

P
S
R

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2012**

The third regular meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 6, 2012, in the Mendenhall Student Center.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 2, 2012, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors McFadden (Education/Secretary of the Faculty), Romack (Chemistry), Leorri (Geological Sciences), Taggart (Music/Faculty Assembly Delegate), and Scott (Academic Library Services/Faculty Assembly Delegate).

Alternates present were: Professors Tisnado for LaMere (Art and Design), Hegde for Triebenbacher (Child Development and Family Relations), Sorensen for Kerbs (Criminal Justice), Loy for Cooper (Health and Human Performance), Hashimoto for Deale (Hospitality Management), Gilliland for Levine (Medicine), and Frank for Smith (Technology and Computer Science).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolutions from the September 11, 2012, and October 2, 2012, Faculty Senate meetings:

- #12-82 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the April 25, 2012 and August 22, 2012 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- #12-83 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the August 31, 2012 Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes, including the Request to Establish a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP).
- #12-84 Recommendation on Implementation of New Student Perception of Teaching Survey.
- #12-86 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 5, 2012 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- #12-87 Curriculum matters contained in the April 12, 2012 (I of II) and September 13, 2012 University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.
- #12-88 Student Perception of Teaching Survey Forms, including SPOTS Laboratory Course Form, SPOTS Field-Based Course Form, and SPOTS Distance Education Course Form, as companion forms to the previously approved SPOTS Face-to-Face Form, to be implemented beginning Spring 2013 along with the previously approved SPOTS Face-to-Face Form.
- #12-89 Formal faculty advice on revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II, Section IV. Graduate School Organization.
- #12-90 Formal faculty advice on the Interim Regulation on Promoting Objectivity in Research funded under Public Health Service Grants or Cooperative Agreements or Contracts.

Letters concerning unit elections for 2013-2014 Faculty Senate representation will be mailed to unit administrators in early January. In accordance with the *ECU Faculty Manual*, elections are to be held during the month of February. Please call the Faculty Senate office if you have any questions.

The December 4, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting will be held on West campus in the Banquet Room A at the East Carolina Heart Institute, 115 Heart Drive (not Moye Blvd). Senators are instructed to come to the front building entrance, walk through doors past information desk. The Banquet Room A is down the hall on the right. Any faculty member with an A parking decal can park in the lot in front of the Institute. There will also be reserved parking in front of the Institute for those with B parking decals. This information will be included with the distributed December Senate agenda.

The Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee will host their annual ECU Scholarship Awarding Workshop on Monday, January 28, 2013, 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.

Below is a link for faculty to provide feedback to the 2012 UNC Strategic Planning Process.

<http://surveys.northcarolina.edu/index.php?sid=76125&lang=en>

Please direct any questions to Professor Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the UNC Faculty Assembly.

The University Budget Committee is studying departmental entrepreneurial initiatives for innovative revenue generation. The Committee wants to gather stories of success as well as roadblocks to success. We aim to share this information and help departments overcome impediments. If your department has attempted a project for revenue generation, please send your story to Professor John Given, Chair of the Committee at givenj@ecu.edu.

There has been an editorial correction made to the University Environment Committee's charge to reflect the accurate number of 4 elected members exclusive of ex-officio to equal a quorum. This correction corresponds with all other standing university academic committee charges with the same number of 7 elected faculty members.

Faculty are encouraged to contact the Faculty Senate office if interested in filling a committee vacancy on one of the two academic committees noted below:

2014 term open on Student Academic Appellate Committee

2015 term open on Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard discussed four topics in the general category of challenges to university, calling his comments, "The World According to Ballard." He urged that the university community work together to convince larger community of the overall value of the work and efforts provided by the university.

1. Budget sustainability: ECU is at a 15 year low with state-support for colleges per capita. UNC-GA is planning to have a group of consultants look at academic proficiencies.
2. Proactive planning with digital world as a system: ECU needs to demonstrate to the legislature that we are in a different sort of technological world; we need to plan proactively for the future of our distance learning efforts and use of technology in our learning environment.
3. Answering the question of whether students are learning and what the return on their investment is: A recent book, *Academically Adrift*, encouraged educators to better address whether we are teaching our students. We need better metrics to assess learning.
4. Access and affordability: This is a critical issue for the university community. Increased quality and less cost is a daunting challenge.

Each of these issues needs serious and in-depth discussions. Strategic planning process at the UNC-A level is focusing on degree attainment along with other topics. Some states have goals for degree attainment substantially higher than NC; we must keep quality in our classrooms in order to best address this goal. Students need to meet the needs of business and other employers, along with what value they add to their discipline and work world and what competencies they have acquired through their experiences in the institution.

ECU is involved in the continuous process of strategic planning, especially involving IPAR and SACS preparation on campus, looking at the question of measuring competencies and foundational skills. Chancellor Ballard has asked the vice-chancellors to examine strategic structure and to ensure we are accurately defining ourselves via our mission, vision, and five strategic directions. They have been asked to address those items that are in need of updating to become relevant at this time in ECU's history. This process will be blended with that of UNC-GA's strategic process as an integral and continuous process. IPAR is helping make sure that our strategic directions are blended in with the five goals of the university system; everything we are doing must be related to the goals of the UNC system, as presented by President Ross at the last Senate meeting.

In relation to the PPC Committee, Chancellor Ballard continues to receive input about their report for remainder of this semester; he expects that most of the recommendations will be accepted and are likely to be implemented around April of 2013 when the state legislature addresses the budget for the university system. An implementation period of about three years is currently expected. He noted that there likely to be a new leadership structure in the state legislature; many of ECU's best "friends" are no longer serving in the legislature.

No questions were posed to Chancellor Ballard following his remarks.

D. Phyllis Horns, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Prior to her remarks, she distributed two documents relating to a proposed School of Public Health.

Vice Chancellor Horns made a progress report on dental medicine, claiming it is "going like gang busters." The dental school's second class of students have enrolled and are actively engaged in their coursework in the new Ross Hall building on the west campus. There are 133 dental chairs in the facility, and faculty are invited to use their services. Second year students are anxious to be involved in their dental clinics in the very near future. Many positions are in the process of being filled to complete this vision; there is a hiring "frenzy" to fill positions related to the new dental clinics. Additionally, there is a current search for a new Associate Dean of Research to extend the search for resources external to university; faculty have already received over \$3 million for external funding. There is major progress on establishing a unit code, and faculty expect to bring their code draft for approval very soon. Their promotion and tenure processes are included and are important components of this document.

Vice Chancellor Horns also reported on the planning for the School of Public Health. She explained that the existence of health problems in eastern North Carolina and the fit of the mission of the Health Science Division and the proposed School of Public Health were primary reasons to propose the new school. Requirements for accreditation include the fact that the school must have independence and status and cannot be part of a School of Medicine. The school must offer the Master's of Public Health (MPH) degree with a minimum of 42 semester hours in five areas of public health knowledge, with a doctoral degree in at least three of these areas: biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental

health sciences, health services administration, and social and behavioral sciences. The accreditation process examines adequate resources including a critical mass of faculty, a culminating project by students, and engagement in activities supporting the professional development of the public health workforce. She distributed a basic timeline that included the following items for the next seven years:

- 2012-2013: Submit plan to establish PhD in Epidemiology; build MPH program; initiate planning for doctorate in public health; and continue campus dialogue on creating the School of Public Health.
- 2013-2014: approval of PhD in Epidemiology; submit permission to plan a doctorate in public health degree with concentrations in Health administration and biostatistics; continue campus dialogue on School of Public Health
- 2015-2016: enroll students in Epidemiology for the PhD; submit permission to establish the doctorate in public health; continue campus dialogue on School of Public Health
- 2017: school designation application to Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH); Doctor of Public Health (DrPH) approved
- 2018-2019: Accreditation process epidemiology PhD graduates; enrollment in both DrPH concentrations
- December 2019: accreditation site visit
- June 2020: nationally accredited School of Public Health

She explained that UNC Tomorrow was the impetus for this effort, trying to be strategic and intentional, in an effort to balance the needs of the campus and community to mount an accredited and impressive School of Public Health. For the Division of Health Sciences, this is a logical next step, shifting the focus to be more integrated with health issues with existing elements of the university via these plans. Faculty and staff in the division have been instrumental in the planning process. Efforts are being taken to align the proposed school with other areas of the university, i.e., Department of Public Health, Agrimedecine Institute, Center for Health Disparities; these entities are being aligned within the division to help capitalize on the resources of the institute to support the development and design of the School of Public Health.

No questions were posed to Vice Chancellor Horns following her remarks.

E. Terry Holland, Director of University Athletics

Coach Holland began his remarks by commenting on the campus' positive relationships with athletes, faculty, and administrators. Many athletes and their families have commented on positive impressions throughout campus from campus class visits the interactions with faculty members and perspective athletes and their families. He reported that in the past year, athletes have provided more than 6,000 hours of community service. Holland commented on the positive work on our campus by the faculty representative for the Athletics, remarking on his efforts to attend and support all sporting programs at the university. Holland compared Dosser's work with other faculty representatives on the ACC and emphasized the high level of integrity, which is evident in the representation by Dosser. Conference USA affiliation is improving, and the location of schools in the conference are closer geographically to teams within the conference. He commented that the best conference for ECU would be one, which would require limited travel time for student travel to sporting events.

No questions were posed to Coach Holland following his remarks.

E. David Dosser, Faculty Athletics Representative

Prior to Professor Dosser's remarks, he shared several written documents with the Faculty Senators and Alternates including Student Athlete Academic Highlights, 2011-12 Comparison Student Body vs. Student-Athletes, and 2011-2012 Academic Rankings of Squads in Conference USA.

Professor Dosser's remarks are provided here in their entirety.

"I have been a faculty member at ECU since 1988 and the Faculty Athletics Representative since July of 2003. As the FAR, I represent this body and all faculty members at ECU. I answer to the Chancellor and Provost. I teach half-time in the family therapy program and serve as the FAR half-time. All my salary is paid by academic affairs with half of it going back to the CDFR department for my release time. In addition, my travel expenses are paid by the Chancellor's office. I never accept gifts from the Athletic Department and they have quit asking me. I do get free tickets. I make a donation to the Pirate Club in addition to my regular donation in the amount of the free tickets that I receive. I like my job. It gives me great variety.

As the FAR, I provide a bridge between the academic side of campus and the athletic side with a focus on three main areas: welfare of student-athletes, academic integrity, and rules compliance. As the FAR, I am in an oversight and advisor role within the Department of Athletics, but I do not work for the Department of Athletics. I work for you. I am a faculty member first, and foremost. I hope I am doing a good job representing this body and other faculty members. Please let me know if I am not.

I appreciated getting this body's endorsement for another 3-year term, which began on July 1, 2012. I asked for that because I need the support of the faculty senate. Today, I want to talk to you about rules compliance and academic integrity and what we have in place to monitor what goes on with our athletic department. If you have been reading the papers, even if you do not read the sports section, it might seem that everyone in intercollegiate athletics is CHEATING. And it is not just athletes; it is coaches, other athletic department officials, and even athletic directors who have cheated in one way or another. The most recent scandal is just up the road in Chapel Hill. In some ways nationally, the tail may indeed be wagging the dog. Athletics have become too important and make too much money. I learned that in Division I, budgets range from over \$150 million to under \$1 million. How can that be a level playing field?

Our athletic budget is approximately \$30 million. College athletics are a business, but I believe universities should prioritize education. But the majority of our alumni are more interested in ECU football and not academics. I believe the faculty should be most concerned about academics. I want you to know what is in place at ECU, to catch, or better yet, prevent these sorts of problems happening here.

We talk to student-athletes at the beginning of every year about what academic fraud is and what could constitute an academic integrity violation and what the consequences of such actions are likely to be. In fact, they hear this several different times from several different people. Now, we have a monthly compliance meeting to discuss compliance issues with Dr. Ballard and Dr. Sheerer. In attendance at those meetings along with me are John Fletcher, Tim Wiseman, Nick Floyd, and Jamie Johnson, our new Associate AD for Compliance. Jamie also holds monthly compliance meetings with all our coaches. Jamie has also instituted a compliance newsletter. Jamie is doing a great job making compliance count at ECU.

Here is what you can do. As I have said many times, I wish faculty members were more involved with athletics and efforts to more fully integrate athletics into the educational mission of ECU. This is because student-athletes are admitted to the university as students not as athletes. When student-athletes choose their majors they are admitted to your departments as students and not as athletes. So faculty members are responsible for them sooner or later. The vast majority of student-athletes are doing well as students and will graduate without any possibility of playing professionally in their sport. So faculty members need to prepare them for the rest of their lives as best they can.

I also want you as senators to be certain that student-athletes are treated the same as other students – no better and no worse. Sometimes faculty members get caught up in trying to help the athlete too much. That is never good. That is the complaint at UNC-CH right now. Sometimes faculty members treat student-athletes unfairly, because they are athletes. That also is not good. Please be sure faculty members in your units are following the university excused absence policy. Compliance is every Pirate's Job, and that includes faculty members.

It is also important that you make your expectations regarding academic integrity very clear to all your students. Please let someone know if you have reason to suspect that a student-athlete may have cheated. Please let someone know if you have reason to suspect that a tutor may have helped a student-athlete too much. If you have questions or concerns, please call me. As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks today, I am sad about many things that are happening in intercollegiate athletics. But I still believe that we are doing things here about as well as can be done. I say that after talking to FARs from around the country at the Division I A FAR meeting, which I go to every year. I also represent C-USA on the Academic Cabinet and that is populated by FARs.

Dr. Ballard started an Academic Success Committee with attention given to anything related to the academic success of our student-athletes including graduation rates, APR scores, grades, majors, class attendance, where they live, initial and continuing eligibility waivers, and special admits. This committee is made up of four faculty members (Stacey Altman, Cal Christian, Mike Felts, and me), four athletic administrators including Nick Floyd, and four academic administrators including Dr. Sheerer. Right now this committee is meeting every month. Let me share with you some of the accomplishments of the Academic Success Committee, which has met approximately twenty-five times:

- Student-athlete attendance policy. We had a student-athlete attendance policy before, but it wasn't being enforced. We wanted a policy that could be enforced and everyone understands that when student-athletes are in class, they make better grades.
- We have carefully monitored the academic success of student-athletes.
- We have developed a conduct policy with careful attention to arrest and convictions and have determined that this allows equitable treatment for the fourth string quarterback and the starting quarterback.
- We have very carefully monitored each team's APR scores.
- We have revised the policy for special talent waiver-requests.
- We have very carefully monitored non-qualifier requests.

- We have carefully monitored what has been going on at UNC-Chapel Hill, in terms of their academic misconduct. Dr. Ballard has made clear those things should never happen here.
- We have improved the study hall for all student-athletes.
- We have dealt with the housing of student-athletes.
- We have carefully monitored the graduation success rate of ECU student-athletes.
- We have instituted academic integrity training for all student-athletes and they must pass a test that shows they understand what academic integrity is all about.
- We are revising the exit-survey that the NCAA requires us to deliver each spring and we want to implement a plan to review a survey of all returning student-athletes.

Coaches can and must recruit students who will graduate. We have to quit admitting athletes who do not want to be students. That leads to academic enforcement rather than academic enrichment. Coaches are teachers, just as we all are. They are interested in preparing their students for the rest of their lives, just like we are as professors.

Participation in athletics should enrich, expand, and elaborate the student's educational and overall collegiate experience. Involvement in athletics should teach important values and skills that apply to all areas of life. These values and skills include: teamwork, communication, sacrifice, hard work, managing success, coping with adversity, perseverance, confidence, courage, determination, humility, and time management. This is why employers like to hire student-athletes. And finally, the vast majority of our student-athletes are doing all the right things athletically and academically. We struggle with very few. We were on NCAA probation because of 5 student-athletes out of more than 420."

Professor Wilson (Sociology) asked if Professor Dosser could assure the faculty that he has everything he needs at his disposal to assure the Faculty Senate that ECU has integrity within the University's Athletics Department. Professor Dosser replied yes. No further questions were posed to Professor Dosser following his remarks.

G. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Sprague provided the following comments to the Senators.

"Can you believe it is November already? Today is the tenth Tuesday class day of the semester, and there are only four more to go! Faculty members are on the home stretch of the semester-long race to present material in a meaningful way and measure the quality of our students' work. We must discuss the plus/minus grading system one more time. As the faculty officers said in a recent memo, the plus/minus grading system is not optional. It is the only grading system at ECU for undergraduate courses. The *ECU Undergraduate Catalog* and the grade submission page in Banner both reflect this. The plus/minus grading system is in effect due to the efforts of this body. It was adopted due to a faculty-led initiative. Between 2005 and 2007 several faculty senators championed the issue of a plus/minus grading system. Due to their efforts in the senate and in senate committees, the Admission and Retention Policies Committee completed a thorough study of plus/minus grading systems and drafted the policy that was approved by this body and Chancellor Ballard in 2007. What about academic freedom and differences between various disciplines? Each instructor must determine the appropriate grading scale for his or her course. The grading scale must map student

performance (e.g. points earned in a class) to grades on the plus/minus grading system. The grading scale must address the learning outcomes of the course and must be clearly delineated in the course syllabus.

What can we expect for the rest of the academic year? I think that many of our activities will be dominated by what I call learning to live with the "new normal." After today, we will know more about the leadership of North Carolina for the next two years. What we do know is that our state funding will not be as automatic as it has been in the past. We are being asked to justify the way we operate, and we are being held accountable like never before. As Chancellor Ballard said, the strategic planning process is underway at the system level, and it will impact every one of us because resources and policies will be tied to this plan. We will be holding an online forum about the UNC strategic planning process. Look for an announcement about this soon. After the UNC-system process, the next phase is the ECU planning process. This will likely have a more significant impact on us than past strategic plans. We are being asked to identify priorities that are responsive to the needs of the state, and to connect our priorities with budgets, programs, positions, and policies. We must show that we make a positive impact on North Carolina and the region. I look forward to working with the ECU faculty and administration on strategic planning and to demonstrate the value of ECU and its faculty.

There is currently a study underway on the future of our ECU libraries. External consultants have been asked to make recommendations on how our libraries can better align with the "new normal." This report is likely to go beyond combining library administration and budgets and touch on faculty status and tenure for librarians. The Faculty Senate and its committees must be involved in this discussion. Any proposed changes to code units must follow the process in the *Faculty Manual*. The libraries are crucial to the faculty and our students, and it is in the interest of the ECU faculty and the entire university to have the best libraries and the best librarians possible, librarians that are involved in scholarship in their discipline and that are in touch with the latest issues affecting the library.

It is time for the faculty to take charge of UNIV 1000. As a matter of curriculum it is within our purview. In the coming weeks we will look to a faculty-led group to identify appropriate learning outcomes for a UNIV 1000 course and to work with student affairs professionals to identify content that they can provide as well as an appropriate model for our students to get this content.

The Faculty Governance Committee is once again considering revisions to our tenure and promotion procedures in Part IX of the *ECU Faculty Manual*. There is a long process for any changes to Part IX requiring approval by the faculty senate, the chancellor, and then the UNC General Administration. We want to be sure that our proposed changes are rational and meaningful, and cannot submit small changes every time we want to modify something. We will be announcing faculty forums on potential changes to Part IX soon.

This is a time of change. We are being asked to do things differently and to be accountable for what we do. We do make a difference for the people of North Carolina. Once again we must make our case. I will be looking to the faculty senate and the standing committees to participate in this process. We are up to this challenge."

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) stated that faculty within his academic unit were analyzing composite notes from the meeting last week with library faculty, Provost Sheerer, Vice Chancellor Horns, and two library consultants, which outline the faculty members' concerns with the process thus far. The final correspondence will be forwarded to Professor Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty, and Professor Robert Campbell, Chair of the University Libraries Committee, with a request to have this issue placed on the December Faculty Senate meeting. Professor Sprague stated that he looked forward to receiving this information and would make sure that the item was placed on the December meeting agenda.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) noted his confusion with the most recent memo distributed from the Faculty Officers on the new +/- grading system. He reminded the Senators that in July there was a memo from Provost Sheerer stating that faculty were not mandated to use the new +/- grading system. He also asked how course syllabi should be altered to reflect this change in procedures. Professor Sprague replied that he stood by what was distributed yesterday by the Faculty Officers and that there was no ambiguity on this issue. In reference to the course syllabi, given the lateness of the semester, no changes would be expected for the Fall semester.

Professor Knickerbocker (Foreign Languages and Literatures), in relation to the ongoing discussion on removing the option to grant tenure to library faculty and Professor Sprague's reference to the need for librarians to do research but left out teaching responsibilities, he asked was there significance to that? Professor Sprague replied no that he just left out teaching responsibilities and noted that he thought library faculty should be held to the standards of their discipline.

No further questions were posed to Professor Sprague following his remarks.

H. Andrew Morehead, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Professor Morehead provided a report on the October 26, 2012 UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting. No questions were posed to Professor Morehead following his remarks.

I. Approval of the Fall 2012 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

There was no discussion and Professor Morehead (Chemistry) moved approval of the Fall 2012 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates. **RESOLUTION #12-91**

J. Question Period

Professor Popke (Geography) asked Provost Sheerer or Vice Chancellor Horns to comment about current issues and discussions related to the academic libraries. Since the PPC recommended enhanced efficiencies, what current discussions are occurring, and how will tenure status and code unit status be part of the discussion? What is the role of the consultant in these discussions? Sheerer replied that the PPC report included the topic, not as a new one, where different models have been discussed about the library. She stated that at a former institution where she worked, tenure status was removed from people who worked in the library, since they separated the kinds of positions in the library. The PPC looked at role of libraries in all aspects of the PPC; they asked the question repeatedly if duties of faculty who work in the library align with the promotion and tenure process (Fund 1110 money pays salaries for library faculty members and Fund 1310 money pays salaries for other faculty lines). As a result of the PPC report, they decided to undertake a study about the question. They brought in two consultants, one the head of the ALA in Chicago, to guide the faculty and administration through a series of discussions about the future of the library. They emphasized that several models could be considered as a result of these discussions. Are there different ways of

doing things that may make the services we provide more effective? Efforts right now are to examine different models; the discussion is ongoing.

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) asked, as a point of clarity, was the Provost referring to Northern Illinois University when referencing librarians at other institutions giving up tenure status. Provost Sheerer replied yes, she was at Northern Illinois University in 1989 and worked with Peggy Sullivan who went through the process of removing tenure status from library faculty. Professor Reynolds noted that he and others had actually talked with Ms. Sullivan who had stated that the university never removed tenure status for library faculty but added adjunct status for faculty. Tenure status for faculty at that institution was never removed.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that the library situation sounded worrisome and that what the administration was thinking about doing all around campus was really a scary thing. She noted that what she was hearing from some General Administration and Board of Governors members was that there was a need to discuss if tenure was still needed at universities. So if the University administration was thinking about eliminating tenure at the same time as talking about budget problems, she was worried what was the ultimate goal of administration. Professor Rigsby stated that this activity would give a sign to those across the state that tenure was no longer needed at all universities and this type of activity puts all faculty at risk and she wanted to share this with the senators. She cautioned that getting rid of tenure for one set of faculty begins a "very slippery slope." Provost Sheerer replied by asking what was Professor Rigsby's question. Professor Rigsby stated that there was not one.

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Professor Hector Garza (Theatre and Dance), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum matters included in the September 10, 2012 meeting minutes, including THEA 3021, Writing Solo Performance. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters included in the September 10, 2012 Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-92

Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 19, 2012 and October 3, 2012 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, including items within the College of Nursing, School of Medicine, Department of Mathematics, and Center for Sustainable Tourism. He explained that an Ad Hoc Committee had been formed to design a Faculty Mentoring Award proposal, as recommended by Dean Gemperline. Two students were added to the committee. The proposal for the award will come forward prior to the Research and Creative Activity Week in Spring 2013. A statement of academic freedom was recommended for inclusion in the Graduate Catalog, similar to that contained in the Undergraduate Catalog. Advancement to Doctoral Candidacy process was a focus of discussion, along with a timeline proposed, common set of attributes, and standards for this designation. Further work continues within the Graduate Council on this topic by gathering information from graduate directors about the definition of Doctoral Candidate.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 19, 2012 and October 3, 2012 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #12-93**

Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees

A. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Reece Allen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 27, 2012, and October 11, 2012 meeting minutes, including items within the Departments of Geography, English, and Child Development and Family Relations and Schools of Theatre and Dance and Communication. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 27, 2012, and October 11, 2012 University Curriculum meeting minutes were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-94

Professor Allen then briefly discussed the Committee's action on Course Proposal Form in relation to the new +/- grading system and the Faculty Senate's discussion last month. He stated that the committee did not take any action on this matter. Chair Sprague explained that several leaders on campus had met and discussed the issue; there was a resultant memo sent to all faculty members on Monday, November 5, 2012. There was no action from the committee on this topic.

B. Service Learning Committee

Professor Kylie Dotson-Blake (Education), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum matters contained in the October 16, 2012 meeting minutes, including service learning designation for HNRS 2116, Living Green: The World between Technology & Humanity and IDSN 4700, Problems in Interiors. There was no discussion and the curriculum matters contained in the October 16, 2012 Service Learning Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-95**

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Ed Stellwag (Biology), Chair of the Committee, presented the curriculum and academic program matters included in the October 12, 2012, meeting minutes, including a new undergraduate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages within the Department of English, moving a graduate Certificate in Assistive Technology from the College of Allied Health Sciences to the College of Education, and discontinuing a Minor in Worksite Health Promotion within the College of Health and Human Performance. There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters included in the October 12, 2012, Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-96**

D. Committee on Committees

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee, presented the second reading of proposed revisions to the Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee Charge. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee Charge were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-97**

E. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology), Chair of the Committee, presented first a request to remove foundations credit from several Department of Philosophy courses and Department of Political Science courses. There was no discussion and the request to remove foundations credit from several Department of Philosophy courses and Department of Political Science courses was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-98**

Professor Brown then presented proposed revisions to the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS) Face-to-Face Form, stating that three additional questions were needed to be added to this survey to correspond with all others already passed earlier by the Faculty Senate, specifically:

21. On the average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course outside of class?
0-2 hours 3-4 hours 5-6 hours 7-8 hours 9 or more hours
22. What is your current class level?
Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Other
23. Which reason best describes why you have taken this course?
It is an elective course
It is a choice among required options
No other options available
It is specifically required

There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS) Face-to-Face Form to include questions 21, 22, 23 were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-99

F. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Rachel Roper (Medicine), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on University Behavioral Concerns Team Interim Regulation and stated that there were no suggested revisions to the interim regulation. She explained that the Chancellor had initiated this process in 2011 and that concerns about any member of the campus community can be reported to the University Behavioral Concerns Team. The focus is to benefit the individual and to support the university community. Any actions taken will be confidential and remain consistent with law and university policies.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) referenced the statement under item #2 *Members of the ECU community should report any situation involving a member of the campus community that could result in harm to anyone at the University*, and stated that this seemed broad and meant anyone at the University would need to understand personnel and privacy laws and procedures. She wondered if this could result in over reporting concerns, or worse when faculty or staff would not report something because they would think the person was misbehaving but not to the level of concern for the University. She asked if faculty would be liable for not reporting such misbehavior.

Donna Payne, University Attorney, stated that the purpose of the University Behavioral Concerns Team Interim Regulation was to provide a forum or place where faculty would report things that occurred that made him or her uncomfortable or set off alarms of concern in a confidential way. She believed that the forum created a less likely chance that faculty would report something confidential to someone not trained in FERPA and how to protect confidential information about employees and students. She noted that this regulation protected faculty in reporting or not reporting an incident and felt that the University needed to do the best they could to use the knowledge we have to keep all employees and students safe at the same time as protecting individual rights. She stated that the regulation did not cause as much a problem to liability as it did to protect people's safety, noting that there are two teams with one focusing on employees and another on students. She urged that university members do as much as possible to protect the safety of the university community. She explained that the issue of personal safety is much more important than the issue of personal liability. The proposed policies are designed to divide the employee responses from the student responses. The big change is that the change would separate two different setting.

Professor Boklage (Medicine) expressed his puzzlement as to how this proposed regulation related to the situation at Virginia Tech a few years ago. He asked where in the regulation did the activities of that event come into play. Attorney Payne replied that the regulation would come into play when faculty saw red flags in student papers submitted and reported it, when police knew that a student had obtained firearms and brought that information to the team, when a team member knew an employee or student was committed for mental evaluation. She noted that with this regulation in place, the teams meet regularly to discuss all of the information about various situations before the employee or student got to the point of being a danger to the University community. Together faculty, staff, and students, utilizing this regulation would prevent problems and keep all safe from misfortune.

Following discussion, the formal faculty advice on University Behavioral Concerns Team Interim Regulation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-100**

VII. New Business

Professor Mary Wilson (Nursing) requested consideration of a resolution in relation to the Teaching Grants Committee and proposed revisions to the 2013/14 Teaching Grants that was distributed to Senators prior to the meeting. Following a 2/3rds vote to hear this matter from the Teaching Grants Committee, Professor Wilson noted that Professor Donna Roberson (Nursing) was present to address any questions Senators may have. The resolution stated the following:

WHEREAS, the annual awarding of teaching grants provides full time tenured, tenure-track, and fixed term faculty with the necessary funds to improve teaching instruction at ECU; and

WHEREAS, the Teaching Grants Committee is charged with recommending policies and procedures governing the grant application process, criteria for the awarding of grants, guidelines for the use of teaching grant funds and procedures for annual reporting by grant recipients; and

WHEREAS, the Committee is also charged with recommending teaching grant proposals to be funded based on the merit of the proposals; and

WHEREAS, these funds are provided for projects that are creative and innovative or meet demonstrated needs; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has judiciously overseen this process and recommended the funding of over 245 exceptional teaching grants since 1983; and

WHEREAS, the 2012/13 academic year was the first year in which the Committee was unable, due to budget restraints, to recommend the funding of any teaching grants; and

WHEREAS, in late September the Provost acknowledged that limited funds (totaling \$114,000) were available for funding 2013/14 teaching grants; and

WHEREAS, the Committee met upon receiving this news to update the granting process and discuss possible changes to the criteria yet failed to meet the Agenda Committee's deadline for inclusion on the November 6, Faculty Senate agenda; and

WHEREAS, other than the usual editorial updates to the granting procedures, the Committee has elected to revise the criteria to limit the monetary amount awarded for summer stipends to no more than \$10,000; and

WHEREAS, the committee request approval from the Faculty Senate in a timely manner in order for the 2013/14 granting materials to be made available immediately to faculty to allow adequate time to meet the January 17, 2013 deadline.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate approves the limit in the monetary amount awarded for summer stipends to no more than \$10,000.

[Link to Revised 2013/2014 Teaching Grant Proposal](#)

Professor Karriker (Business) asked about the \$10,000 amount for summer stipends and how that related to the amount paid for teaching one summer course? Professor Roberson replied that

Summer stipends were awarded at a certain rate for all faculty the same way that those teaching a summer course are paid. The only difference with these grants would be that there would be a cap of \$10,000 paid to any one individual requesting a summer stipend since the funds for all were limited.

Following discussion, the limiting of teaching grants' monetary amount awarded for summer stipends to no more than \$10,000 was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-101**

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Anderson
Interim Secretary of the Faculty
College of Education

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 6, 2012, MEETING

12-91 Approval of Fall 2012 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-92 Curriculum matters included in the September 10, 2012 Writing Across the Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-93 Formal faculty advice on the curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 19, 2012 and October 3, 2012 Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-94 Curriculum and academic matters contained in the September 27, 2012, and October 11, 2012 University Curriculum meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-95 Curriculum matters contained in the October 16, 2012 Service Learning Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-96 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the October 12, 2012, Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-97 Revised Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee Charge.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-98 Removal of foundations credit from several Department of Philosophy courses and Department of Political Science courses.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-99 Revised Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS) Face-to-Face Form.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-100 Formal faculty advice on University Behavioral Concerns Team Interim Regulation.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-101 Limiting the teaching grants' monetary amount awarded for summer stipends to no more than \$10,000.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

revised 12/3/12