and is cost-effective. The shared vision exemplifies theoretical training and involvement in actual community work serving the public. There are many identities within the college (therapy clinic, intergenerational center, daycare center) and each exemplify the vision of the college. The shared vision of the college mission of *Enriching Lives and Enhancing Community* was a major branding effort several years ago. A statement from a member of CHE was read by Professor Ballard also made the relationship of the mission of the college to the stated mission of the University : *To serve as a national model for public service and transformation.* Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Chen (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that she wishes to share responses from faculty within her department which were different for the two separate entities within the one coded department. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Sanders (Technology and Computer Science) in reference to the report, the STEM?? where would we go with the suggested move? We can only use engineering with limitation. The professional college focuses on application of knowledge and achieving engaged with the community. Some department included with them may not have the same goals and focus.

Professor Theurer (Music) read submitted comments from his academic unit colleagues.

Professor Edwards (Sociology) expressed his support for not breaking up the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Popke (Geography) expressed some of the Harriot College of Arts and Sciences submitted comments.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated he spoke on behalf of his school and his colleagues in urging that the four professional schools that combined to create the College of Fine Arts and Communication produce graduate prepared for the world after graduation. The faculty are now at home in a strong and visionary college that came into existence as a "shot gun marriage" but have thrived and created a productive environment for both the students and the faculty.

Professor Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance) expressed agreement in maintaining the current academic structure within the College of Fine Arts and Communication without taking on more disciplines due to the various goals and objectives.

Professor Zoller (Art and Design) stated that faculty within her academic unit conduct classes and research differently than others within the College and that it worked well. Faculty within her unit wanted to stay together as a working cohesive college.

Professor Cooper (Health and Human Performance) stated that there were concerns about reorganizing units when a School of Public Health has not yet been applied for or approved by the Board of Governors. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) endorsed the earlier statements addressed by Professor Popke stating that members from his department have collaborated successfully with others within the College of Fine Arts and Communication and did not think that the University needed to move the department into the College in order to continue collaboration.

Professor Perry (Anthropology) expressed support for the College of Arts and Sciences statement and approved unanimously that the College works best as one liberal arts college.

Professor Heidal (Nutrition Science) stated that faculty within her unit have expressed an interest in moving to another college or school of public health or a STEM program. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Bauer (English) stated the Department of English is large and that the faculty wants to remain in the College of Arts and Sciences as stated in the comments by Professor Given. She stated that the idea of separating the liberal arts curriculums from the sciences is disturbing and that she saw no advantages of a STEM curriculum.

There were no other comments at the College Level.

Faculty Senator comments on the Departmental Level Analysis

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family relations) reiterated comments shared earlier.

Professor Chen (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that Merchandising faculty within the Department of Interior Design and Merchandising were in favor of moving to the College of Business.

Professor Yoon (Social Work) stated that within his 6 years at ECU, there had been 3 different deans and department chairs within the College and that faculty are now finally thriving within the College. Faculty within his unit have asked that the Department of Social Work be left alone and not moved to another college. However, if the College of Human Ecology was dissolved and faculty within the Department had to move, he asked that the faculty be moved to the College of Allied Health Sciences. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Heidal (Nutrition Science) stated that faculty within her department were in favor of considering option #2 and option #4 and not option #3 because we don't know what the other options will be in the future.

Professor Howard (Communication) stated that there was a strong preference within his unit that they be allowed to stay where they were. Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor McGilvray (Medicine) expressed support for bringing in clinical and laboratory sciences but that the faculty in his department were not in favor of merging all 5 basic science departments. There would be more detrimental effects to recruiting and prestige than could be off-set by the benefits of such a merger.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) stated option 22 and 23 will only work if the funding comes with the potential merger. Units that are currently formula funded would complicate this idea of merger.

Professor Cooper (Health and Performance) stated that he would like to speak against options 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18. Item 11 which explores the idea of merging Hospitality Management is also not a good idea since the current faculty of his department use a social science and not a business model of inquiry and education. There are two examples where such a merger has not worked. Regarding item 17 the opinion of his faculty is that the current faculty are better together than they are if separated.

Professor Russell (History) stated that faculty within her unit did not support the suggested move and see history as a humanities although currently in terms of curriculum it is a social science. She stated that faculty within her unit function well within the College of Arts and Sciences.
Additional comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Professor Preston (Education) expressed strong support for breaking down structural barriers to allow faculty the ability to do more good with students and within the community. As a public relations concern, whatever kinds of reorganizations ECU ends up with needs to be carefully detailed to the public via news organizations.

Additional general comments Senators wish to include for the record

Professor Novick (Medicine) asked with respect to the remaining meetings this semester, would this topic be included on the Senate meeting agendas for March 27, April 17, and April 24? Chair Walker replied that Chancellor Ballard would address his timeline and additional issues relating to the continued work of PPC at each of the regularly scheduled meetings that he is in attendance.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked PPC if they had determined yet where ECU strategically wanted to be in 5 years? Also, it would be helpful to understand the strategic advantages of the changes being discussed beyond the tactical necessities of just adapting to the required budget reductions by moving departments and potentially dissolving colleges.

There was no new business to come before the body at this time and the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunt McKinnon
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Interior Design and Merchandising

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate