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Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

East Carolina University is a Doctoral/Research university that enrolls almost 28,000 students in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Established in 1907, the institution began as a Teachers Training School, became a four-year college in 1920, and became East Carolina University in 1967. In 1971 the North Carolina General Assembly restructured public higher education in the state, making East Carolina University a constituent institution of the consolidated University of North Carolina System. The institution is comprised of thirteen colleges and schools offering more than a hundred bachelor's degree programs, more than seventy master's degree programs, eighteen doctoral programs, departmental certificates, and first-professional degree programs in medicine and dentistry.

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

A. Assessment of Compliance with Section 1: The Principle of Integrity

1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters. (Integrity)

(Note: This requirement is not addressed by the institution in its Compliance Certification.)

Neither the Off-Site nor the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found any evidence of a lack of integrity on the part of the institution.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

2.1 The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies. (Degree-granting Authority)

Based upon review of the Constitution Article IX, General Statutes 116-4 and 116-11 and UNC Code, East Carolina University (ECU) has demonstrated degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency. The University of North Carolina (UNC) has given ECU degree-granting authority since the North Carolina General Assembly established the state higher education system in 1971.

Additionally, a review of the history of ECU summarizes the institution's growth and development. ECU was established by the General Assembly of North Carolina in 1907 as East Carolina Teachers Training School. The institution became a four-year college and was renamed East Carolina Teachers College in 1920. The North Carolina General Assembly granted authority to initiate graduate programs (1929), institute liberal arts programs (1941), change the institutional name, first to East Carolina College (1951), and then to East
Carolina University (1967). In 1971, the North Carolina General Assembly restructured public higher education in North Carolina, making ECU a constituent institution of the consolidated UNC system.

2.2 The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

A military institution authorized and operated by the federal government to award degrees has a public board on which both the presiding officer and a majority of the other members are neither civilian employees of the military nor active/retired military. The board has broad and significant influence upon the institution's programs and operations, plays an active role in policy-making, and ensures that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from the board except as specified by the authorizing legislation. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting board members are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. (Governing Board)

The current University of North Carolina System is the result of a restructured higher education system in North Carolina which brought all state-supported institutions of higher learning into a single system governed by the System's Board of Governors (BOG).

The 32-member BOG is responsible for the general determination, control, supervision, management, and governance of all affairs of the UNC's 17 constituent institutions, including ECU. The North Carolina General Assembly elects the 32 voting members of the BOG for staggered four-year terms. Special members are non-voting members with varying terms. Such special members are former chairs of the BOG, former state governors, and the president of the UNC Association of Student Governments (or that student's designee). No member, officer, or employee of the General Assembly or officer or employee of the state or of any constituent institution or spouse of any such member, officer, or employee may be a member of the BOG.

The BOG is required by state law to ensure that adequate financial resources are devoted to higher education; to develop, prepare, and present to the Governor and the General Assembly a single, unified, recommended budget for all the constituent institutions; and to set tuition and fees at the constituent institutions. The BOG approves academic programs and mission statements at all its constituent institutions, including ECU.

ECU specifically is governed by its own 13-member Board of Trustees (BOT). Eight members of the BOT are elected by the BOG, four members are appointed
by the NC Governor, and the president of the student government serves as an ex-officio member. Elected and appointed members serve a maximum of two consecutive four-year terms. No member of the General Assembly or officer or employee of the state or of any constituent institution of the UNC, or spouse of any such member, officer, or employee is eligible for election or appointment as a trustee. The officers of the BOT are the chair, vice chair, and the secretary. The BOT holds at least three meetings a year.

Powers, duties, and responsibilities of the BOT are defined and include the appointment and compensation of senior academic and administrative personnel, conferral of tenure, awarding of degrees, review and approval of plans and specifications of capital construction projects, and making recommendations for tuition and fees. In addition to powers and duties as defined and delegated by the BOG, the BOT serves as adviser to the BOG on matters pertaining specifically to the institution and advises ECU's Chancellor concerning the management and development of the institution.

Control of both the BOG and the BOT rests with the collective membership of the specific board in each case and not with a minority of board members with outside interests. Half the BOG members are elected by the North Carolina House of Representatives and half by the North Carolina Senate. Members serve staggered terms. As noted above, members of the BOT are selected by three different entities. BOT members also serve staggered terms. Thus, no single entity or individual controls the membership of either governing board.

Neither the chair of either governing board nor any member of either body may have a contractual or financial interest in ECU. And, as noted above, no officer or employee of the North Carolina General Assembly or of any constituent institution, or the spouse of any such officer or employee, may serve on either the BOG or the BOT.

Both the chairs of the governing boards and a majority of the voting members of the BOG and the BOT are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in ECU. Decisions made on behalf of UNC by its governors, trustees, chief executive officers, and chief financial officers are required to be made in the best interest of the institutions and are not influenced by any potential financial gain to the decision-makers. State policy prohibits the BOG from appointing relatives of BOG members to the BOT and places restrictions on any contractual relationships that can exist between members of both the BOG and the BOT. As prescribed by the policy, standing committees of the BOG and the BOT oversee application of, and compliance with, the conflict-of-interest policy. Standards of ethical conduct as well as standards regarding conflicts of interest for members of both the BOG and the BOT are in effect. The statute provides that any member of the BOG or the BOT who fails to comply with the statute is subject to removal from the board. In addition, the statute requires every member of the UNC and ECU boards to attend ethics training sessions and to file annual statements of economic interest.

2.3 The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board. (See the Commission
ECU provided appropriate documentation to establish the selection process and the responsibilities of the Chancellor position. The current Chancellor, who was selected in May 2004 by the UNC Board of Governors upon recommendation by the President of the UNC, is not a member of the ECU BOT or BOG. UNC Code Section 502 A identifies the Chancellor as the administrative and executive head of ECU, a constituent institution of the UNC.

The Chancellor has the power to exercise complete executive authority on behalf of the institution, subject to the direction of the president. The Chancellor is ultimately responsible for carrying out policies of the BOG and of the BO, evaluating the BOT policies, and reporting evaluation results to the BOT. The Chancellor reports directly to the President of the University of North Carolina system. The performance review of the Chancellor is in accordance with criteria and procedures as determined by the President and provided for in UNC policy. As chief executive officer of ECU, the Chancellor attends all meetings of the BOT and is responsible for keeping the BOT fully informed on the operation of the institution and its needs; however, he is not a member or presiding officer of the BOT.

2.4 The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service. (Institutional Mission)

East Carolina University’s mission statement reads as follows:

*To serve as a national model for public service and regional transformation by:*

- Preparing our students to compete and succeed in the global economy and multicultural society,
- Distinguishing ourselves by the ability to train and prepare leaders,
- Creating a strong, sustainable future for eastern North Carolina through education, research, innovation, investment, and outreach,
- Saving lives, curing diseases, and positively transforming health and health care, and
- Providing cultural enrichment and powerful inspiration as we work to sustain and improve quality of life

The mission statement is clearly defined, appropriate to higher education, and specific to the institution with regard to its particular foci of public service and
commitment to transforming Eastern North Carolina through teaching, learning, research, and public service. The ECU Board of Trustees (2008) and the UNC Board of Governors (2009) approved it. It is comprehensive and guides the Institution's planning processes.

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)

ECU developed a Model for Institutional Effectiveness that incorporates systematic and institution-wide effectiveness measures and assigns responsibility for implementation. This includes review of the mission, program review, and assessment of student learning outcomes. Additionally, ECU has committed significant resources and has adopted strategies that continue to enhance their ability to provide a transparent and sound basis for budget decisions, resource allocations, and plans for continuous improvement. ECU provides ample evidence that institution-wide evaluation processes are in place that lead to continuous improvement.

2.6 The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs. (Continuous Operation)

ECU is in operation and currently has students enrolled in degree programs. Enrollment history shows that the student population has grown to a current enrollment of 27,386. The campus operates more than 160 buildings on the main campus, health sciences campus, and west research campus. The University's academic programs are housed in 13 colleges and professional schools, including the Brody School of Medicine and the Ross School of Dental Medicine.

ECU offers 102 bachelor's degree programs, 2 intermediate programs (CAS, EdS), 77 master's degree programs, 75 departmental certificates, 16 doctoral degree programs, and 4 first-professional degree programs (AuD, DMD, DPT, MD). Tables included in ECU's Compliance Report provide direct evidence that there are students enrolled in degree programs effective spring 2012. The tables list every degree program by department and the number of students enrolled in that program or major as of spring semester 2012. The table also includes information pertaining to discontinued degree programs that currently have the last enrolled students completing the programs. The table also lists newly approved degree programs that may have few or no students enrolled yet.

ECU identifies itself as a state leader in Distance Education, with approximately one-fifth of student enrollment classified as distance students. Figures provided illustrate strong growth in Distance Education enrollment from 2006 to 2008, followed by successive years of stable enrollment of over 6,000.
2.7.1 The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit. (Program Length)

The institution offers 102 baccalaureate programs and 173 post-baccalaureate certificates and degree programs. The Undergraduate Catalog and a table of required credit hours by program provided by the institution indicate that all baccalaureate programs require a minimum of 120 semester credit hours. The Graduate Catalog indicates that all post-baccalaureate programs require a minimum of 30 credit hours. The table indicates that the MA in Mathematics requires only 24 hours. However, the Graduate Catalog identifies an additional six to nine credit hours for thesis or additional course work, totaling 30-33 hours. The institution grants credit by semester credit hours as defined in UNC Policy Manual 400.1.6 (i.e., 750 contact minutes per semester credit hour).

2.7.2 The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. (Program Content)

The institution’s mission, approved by the Board of Governors (2009), expresses dedication to “serving as a national model for public service and regional transformation.” Academic programs are intended to prepare students to “compete and succeed in the global economy and multicultural society.” The institution aspires to distinguish itself “by the ability to train and prepare leaders.”

Program degree and course requirements are listed by college in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Catalog. Course descriptions, including prerequisites, are provided in the catalogs as well. The institution completed a Prioritization Study (2010-2012) which included academic units’ description of contributions to the institution’s mission and strategic plan. Narratives for all programs were provided in documentation.

Degree programs have residency requirements. Undergraduate degrees require a that minimum of 30 semester hours and at least one-half of the total hours required in the major discipline be completed through enrollment in courses offered by the institution (Undergraduate Catalog 2012-2013, “Baccalaureate Degree Requirements”). Graduate degree programs require that students earn at least eighty percent of the required degree credits through enrollment in courses offered by the institution (Graduate Catalog 2012-2013, “Residence and Graduation Requirements”).

Program content and Prioritization Study narratives, residency requirements, and program development and degree proposal review and approval processes illustrate the institution’s efforts to maintain program cohesiveness and
compatibility with the institution’s mission. Institutional planning documents for requests for the development of new programs must include justification of the program’s support of the institutional mission and strategic plan. Mission alignment is reviewed by the Academic Program Development Collaborative Team and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate as part of the degree proposal review and approval process. These documents also specifically request evidence and discussion of similar programs at institutions of higher education in the state and nation. Requests for the development of new programs must include indication of societal need as well as other institutions identified, visited or consulted in developing the proposal.

All unit programs participate in an academic program review every seven years; a review schedule is posted on the Office of Academic Programs, Graduate School, and the Faculty Senate web sites. The institution’s Procedures for Unit Academic Program Review provides guidelines on the review process, timeline, self-study report and outcomes assessment, on-site review by a committee of internal and external reviewers, and biennial reports on action plan implementation. Reports are tracked on the institution’s Academic Program Review SharePoint Site. Some programs and/or academic units hold specialized external accreditation reviews that include a review of both undergraduate and graduate programs in relation to standards established for the discipline, including curriculum content. A list of degree programs accredited by professional associations, boards, commissions, councils and societies, along with the years of last and next accreditation reviews, was provided.

State licensure requirements for some professions (nursing, education, social work, etc.) include established curriculum mandates, which also provide content guidelines in the respective degree areas. The institution demonstrates student success on licensure exams. A list of relevant licensure exams and pass rates for 2005-2006 through 2009-2010 was provided.

*2.7.3* In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. *(General Education)*

Baccalaureate degrees require a minimum of 120 semester credit hours, including 42 semester credit hours (35%) in general education. The Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum is the general education program at the institution.
According to Faculty Senate Resolution 05-04 (2005), the fundamental goal of the curriculum is to “provide students with the fundamental knowledge and abilities essential to their living worthwhile lives both private and public. The curriculum is based on the faculty’s belief that the best way to prepare students for living worthwhile lives is to provide them with a solid foundation in the core disciplines in the Liberal Arts (the Humanities, Arts, Basic Sciences, and Basic Social-Sciences), in conjunction with a multi-disciplinary education in the specific areas of health promotion and physical activity and mastery of writing and mathematics competencies.” The Foundations Curriculum supports and contributes to a component of the institution’s mission statement: “preparing students to compete and succeed in a global economy and multicultural society.”

The curriculum is published in the Undergraduate Catalog, accessible online and in PDF format. Catalog information includes a rationale and program goals. The curriculum presents “a common, unified body of knowledge and broad, interdisciplinary skills.” It is distributed in four core disciplinary areas (humanities, arts, natural sciences, and social sciences); one multidisciplinary area in health promotion and physical activity; and two areas of competence (writing and mathematics). The number of semester hour credits required in each area is listed in the catalog. Students can easily complete at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics.

The institution’s Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee (FCIEC) evaluates courses requested to be included in the Foundations Curriculum to ensure that they are consistent with published goals. All foundations courses must ensure that students learn 1) subject matter, 2) fundamental concepts and research methods, and 3) relevance of scholarship in the discipline for the student’s overall education. A Request for Foundations Credit requires applicants to describe how the course’s content will meet the three foundations goals and to list examples of required course textbooks or other required materials that address that content. A sample course syllabus is required and must reflect coverage of the goals; readings and assignments that meet the goals must be identified. Documentation assists the committee in ensuring that Foundations courses engage students in work at the collegiate level. Course requests are reviewed by the committee, and those courses that meet the requirements are presented to the Faculty Senate for its vote and, if passed, to the Chancellor for final approval.

Individual Foundations courses are assessed in the academic unit delivering the course. Assessment reports for 2008-2009 through 2011-2012 were provided. Reports include learning outcomes for each of the three required goals, means of assessment and criteria for success, results and actions taken based on results. In addition to the annual assessment reports, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) was administered in 2007-2008 and 2011-2012. The CLA is designed to measure an institution’s value-added contribution to the development of a student’s ability to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems, and communicate clearly and cogently. Results indicated that in 2007-2008 the institution performed near expected, with a value-added percentage ranking of 42% of the 176 four-year undergraduate institutions participating. The 2011-2012 results indicated the institution performed near expected, with a value-
added percentage rank of 53% of the 161 four-year undergraduate institutions participating.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification and conducted an on-site conversation with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. Based on this review, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verifies and confirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

2.7.4 The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. (See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach." (Course work for Degrees) (Note: If an institution does not offer all course work for at least one degree at each degree level, it must request approval and provide documentation for an alternative approach that may include arrangements with other institutions. In such cases, the institution must submit information requested in Commission policy, “Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach.” This information should be submitted as part of the Compliance Certification.)

ECU offers degree programs at the bachelor’s, master’s, intermediate, and doctoral levels, as well as in four first professional areas, and provides instruction for all course work required for each program. Examples included in the Compliance Report document that at the baccalaureate level, the institution provides instruction for all coursework for the B.S. in Chemistry, at the Master’s level, the institution provides instruction for all coursework for the Master of Social Work degree, at the Education Specialist level, the institution provides instruction for all coursework for the Education Specialist in Educational Administration and Supervision, and the institution provides instruction for all coursework for the Ph.D. in Nursing and the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree. The Graduate Catalog and departmental website provide evidence of course descriptions and programs of study for the advanced degrees.

*2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. (Faculty)

The number of faculty at the institution is determined by a funding model provided by the University of North Carolina. Positions are distributed among the academic programs through discussions with the deans and the ECU Academic Council based upon institutional priorities, criticality justifications, and enrollment demands.

In the academic year 2010-2011, 83% of the total faculty at the institution were full-time. In all but two of the undergraduate programs, at least 50% of the total
credit hours in each area were taught by full-time faculty. For the two undergraduate programs below 50%, reasonable explanations were provided for the higher percentage of part-time instruction (e.g., off-campus internship supervision, clinical supervision, introductory level general education courses). The ratio of full time equivalent students (FTE) to FTE faculty for the institution is 17:1, well below the peer institution average. (The report offers two peer averages – 20:1 and 19:1. Nonetheless, the institution’s FTE student to FTE faculty ratio is lower than both of these averages.)

Although average faculty workload has increased over the last four years, the average number of sections taught by full-time faculty is below 4 (3.6). Advising is a faculty responsibility, but in areas where the advising load is heavy (i.e., the Colleges of Business, Nursing and Education), advising centers have been established to provide workload relief for faculty and focused advising to students. However, the National Survey of Student Engagement results indicate that first-year and senior students are satisfied with their interactions with faculty. The scholarly productivity of the institution’s faculty indicates that faculty workload provides adequate time for such activities. Likewise, the level of professional and community engagement is high, evident in the Carnegie Foundation “Community Engagement” classification and many awards received by individuals and the institution.

The institution’s procedures for program review and development of new programs ensure the number of faculty is adequate to support the programs. Also, several programs hold accreditation in the field which requires an adequate number of faculty to support those programs.

During the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s visit, the institution demonstrated that the number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution to ensure the quality and integrity of the academic programs. The team met with the Provost, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Emerging Academic Initiatives, and the Director of the Office of Institutional Research.

2.9 The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. (Learning Resources and Services)

East Carolina University maintains three facilities that provide information collections and services to support the university mission, with two arrangements for reporting. The Laupus Library supports the Division of Health Sciences and is located on that campus and administered through that unit. The Joyner library, located on the main campus, supports other academic areas, and is administered through Academic Affairs. It is supplemented by the Music Library, which is located on the main campus in the Music Center and supports music and theatre studies. Joyner Library includes a discrete Teaching Resources Center. Collection development policies and holdings statements for the two libraries outline collection processes, expenditures, and resources for the two
major libraries. A common Virtual Library provides access to electronic resources, with a common committee tasked with evaluation and subscription support. The libraries share a common cataloging initiative and a Summon overlay supports single-searchbox access to catalog and commercial database resources. Joyner Library serves the campus as a selective US Depository and provides the University’s institutional repository. Both Joyner Library and Laupus Library maintain Special Collections, with the focus of the latter on collections in the field of health sciences, supported by exhibits and relics displayed in the Country Doctor Museum at an adjacent site. Resource access is expanded through interlibrary loan services and cooperative agreements in place with North Carolina institutions of higher education. ECU’s Digital Collections unit digitizes unique content and provides online access. The collection and facilities assessment of the Teaching Resources Center provided in the Compliance Report dates to 2005.

2.10 The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. (Student Support Services)

East Carolina University provides student support programs, services and activities to over 27,000 undergraduate, graduate, dental, and medical students. In addition to programs and services for the general student population, such as the Office of the Registrar, Office of Student Financial Aid, Student Health Services, and Campus Dining, ECU also ensures that programs and services are targeted to the needs of first-time first year, transfer, special needs, honors, distance education, graduate, international, medical, and student athletes. ECU has more than 350 campus organizations within 22 different interest categories such as academic, arts, cultural, graduate, leadership, medical, military, recreational, religious, and service. There are 19 Varsity sports, as well as intramural and club sports available to students. The Student Recreation Center provides a number of wellness activities for students.

The Office of Student Transitions and First Year Programs provides a diverse array of First Year Programs such as Pirate to Pirate Mentoring Program, Camp P.I.R.A.T.E.S., and Pirate Read: ECU’s Common Read Program to prepare students for the college-level environment, learn about resources on campus, and development leadership skills. The Career Center on campus provides workshops, programs, and opportunities for students that facilitate career exploration, practical work experience, and professional development.

ECU offers academic advising services to students and has a Major Advisement Program (MAP) providing specialized advising services for those students who need additional support and guidance, such as those who are undecided or reconsidering majors, who are experiencing academic difficulty, or who have been readmitted to ECU. ECU advisors created MAP to assist students in making this important decision through individualized self-assessments, as well as career and major exploration.

To ensure that Distance Education students have access to supports, programs and services, ECU has developed web based processes that support all
students, both DE and campus. Dedicated e-mail addresses for both prospective students (options@ecu.edu) and current students (ocs@ecu.edu), in addition to a toll free number staffed by student service specialists, help students navigate the online resources available to them. They provide a single point of contact for distance-education students. OCS is charged with assisting ECU students away from the campus by identifying the nature of their concerns and marshaling the resources of multiple offices to bring that concern to a successful conclusion by providing students with general information, policies and procedures, and referrals to other support services on campus. Student Services staff are easily accessible to assist students through a dedicated email box or a toll free number. OCS publications and the Options for Adult Learners website provide information about admissions, advising, registration, bookstore services, library resources and other university services.

The Student Development and Counseling Center is housed in the College of Nursing to provide academic support, counseling and workshops for nursing students. Similarly, medical students also have a diverse array of organizations and interest groups that support the professional development of medical students through networking, community service, educational activities, and travel to conferences. The Medical Student Council is an elected governance organization whose purpose is to represent the entire medical student body and serve as a unified voice in the education, political, and social interests of BSOM medical students. The BSOM Personal Counseling provides confidential personal counseling and psychiatric services to medical students.

The Office of International programs provides orientations and support and a variety of transitional support services such as the First Friends Program, and engagement in the International Student Association.

After discussion with various administrators from the Office of Enrollment Services and the Division of Student Affairs, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee concluded that support offered to students is consistent with requirements of this standard. The services offered through Student Affairs demonstrate a myriad of programs offered to students to support their co-curricular involvement. Furthermore, this programming supports student learning and contributes to the overall development of student learning as well as student success.

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or Standard Review Report issued in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a systemwide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or Standard Review Report) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the
change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. **(Financial Resources)**

The institution did not provide its most current year audit and management letter for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review. Based on information from the Fiscal 2011 audit, the institution has sufficient current assets to provide multiple coverage of current liabilities. Working capital was $193 million on June 30, 2011, a $10 million increase from the prior year. Total revenues increased from $668,703,671 in Fiscal 2005 to $810,403,797 in Fiscal 2011. The institution routinely operates within its current revenues and continues to build financial strength. Long-term debt is manageable at approximately $160 million.

The institution provided the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee with an audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, conducted by the North Carolina Office of the State Auditor (NCOSA). The audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the *Government Auditing Standards*. Those standards require an audit to obtain reasonable assurance that the audit is free of material misstatement. In the opinion of the state auditor and based on the state auditor’s review of reports of others audits, East Carolina University’s financial statements represent, in all material respects, the respective financial position of ECU and its discretely presented component unit.

The institution’s net assets increased from $861 million in 2011 to $948 million in 2012. The increase of $87 million represents the residual interest in the assets after the liabilities are deducted. This increase is mostly due to increases in the investment in capital assets, net of related debt and unrestricted net assets categories.

Operating revenues increased from $420 million in 2011 to $461 million in 2012. Revenues represent amounts received or accrued, and are classified as either operating or non-operating. The $41 million increase is represented mostly by increases in student tuition and fees and patient services revenue.

Operating expenses decreased from $754 million in 2011 to $747 million in 2012. Operating expenses represent the amounts paid or accrued for operating purposes. The major contributing factor in the decrease occurred in supplies and materials where pharmaceutical cost of goods sold incurred a significant decrease.

The financial statements reveal the financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, representing the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for most recent year. Long-term debt is manageable at $166M, representing a $4M reduction from the previous year. The auditor’s report finds no deficiencies in internal controls considered to be material weaknesses.
The budget materials represent sound planning and management of resources, sound fiscal procedures and management, with oversight by a governing board.

2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. **(Physical Resources)**

The institution has invested significantly in its physical resources. There is strong evidence of facilities planning as evidenced in the 2012 Master Plan entitled “A Campus within Context.” The effective utilization of space is managed through using specific software tools and by insuring oversight by the University Space Planning Committee. The facilities respond well to the “ECU Strategic Action Plan,” which details the strategic priorities of the institution. The 2007 Facilities Condition Assessment Program Report identified a deferred maintenance backlog of $475 million for all facilities. Strategies have been identified to address deferred maintenance. The highest priority needs are addressed through the biennium budget request and the institution’s six-year deferred maintenance plan.

2.12 The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. **(Quality Enhancement Plan)**

The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan. See Part III for more information.

C. **Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards**

3.1.1 The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution’s operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution’s constituencies. **(Mission).**

East Carolina University's mission statement reads as follows:

*To serve as a national model for public service and regional transformation by:*
- Preparing our students to compete and succeed in the global economy and multicultural society,
- Distinguishing ourselves by the ability to train and prepare leaders,
- Creating a strong, sustainable future for eastern North Carolina through education, research, innovation, investment, and outreach,
- Saving lives, curing diseases, and positively transforming health and health care, and
- Providing cultural enrichment and powerful inspiration as we work to sustain and improve quality of life*
The mission statement is clearly defined, appropriate to higher education, and specific to the institution with regard to its particular foci of public service and commitment to transforming Eastern North Carolina through teaching, learning, research, and public service. The ECU Board of Trustees (2008) and the UNC Board of Governors (2009) approved it. It is comprehensive and guides the Institution’s planning processes. ECU’s mission statement is widely available to institutional constituencies. It is published in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Catalog.

3.2.1 The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer. (CEO evaluation/selection)

Documentation demonstrates that the ECU Chancellor is the chief executive officer of the University, and the UNC BOG is responsible for the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor (UNC Code Section 500.B). The UNC President nominates two or more names to the BOG who elects and fixes compensation for the Chancellor of ECU (NC General Statute 116-11(4) confirms this authority).

The BOG delegates responsibilities to the BOT as defined in Appendix 1 of the UNC Code, and the BOT participates in the evaluation of the Chancellor. As documented in UNC Policy 200.4 Assessment Process, the BOG adopted an assessment process for chief executives and governing boards of the University. In the fourth spring after a Chancellor’s appointment, and every four years thereafter, the President and the BOT collaborate to conduct a comprehensive review of the institutional Chancellor’s performance. This review process includes input from major campus constituencies such as faculty, students, and staff. The policy states that “the assessment process should include the BOG and the President as well as the institutional BOT and the Chancellors. The institutional BOT may work in coordination with the President and the BOG to initiate actions – such as an evaluation of the Chancellor – but those actions must be reviewed and approved by the BOG, except for those responsibilities outlined in Appendix 1 of the UNC Code that fully delegate authority from the BOG directly to the BOT of the constituent institutions. This comprehensive review provides an opportunity for the BOG to assess its own work as well as the performance of the President and for the institutional BOT to comment to the President about their respective Chancellor's performance....” This policy confirms that the assessment process offers the institutional BOT an opportunity to provide information to the President regarding their respective Chancellors. The process also offers a method for identifying any areas that may require attention and/or action. The BOG, ECU and the BOT participated in this comprehensive assessment as documented in minutes of the Chancellor’s most recent evaluation in spring 2010.

3.2.2 The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution’s governance structure: (Governing board control)

3.2.2.1 the institution’s mission
ECU provides support to document legal authority and operating control for the institution’s mission. Pursuant to Section 301 C of the Code, the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs makes recommendations to the BOG in all areas pertaining to the development of a coordinated system of higher education in North Carolina, which in this case includes the mission of ECU. ECU’s mission was approved by the ECU BOT in minutes for November 2008 and the BOG approved the ECU mission in November 2009. The approval of the mission statement by the BOG was communicated to the Chancellor by a memo dated November 19, 2009.

3.2.2.2 the fiscal stability of the institution

ECU demonstrates governance oversight related to the fiscal stability of the University. NC General Statute 116.11, the BOG is responsible for the general determination, control, supervision, management, and governance of ECU. Consistent with this statute, the UNC Policy Manual 700 A states that the responsibilities of the BOG are to ensure that adequate financial resources are devoted to higher education; to develop, prepare, and present to the Governor and the General Assembly a single, unified, recommended budget for all the constituent institutions; and to set tuition and fees at the constituent institutions.

In evaluating fiscal stability the BOG designated ECU as a “special responsibility constituent institution” in 1992. As outlined in UNC Policy Manual 600.3.2 as a “special responsibility constituent institution,” ECU has demonstrated governance and chief executive oversight and internal financial controls that enable it to competently and responsibly administer financial and other management authority as delegated to ECU by the BOG.

3.2.2.3 institutional policy

ECU has established oversight of institutional policy by the governing bodies, BOG and BOT. The BOG has clearly defined legal authority and operating control for institutional policy in NC General Statute 116-11(2) and Section 203A(2) of the Code in the UNC Policy Manual. The BOG delegates certain control to the BOT of ECU pursuant to NC General Statute 116-11(3) and Section 203A(9) of the Code of the UNC Policy Manual.

ECU has an internal process to recommend new or changes to policies, regulations and rules which are then reviewed by ECU’s Office of the University Attorney. All mandated policies require BOT approval, and all mandated regulations require Chancellor or Executive Officer delegate approval.
3.2.3 The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members. (Board conflict of interest)

NC General Statute 138A, The State Government Ethics Act, establishes standards of ethical conduct as well as standards regarding conflicts of interest for members of the BOG and the members of the ECU BOT. The statute provides that any member of the BOG or the BOT who fails to comply with the statute is subject to removal from the Board. In addition, the statute requires every member of the BOG and constituent institution’s Boards of Trustees to attend ethics training sessions and to file annual statements of economic interest.

Additionally, the BOG has a Policy on Dual Memberships and Conflicts of Interest that covers members of the BOG and the BOT. The Chair of the BOT reads the Opening Ethics Statement for BOT Meetings and the chairs of all the Board’s committees read a Conflict of Interest statement at the beginning of each meeting to remind board members that they must avoid conflicts of interest and appearances of conflict of interest.

All members of the BOT participate in ethics educational presentations conducted by the North Carolina State Ethics Commission, and file annual statement of economic interest with the Commission. The policies and procedures cited above help protect the integrity of ECU by ensuring that its board members exercise their authority honestly and fairly, and free from impropriety, threats, favoritism, and undue influence.

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. (External influence)

In accordance with North Carolina law, the Board of Governors is responsible for the general determination, control, supervision, management, and governance of all affairs of the University’s 17 constituent institutions, including East Carolina University. Half the members of the BOG are appointed by the North Carolina House of Representatives and half by the North Carolina Senate. Eight members of the ECU Board of Trustees (BOT) are appointed by the BOG and four are appointed by the governor. The president of the ECU Student Government Association is also a member of the BOT. The appointed members of both boards serve staggered four-year terms, and may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. No member of either board is appointed by political, religious, or other external bodies and no member can be removed by those bodies.

State policy requires that members of the boards of trustees of constituent institutions annually submit a Statement of Economic Interest form to the North Carolina State Ethics Commission. In addition, newly appointed public servants, who include members of boards of trustees of the constituent institutions of the University, must participate within six months of their appointment in an ethics and lobbying education presentation conducted by the North Carolina State Ethics Commission. Thereafter, the BOG and BOT must attend an ethics and lobbying education presentation at least every two years.
3.2.5 The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. (Board dismissal)

ECU has documented board policies that provide for dismissal of members for appropriate reasons in an approved process. Members of the BOG and the BOT are subject to dismissal for violation of section C of the State Government Ethics Act. Other reasons for dismissal of a BOG are outlined in Section 200B (1)(b) of the Code as follows: "Whenever a member shall fail, for any reason other than ill health or service in the interest of the state or nation, to be present for four successive regular meetings of the board, the individual’s place as a member shall be deemed vacant."

Members of the BOT are subject to dismissal for violation of Section 400 A (3) of the UNC Code which outlines reasons similar to those listed for the BOG and reads: "Whenever a member shall fail, for any reason other than ill health or service in the interest of the state or nation, to be present for three successive regular meetings of a board of trustees, the individual’s place as a member shall be deemed vacant."

While no members of the BOG have been dismissed since ECU’s last reaffirmation of accreditation in 2002, there was one member of the BOT removed in 2004 after he missed three consecutive board meetings.

3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (Board/administration distinction)

The statutes, code, and policies define an appropriate segregation of policy making function and responsibility between the BOG, BOT, administration and faculty of ECU. The BOG, as stated in NC General Statute 116-11(2), allows the Board to adopt such policies and regulations for the governance of the university as it deems appropriate and the UNC Policy Manual outlines the policy-making functions of the governing board include developing a long-range plan for a coordinated system of higher education, determining the academic programs and types of degrees to be awarded by each constituent institution, and setting enrollment levels of the constituent institutions. The President of UNC is the chief administrative and executive officer and has complete authority to manage the affairs and execute the policies of the UNC and its constituent institutions, subject to the direction and control of the BOG.

Evidence demonstrates the Chancellor is the administrative and executive head of ECU and exercises complete executive authority at the institution, subject to the direction of the UNC System President. The Chancellor is responsible to the president for the administration of the institution, including “the enforcement of the decisions, actions, policies, and regulations of the BOG applicable to the institution” (Code 502 (b) 3). The BOT carries out policy-making functions at the institutional level.
The faculty has a documented role in the recommendation of academic policy and appropriate procedures for institutional governance (UNC Code 502D.2). There is evidence that the Faculty Senate carries out these responsibilities to administer and implement policy is found in the ECU Faculty Manual Part II and the Faculty Senate minutes.

3.2.7 The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. (Organizational structure)

ECU has provided evidence of a defined organizational structure. The Chancellor is ECU’s executive officer, and the general authority of the Chancellor is published in UNC Code Section 502. Reporting to the Chancellor are six major divisions, headed by Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administration and Finance, University Advancement, Research and Graduate Studies and Health Sciences. Both a webpage and organizational charts are available on the institution’s website to publish the organizational structure.

The creation and maintenance of institutional policies are outlined in the Regulation of Formatting, Adopting and Publishing Policies, Regulations, and Rules, approved by the BOT. Regulations are approved by the Chancellor.

* 3.2.8 The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution. (Qualified administrative/academic officers)

ECU provided the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee with appropriately detailed job descriptions for each position designated by the state system. ECU also provided information related to the process utilized to evaluate job descriptions, and select candidates for vacant positions. The Compliance Report includes appropriate documentation (via spreadsheet) which establishes experience levels, responsibilities, and educational qualifications data for each person.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review determined that all administrators and academic officers are qualified and possess adequate credentials as well as administrative and professional experience for their positions. The institution provided detailed documentation of policies pertaining to the appointment, review, and evaluation of campus administrators. For Vice Presidents, Provost, Deans, and others as appropriate, the institution provided CVs, a description of responsibilities, and a summary of professional experience.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed policy documents as well as credentials and responsibilities of administrators and academic officers. In addition, the committee conducted interviews with the Associate Provost for Personnel Administration, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration in the Brody School of Medicine, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration.
3.2.9 The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. (Personnel appointment)

East Carolina University publishes policies addressing the appointment, employment and evaluation of all personnel. ECU has personnel who are SPA employees (subject to the State Personnel Act), EPA employees (exempt from the State Personnel Act) and CSS employees (Clinical Support Services). The East Carolina Policies, Regulations and Rules website provides evidence of adoption and revision of institution policies.

All ECU policies related to recruitment, appointment, employment and evaluation are available online via the ECU faculty manual, the ECU Human Resources website, the CSS staff employee Handbook and the ECU Faculty Senate website. Search authorization memos and examples of staff and administrative evaluations provide evidence of implementation and enforcement of policies.

3.2.10 The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators. (Administrative staff evaluations)

ECU provided the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee with an appropriate summary of the evaluation process utilized for administrators. In addition, the institution has outlined a protocol for allowing administrators and faculty members the opportunity to express their opinions via an annual survey process. The institution appears to utilize a layered approach with regard to evaluations to allow a variety of voices to be heard. ECU provided narrative and examples of tools which are used during the established evaluation processes. However, none of the examples provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee were of actual evaluations which demonstrate the evaluation polices in action.

Based on interviews with representatives from academic and other areas, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee confirmed that the institution periodically evaluates its administrators. Documentation of those evaluations are—in a decentralized fashion—retained in specified offices. ECU provided various samples of administrative faculty and staff evaluations. The institution allows employees to be self-reflective as well as set goals. Additionally, employees have the opportunity to share concerns with their superiors and receive feedback. The decentralized approach of evaluating individuals allows for greater oversight when and if conflict arises.

3.2.11 The institution’s chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution’s intercollegiate athletics program. (Control of intercollegiate athletics)

ECU has substantiated that the Chancellor has ultimate and active responsibility for the appropriate administration and financial control of the intercollegiate athletics program. This authority is provided to the Chancellor through UNC Code Section 502B. These responsibilities consist of administrative oversight (athletics policies and procedures, recruiting standards, academic performance
of athletes, and Director of Athletics and Head Coach selection/retention) and Financial Oversight (operating budgets, adequate information and control of the University's external foundation, the Pirate Club).

The Director of Athletics oversees all activities of the department of intercollegiate athletics and appropriately reports directly to the Chancellor. In his oversight of the University's athletics program, the Chancellor is guided by the University Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. According to the Bylaws of the BOT, “The Chancellor, who is specifically charged with the responsibility for the establishment and supervision of the institution’s program of intercollegiate athletics, shall consult with the Committee on matters relating to intercollegiate athletics, including the appointments of the Director of Athletics and head coaches for football and basketball. The Committee shall make recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding institutional policy on personnel, operating budgets, and long-range plans for intercollegiate competition.” The Chancellor receives additional assistance from the Director of Athletics and the athletics staff, the Faculty Athletics Representative, and the University’s Athletics Compliance Officer.

The Athletics department has a Policies and Procedures Manual for the Athletics Department that pertains to the daily operations of the athletics department. ECU has a Faculty Athletic Representative and Faculty Senate committees for University Athletics and Academic Success.

The Chancellor exercises fiscal control over the Department of Athletics with assistance from the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance. The VCFA reviews and monitors the budget similar to other University departments. The Chancellor reviews the NCAA Dashboard annually, enabling the Chancellor to compare East Carolina University results within the conference and within a peer group of institutions.

The documentation provided in the compliance Report includes adequate information to demonstrate that the Chancellor can determine that the East Carolina University Educational Foundation (Pirate Club) conducts its activities in a manner consistent with the institution's mission and with other external oversight bodies without compromising the integrity of the institution. The documents reviewed by the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee included the Operating Agreement of the ECU and ECU Educational Foundation, Inc., the Pirate Club Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws of the ECU Educational Foundation, Inc.

3.2.12 The institution demonstrates that its chief executive officer controls the institution’s fund-raising activities. (Fund-raising activities).

ECU has provided documentation to demonstrate that the Chancellor has appropriate control of the institution’s fund-raising activities. THE UNC Policy Manual Section 502A and 502B3 provide the Chancellor the authority and responsibility under the general oversight of the President of UNC and the BOG.
ECU has a well drafted regulation for the coordination of all fund raising activities at ECU. Additionally, the Chancellor has charged the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement with the responsibility of planning, implementing, and executing an effective program of private gift solicitation while also coordinating fund-raising activities for the entire University. The Vice Chancellor for University Advancement is the chief development officer for the University. To handle this responsibility the Division of Advancement has a well-structured organizational chart.

Organizational fund raising has focused on the five strategic directions outlined in the strategic plan and is supported in the campaign case statement. ECU recently completed a successful $220 million campaign in December 2011 (began in May 2004), surpassing the $200 million goal. The institution’s BOT and each of the ECU foundations passed resolutions endorsing the Second Century Campaign.

3.2.13 For any entity organized separately form the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs: (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. (Institution-related entities)

The institution provides evidence of formal operating agreements that clearly define the relationship between it and its five affiliated foundations. Written operating agreements formally describe restrictions and liabilities associated with these relationships. The institution’s five affiliated nonprofit entities are: the East Carolina University Alumni Association, the East Carolina University Foundation, the East Carolina University Medical & Health Sciences Foundation, the East Carolina University Educational Foundation (Pirate Club), and the East Carolina University Real Estate Foundation. The relationship with each affiliated foundation is consistent with the institution’s mission. Control over the activities of affiliated groups is acknowledged in each agreement. Typical wording is “both University and Association agree to comply with the policies and regulations of the University of North Carolina Board of Governors, the East Carolina University Board of Trustees, the President of the University of North Carolina and the Chancellor….”

The bylaws of each affiliated group describe the relationship with East Carolina University. The University also has an advancement division to manage the relationships with affiliated groups.

3.2.14 The institution’s policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. (Intellectual property rights)
East Carolina University (ECU) has clear policies and procedures governing intellectual property rights for faculty, staff and students. These policies and procedures are available on web sites for the Office of Technology Transfer and in the University Faculty Manual. All new employees are required to acknowledge in writing that they have read and will comply with such procedures and policies (Patent Agreement & Assignment). These records are maintained with the Office of Human Resources for the Division of Academic Affairs and the Office of Human Resources for the Division of Health Sciences for EPA employees, and by University Human Resources for all staff employees. The policies, rules and regulations website provides evidence of adoption and revision of ECU policies. The patent policy is under revision and was recently amended July 2010.

Graduate students are informed of ECU’s intellectual property procedures and policies through a link to the Patent & Copyright Policies page on the Graduate School web site. For additional reference, Graduate Program Directors are further informed about the policies in the Graduate Program Directors Handbook (Section 1.12). This fall, 2012, the Graduate School implemented an on-line training and certification program for all new graduate students to further assure understanding of University policies and procedures related to research, intellectual property and other relevant matters.

Undergraduate students are informed of ECU’s intellectual property procedures and policies as published on the web by the Dean of Students and in the Undergraduate Catalog.

**Distance Learning.** The institution provided the following documents in relation to intellectual property rights: Faculty Manual; Policy, Regulations and Rules website; and Regulations for Establishing a Copyright Use and Ownership Policy (Policy Manual, 500.2.1[R], 2000). None is clear concerning ownership of distance and correspondence education materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses or other media products.

In an examination of the Policy Manual website, Patent and Copyright Policies (Policy Manual, 500.2, 2001) indicates that copyrightable works by faculty include distance learning materials, described as “historically been deemed in academic communities to be the property of their creator” (XII, Copyrightable Works, 1a). The creator of the work, unless it is a directed work, sponsored work requiring University ownership, or a work for hire described in a written agreement between the work's creator and the Institution, owns the work. For Traditional Works or Non-Directed Works Involving Exceptional Use of Institutional Resources (XII, Copyrightable Works, 1a XII, Copyrightable Works, 1a XII, Copyrightable Works, 1a), ownership is by the institution which can release or transfer its rights with the institution retaining a shop right and/or right to require reimbursement and/or income if the work produces income for the creator.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the institution’s Faculty Manual does not specifically address distance learning materials.
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and interviewed college administrators. The Focused Report acknowledges that “(s)ome confusion resulted from our failure to explain that materials produced for distance learning may be considered “directed works” or they may be defined as “traditional works” at East Carolina University (depending on the resources allocated in producing the material, so defined in our policy”. This confusion is not resolved in the Faculty Manual.

The Faculty Manual has clear definitions of directed works and traditional works; however, it provides no guidance as to when, how, and by whom a determination is made as to whether a particular work is directed or traditional. This clarity of definition is important for distance learning materials since they are likely to require the allocation of university resources.

In discussions during the on-site review the Committee learned that university administrators are aware that there are problems with the policies related to intellectual property and that new policies are currently under development.

Recommendation 1: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that its policies are clear concerning the ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies should address intellectual property for students, faculty, and staff.

* 3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (Institutional Effectiveness):

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

ECU programs are engaged in ongoing assessment and take actions based on those results for improvement with various degrees of proficiency. The ECU Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Council, comprised of several working groups on undergraduate, graduate, and foundations programs, defines the assessment process and guides the review of assessment reports. In addition to program learning outcomes, undergraduate and graduate programs also assess institutional learning outcomes, which are directly linked to the strategic directions of the university. Every program on the Academic Program Inventory, stand-alone minor, and the general education program (a total of 302 assessment units) provided assessment reports in TracDat, the electronic institutional tracking system that documents strategic planning and assessment to document how educational programs supports the University’s mission and aligns to the strategic directions of the institution. The assessment process is comprehensive, ongoing, and intended to provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.
Annually, assessment data collected and entered in TracDat are sent to department chairs and associate deans. An overview or procedural outline is distributed to each unit to promote consistent implementation of the assessment plan across campus. Assessment results as well as actions taken based upon those data are included in the assessment report. A rubric is utilized by administrators to review assessment reports. The review process was amended in 2010-2011 to expedite the process and encourages more thorough review of assessment reports.

The narrative includes several tables that present data concerning assessment results and program improvements based upon those results. The 2008-2012 Assessment Units and Reports is a comprehensive list of each educational program, assessment results and related actions taken as a result of that assessment. The format of the report is concise, but the descriptions of the actions taken for improvement is sometimes unclear, noting that “future discussions are planned”, “further observation is needed”, “data is unavailable” or “the outcome will be changed,” with no assessment results/data analysis as the basis for change.

Although the samples provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee included each college and degree level, each degree level in individual colleges is not represented. For example, few graduate programs in the Colleges of Fine Arts, Arts & Sciences, and Human Ecology are included; undergraduate programs are underrepresented in the Colleges of Education and Allied Health Sciences.

Course Proposal Changes describe curriculum or course modification from 2004 through 2011 promoted by assessment results. This sample is small and not representative.

Periodic and ongoing program review is evidence of the institutional commitment to a culture of evidence-based assessment. The process integrates outcomes assessment data and other demographic data, and promotes the use of these data in planning and resource allocation. Program Review, Summary of the Use of Results, provides some examples of program improvement that follows the recommendations of reviewers during periodic program review. However, the sample is small and does not tie program improvements directly to outcomes assessment results.

While the institution has made progress in establishing and maintaining a culture of evidence-based, comprehensive assessment, the narrative and examples provided demonstrate varied levels of expertise regarding documentation of assessing educational outcomes and using that assessment for improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the Associate Provost, the Interim Director of Institutional Assessment, and other administrators and faculty and confirmed the Off-Site Committee finding that ECU programs are engaged in ongoing assessment and take actions based on those
results for improvement with varying degrees of proficiency. The format of the report is concise, but the descriptions of the actions taken for improvement is sometimes unclear, noting that “future discussions are planned,” “further observation is needed”, “data is unavailable” or “the outcome will be changed,” with no assessment results/data analysis as the basis for change. The Committee reviewed additional documentation related to assessment reviews and reporting.

The institution provides descriptions of four types of outcomes for programs in its document titled *Overview of Assessment Reporting for 2011-2012: Academic Programs*. In discussions with the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, the institution confirmed that each degree program should have a minimum of five outcomes, certificate programs are required to have three program learning outcomes only, and the foundations curriculum should have at least one outcome for each of the three goals in each foundations area. While these are guidelines, it appears that this document serves as *de facto* policy for outcomes expectations since it clearly describes the number and types of outcomes that each program should include.

Institutional Assessment personnel evaluate each plan component as developing, acceptable, or exemplary using their institutional rubric. The institution confirmed that the assessment planning process is embedded in the assessment report and consists of the outcomes and planned measures in the assessment reports. Individual programs are sent the evaluation reports for action, and the units are sent evaluation summary reports. The On-Site Committee reviewed several assessment evaluation reports and a sample summary report.

The institution provided a comprehensive Excel file with links to of all of its program assessment reports, a total of 386 lines of information linking to over 300 assessment reports. The institution's focused report refers to the “varying degrees of maturity” of assessment on their campus. A review of a sample of these reports reveals that the programs do not consistently conform to the institution’s expectations as outlined in their guidelines. Some programs report outcomes, the extent to which students achieve the outcomes, and use the results for program improvement well; for example, the BFAs in Art and Art Education in the School of Art and Design, and the BMs in Music, Music Education, and Performance programs in the School of Music. However, the assessment reports reveal a preponderance of evidence that many programs do not close the loop on the assessment process by using results for improvement. The following characteristics summarize some of the observed variations in the approaches to outcomes and assessment:

- Some programs have one learning outcome.
- Some outcomes are actually outputs, and/or outcomes over which they have no direct control.
- Some faculty use course grades to measure learning outcomes, or use other measures that are of limited value.
• Some use indirect measures – surveys, for example – to measure a learning outcome.
• Some programs set low expectations as criteria for success.
• The use of assessment data to improve programs is inconsistent and sometimes not readily apparent, and as mentioned earlier in this report, often stated as a future event.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the assessment reports and the institutional assessment evaluations for a sample of programs. The following examples represent programs that exhibit some of these variations.

Program: Biochemistry, BS.
This program reports one Program Learning Outcome only, for communication. The program reports that the outcome is being assessed currently, but the data provided is for 2009-10, and there is no data provided for 2010-11 and 2011-12. There is no criterion for success or use of the data for program improvement for this outcome. The other two outcomes are categorized as Strategic Planning Outcomes, which are actually outputs. One of the outcomes – getting hired or admitted to a graduate program – is one over which they have no direct control.

The feedback from the institution in the evaluation report confirms that the institution has requested changes in the assessment of this program, and lists the missing outcomes as “developing.”

Program: Chemistry BA/BS.
The BA and BS reports are combined, with two sets of expectations in the same report. The institution allows these degrees to be combined when the degrees are “in the same field in which the difference between required curricula resides in only one or two courses” (Overview of Assessment Reporting for 2011-2012: Academic Programs, p. 2). It is not clear how these distinctions are made at the program level. This program lists two Institutional Learning Outcomes, and one uncategorized outcome that appears to be a Strategic Planning Outcome, all of which are measured by the percentage of students achieving passing course grades (passing grades range from A to D). The Criteria for Success for the learning outcomes related to the mastery of organic and analytic chemistry concepts are: "30% of BA students will score at or above the 50% percentile on the organic chemistry subtest of the ETS major test", and it rises to 50% for students in the BS program. Results showed that student performance dipped in the 2011-12 cycle, which faculty link to a change in the test itself. The use of results is described as follows: “Like last year, student performance on individual topics from the test will be analyzed and faculty will be shown a breakdown of scores by topic. The data will be used to modify teaching practices, as noted previously.” This program uses course grades as outcome measures, the criteria for success appear very low, and the use of results is stated in the future tense, with no specific program improvements stated beyond the generalization that there will be modification of teaching practices.
A review of the institutional evaluation of this report reveals that the criteria for success for these outcomes are rated as “exemplary” because this “exploits nationally standardized tests from ETS.”

**Program: Clinical Laboratory Science, BS.**

For the learning outcome “Understands how cultural beliefs, values and sensibilities shape people's perceptions and impact global decisions and actions,” the assessment is the “completion of a worksheet on diversity in the clinical laboratory as part of requirements for CLSC 4802 Professional Practice Issues II.” The results reveal that “they all completed the worksheet and answers reflected their awareness of the diversity in the class.” The use of results is that “This worksheet appears to be an effective way to discuss cultural diversity in the clinical laboratory and in the students themselves. More questions need to be added that ask students to comment on their own diversity and what surprised them about their fellow students’ cultural beliefs.” The use of results to modify the assessment instrument is clear, but the use of results to modify the program is absent. The institutional assessment evaluation reveals that they have noted the deficiency in this outcome.

**Program: Speech and Hearing Science, BS.**

One Institutional Learning Outcome for this program is: “Applies leadership principles relevant to the chosen discipline.” This is measured by the percentage of class membership in the National Student Speech Language Hearing Association. The Criterion for success is that 50% of the students in the program hold membership in the association. The results reveal that the student members participated in the planning, fund-raising, organization and implementation of an annual symposium. The use of results was a review of the symposium evaluation report and the decision to reduce the symposium to a one-day event and to reduce the cost of registration. There is no readily discernible relationship between the outcome – application of leadership principles – to the measure, the results, or the use of the results.

A Program Learning Outcome for this program is “Uses disciplinary concepts to explain how global and local issues are interconnected.” This is assessed by in-class demonstration exercises; the Criterion for Success is passing class exams. The results reported are that students were successful, but the report is silent on how success is measured or determined. The use of results was that faculty will track exam questions. While tracking exam questions is an appropriate strategy, there is no connection of this strategy to the modification or improvement of the program.

Another Program Learning Outcome is that “The student will acquire knowledge of the normal processes of speech, hearing, and language.” This is assessed by tracking the number of students who maintain a 2.5 GPA in all CSDI courses, which is a degree requirement. This also appears to be inconsistent with the online catalog, which states that “Majors must maintain the overall 3.2 GPA and all CSDI courses must be passed with a minimum grade of C.” GPA is an inadequate measure of
This outcome, because grades and GPAs commingle many factors that are not direct measures of student learning.

The institutional assessment evaluation report confirms that they are aware of these deficiencies.

**Program: Finance, BSBA.**

This program lists two learning outcomes that are each measured by the "average case grade," which should be >75% to be considered successful. Using a measure of central tendency (the mean) as a learning outcome criterion for success is minimally useful because the individual variability of student performance is lost. There is not a way for the faculty to know how many students performed at particular levels of achievement. Additionally, the program reports that they began assessing these outcomes in 2011, but the report includes data on the Portfolio Theory outcome for 2008-2011.

The institutional evaluation report does not address these issues.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was presented with the institution's revised and expanded institutional effectiveness assessment process plan, which addresses the institutional role of the Institutional Assessment Advisory Council (IAAC) that was established in September 2012. The committee reviewed the March 2013 draft of the process plan, which outlines the duties and responsibilities of the IAAC. This is a positive step for the institution in its efforts to strengthen institutional effectiveness of educational programs.

After reviewing the additional evidence provided, the Committee makes the following observations:

- The institution has clear guidelines on the numbers and types of outcomes each program should develop. The programs are not consistently meeting these guidelines. The institution has taken positive steps to develop and implement an institutional assessment review process to ensure that the program faculty meets institutional guidelines for the number and types of outcomes in the programs.

- The institution provides guidelines for developing assessment reports and has a rubric for reviewing these reports. The rubric addresses the elements of the reports and provides levels of achievement for each. These results are reported back to the programs for action and summary reports are sent to associate deans. There has not been sufficient time, however, for the institution to realize program-level assessment modifications based on this feedback.

The institution has provided evidence that expected outcomes are identified, and the institution assesses the extent to which these outcomes are achieved. The institution has not, however, provided evidence that programs consistently use the results of these assessments for program improvement.
Recommendation 2: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it makes improvements in its educational programs that are based on the analysis of assessment results.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

ECU has identified Administration Support Services as “…those units that serve to provide infrastructure to the operational and management missions of the university.” Two thousand and ten through two thousand eleven (2010-2011) and 2011-2012 assessment report for units in the Chancellor’s Division, Divisions of Academic Affairs; Administration and Finance; Health Sciences, and University Advancement were presented. The Assessment Report provided a comprehensive listing of outcomes, assessment methods, results, and action(s) taken to show “use of results”.

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

The Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs provide most academic and student support services, with a smaller number of units situated in the Divisions of Health Sciences, and Research and Graduate Studies. Each academic and student support services unit engages in unit level processes to establish goals and outcomes, assess progress, and improve as needed. ECU embraces a broad-based assessment process for evaluating institutional effectiveness by requiring each academic and student support services unit to define outcomes, perform an assessment of its programs or operations, and report results and improvements from this self-assessment on an annual cycle in TracDat, the institutional tracking system. In addition to documented use of results of outcomes assessment in each academic and student support service area, programs undergo program review in keeping with functional area standards outlined by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS).

3.3.1.4 Research within its mission, if appropriate

ECU has adopted a systematic approach to assess research outcomes and to use these assessments to improve the performances of those units that either support research as a significant portion of their stated missions or units that directly engage research as a significant part of their stated missions. Twenty-five (25) primarily research units were identified. Five research-related goals are highlighted “ECU’s Response to Our Region’s Grand Challenges” white paper from the Division on Research and Graduate Studies and the 2012-2013 Strategic Plan. There are: 1) increase research productivity, 2) expand research opportunities for students, 3) expand the application of research and engagement to benefit the region, 4) improve research infrastructure and support services, and 5) address the need for greater diversity. In addition, seven research foci are established for strategic investments.
and research-intensive instruction and degrees were identified in the assessment report for both undergraduate and graduate curriculums. A complete inventory of assessment plans (including results and actions) were available as well as highlighting examples of the variety and creativity employed in the use of results to improve research at ECU.

3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

The institution’s mission expresses its commitment to “creating a strong, sustainable future” for its service region “through education, research, innovation, investment, and outreach.” Its strategic action plan for 2010 identifies multiple objectives clearly referencing its commitment to service.

The institution adheres to the Carnegie Foundation for the Community Engagement classifications of public service and service to the community. Feedback from the application regarding public service prompted several improvements in public service efforts (e.g., common definitions for terms related to engagement and outreach; establishment of public service assessment units and processes to centralize data collection, analysis and quality improvement; academies and symposia to educate faculty and students about community engagement; establishment of an Office of Public Service and Community Relations in the Chancellor’s Division; and development of a mechanism for community feedback about public service).

Prior to 2010, public service units and colleges reported their public service activities through unit annual reports. Examples of annual reports were provided in the Compliance Report. Formalized assessment plans with quality improvement strategies for public service units were developed in 2010. The institution provided a list of 22 public service units and 2011-2012 assessment reports for each unit. Assessment reports provided evidence of outcomes, means of assessment and criteria for success, results and actions taken for improvement based on results. The institution provided additional summary of the alignment of the public service units’ activities to institutional strategic directions and examples of public service activities in colleges.

The institution also engages in service to various communities through continuing education, co-curricular service, extra-curricular service, and volunteerism. Faculty members report community service activities annually in an electronic database. The institution has fourteen active community partnerships; community-built research projects are a common activity in these partnerships and have resulted in 30 published manuscripts, 127 presentations and seven grant applications. Students engage in service learning in designated courses, as well as in curriculum required practica, fieldwork, and clinical placements.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the...
development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

Recommendation 3: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution provide a comprehensive assessment plan that includes one or more mechanisms for continuous improvement.

See Part III for further information.

3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)

The institution provided a detailed description of the policies and procedures governing the approval and development of new programs. These procedures include faculty initiation of the process, approval by various committees that include faculty and administrators, and faculty development of the curriculum, including distance education programs. Although a list of programs approved for development from 2012 to 2017 was provided, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find evidence (e.g., proposals, committee minutes, etc.) that the procedures that include faculty and administrative approval of degree programs are followed.

The institution provided the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee additional supporting evidence for the approval of academic programs by faculty members and appropriate administrators. Documents for three programs, one each at the baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral level, included notifications from the Academic Program Development Collaborative Team, signed unit approval forms, University Committee and Graduate Committee agendas and minutes, Educational Planning and Policies Committee minutes, Faculty Senate resolutions, Academic Council and Chancellor approvals and notification letters, as well as UNC Board of Governors’ review and approvals. These documents demonstrate faculty and administrative review and approval of new programs at both the institutional and UNC system-levels.

3.4.2 The institution’s continuing education, outreach, and service programs are consistent with the institution’s mission. (Continuing education/service programs)

The institution’s mission statement, approved by the Board of Governors (2009), expresses commitment to “creating a strong, sustainable future” for its service region “through education, research, innovation, investment, and outreach.” The institution’s strategic directions include investing in programs that improve access to its resources, providing ongoing educational and learning opportunities, developing regional partnerships, and directly engaging in addressing socioeconomic issues. The institution’s work in community engagement has been recognized by the Carnegie Foundation (2008 Community Engagement Classification) and the National Outreach Scholarship Conference (2010). A review of documents provided in the Compliance Report and institutional
websites indicates that each college and school engages in education, outreach and/or service programs.

The Office of Continuing Studies provides support services for students and also supports the institution’s efforts in distance and technology-enhanced learning. Continuing Studies partners with multiple institutional units to provide programs and services in Summer School, Distance and Extension Education, Continuing Professional Education (providing access to non-credit, face-to-face and online professional and individual learning opportunities), the Testing Center, Summer Study Abroad, the Lifelong Learning Program (an outreach initiative for adults 50 and older), and Military Outreach (a single contact point for bringing educational programs to military students).

Outreach activities use institutional and faculty intellectual, creative, and problem solving resources to benefit of the community. Examples provided illustrated the breadth of the institution’s outreach services and initiatives: Office of Engagement, Innovation, and Economic Development (OEIED); ECU-TV; the College of Business’s Bureau of Business Research; the College of Allied Health Sciences’ Jean Mills Annual Health Symposium; the College of Fine Arts and Communication’s School of Music; the Brody School of Medicine’s Children’s Development Service Agency; the College of Human Ecology’s Child Development Lab; and the Division of Student Affairs’ Campus Recreation and Wellness initiative.

Service includes volunteerism, co-curricular, and extracurricular service. Representative examples illustrated the institution’s commitment to service learning and community volunteerism: Volunteer and Service Learning Center, the Student Government Association, the Graduate Student Association, and faculty volunteer service.

*3.4.3 The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission. (Admissions policies)

ECU adheres to the admissions policies as approved and implemented by the North Carolina Board of Governors (action taken on April 14, 2000). The University publishes admission policies via the Graduate Catalog, Undergraduate Catalog, and Prospective Students information page. In addition to general admission policies, ECU appropriately publishes information related to non-discrimination policies, policies for individuals with disabilities, and transfer students.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the University’s Admission policies and found them to be congruent with its mission. The policies are published in both the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs. Additionally, the institution publishes information related to non-discrimination polices for students with disabilities and transfer students.

3.4.4 The institution publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination,
advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution’s own degree programs. The institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript. (See Commission policy “Collaborative Academic Arrangements.”) (Acceptance of academic credit) (Note: Although not listed as a reference in the Principles of Accreditation, see also the Commission policy “The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees.”)

The institution accepts transfer credit from regionally accredited colleges or universities for transferable courses for which a grade of C or better was earned. Transcripts are evaluated by the Office of Admissions during the admissions process. Students can request a re-evaluation of transfer courses; the academic unit of the course being considered for re-evaluation determines what additional courses are necessary to meet degree requirements. All courses and grades transferred become a part of the student’s transcript but are not included in the calculation of the institution’s GPA, except courses in which the student received a grade of D or F will be used in the calculation of the GPA for degrees with distinction. Transfer of undergraduate credit policies are published in the Undergraduate Catalog.

Students can receive credit for acceptable scores on advanced placement examinations of The College Board. Applicants who complete an international baccalaureate may receive some college credit. Credit may also be given for acceptable performance in appropriate subject matter areas on both the general examination and subject examinations of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and Defense Activity Nontraditional Education Support (DANTES). Information on acceptable examinations and required scores is posted on the Office of Admissions website.

Students who satisfactorily completed basic military training can receive credit for the exercise and sport science and/or health courses required for the Foundations (general education) curriculum. Students who have completed service schools while on active duty with the military can request evaluation of credits prior to admission through the Office of Admissions. Credit is awarded in accordance with the American Council on Education recommendations provided that the credit recommended is at the baccalaureate level; is applicable to the Foundations curriculum requirements, to the student’s declared major field of study, or to the elective hours prescribed within the student’s designated program of study; and is comparable to courses offered at the institution.

Policies governing the transfer of graduate credit are published in the Graduate Catalog. For graduate transfer students, up to 20% of the credit hours in a program may be earned in a different but regionally accredited institution. No transfer credit from another institution is counted toward the completion of a certificate program with the exception of courses offered as part of a certificate program with a collaborating institution. Master’s degree students in business administration, public administration, and social work and doctoral students are governed by statements in degree requirements.
The Graduate School approves application of graduate course transfer credit only if (1) the college, school, or department recommends it; (2) the graduate credit was earned at a regionally accredited institution; (3) the student was admitted to a formal graduate degree program at the time the credit was earned with a minimum final course grade of B; and (4) the credit can be satisfactorily incorporated within the applicable time frame for completion of all degree requirements.

Not more than 20% of a degree or certificate of advanced study program may be earned through credit by examination, and credit thus earned will not be counted as residence credit. Several departments and schools do not offer credit by examination: English, geography, history, political science, music and nursing. Degree or certificate of advanced study credit cannot be obtained through completion of correspondence courses.

The School of Dental Medicine does not accept transfer credit. The policy is posted on the school's website. The School of Medicine only accepts transfer students if there is availability of open positions; in recent years there have been no vacancies available for transfer students.

The institution participates in the University system’s Comprehensive Articulation Agreement with the State’s community college system, approved by the Board of Governors in 1996 and most recently revised in 2008. The agreement stipulates transfer of credit for students who have obtained an Associate of Arts or Science degree with at least a 3.0 cumulative GPA. Their college-level coursework will, upon acceptance to the institution, be considered to have fulfilled the lower-level general education requirements as stipulated in the agreement, and they will be admitted at a junior-level status, excluding exceptions and provided all other admission conditions are met. The agreement also identifies community college courses that are appropriate for transfer as electives as well as courses that will satisfy pre-major and general education requirements.

Other articulation agreements are in place for specialized programs in other institutions (e.g., Early Childhood Education with 40 community colleges). A University Bilateral Agreements Committee reviews all articulation agreements against the mission of the institution. All agreements are approved by the academic dean and the provost and senior vice Chancellor for academic affairs according to the policies and procedures stated in the Approval and Review of Bilateral Agreements regulation (02.07.04, June 2012). The regulation includes the Committee's charge, review criteria, membership (4 faculty and 3 administrators), and approval process. The policy is posted on the Policies, Regulations and Rules website.

3.4.5 The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution. (Academic policies)

The institution's academic policies are published and accessible in catalogs, manuals and websites, and are made available to students, faculty, and other
interested parties. Approved policies are included in the University Policy Manual. Any unit that includes academic policies in its handbooks, brochures, or other publications must include the text verbatim or use a hyperlink to the Policies, Regulations, and Rules website.

The institution has established an approval process for academic policies that includes input from and review by faculty and administrators. Department and college level committees, Faculty Senate, and Graduate Council participate in the approval process, as appropriate. The University Policy Committee has representative membership and is responsible for the development of the University Policy Manual. New policies that have been approved since 2010 are identified on a Policies, Regulations, and Rules webpage, including approval dates. A flow chart is also available that indicates the process by which a new policy is approved.

Good educational practices prescribed by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the National Association of College Admission Counseling, and the Council of Graduate Schools are some of the standards by which the institution’s policies are measured. Programs for which professional accreditation is available are accredited, indicating that institutional policies meet those standards of good practice as well. The report indicates that all academic policies apply to distance education programs.

3.4.6 The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. (Practices for awarding credit)

As a constituent member of the University of North Carolina (UNC), East Carolina University follows the UNC Policy 400.1.6 of a minimum of 750 scheduled minutes of instructional time or the equivalent per credit hour. New course proposals are vetted by the originating department committee, a college/school committee, the University Curriculum Committee (Undergraduate or Graduate), the Faculty Senate or Graduate Council to determine the appropriate course level and amount of credit to be awarded. The course numbering sequences at the undergraduate and graduate levels are described in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs.

The institution provides guidelines for awarding academic credit for courses such as independent studies, independent research, selected readings, selected topics, etc. The guidelines are published in a University Curriculum Committee document entitled, “Guidelines for Courses with Varying Credit Hours.” These guidelines take into consideration the volume of content and the amount of worked to be performed.

ECU’s policy on awarding credit for courses offered via distance learning or in an alternate format is reflected in its policy on distance education. This policy states:

…there shall be no distinction in academic rigor or content between programs offered through distance education and those offered on
Development of new online programs and courses will follow the same development and approval procedures as for face-to-face programs and courses.

Selection of courses and programs to be offered via distance education is the purview of the offering academic unit. The academic units shall provide oversight of programs and courses delivered via distance education to ensure that each is coherent and complete and has learning outcomes appropriate to the level and rigor of the course or program.

3.4.7 The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the Principles and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution. (See the Commission policy “Collaborative Academic Arrangements.”) (Consortia relationships/contractual agreements)

ECU has established two (2) consortial relationships: University of North Carolina German Studies Consortium and PhD in Technology Management.

The German Studies Consortium, approved by the Chancellor in January 2001, involves eleven (11) constituent institutions within the UNC System, and provided upper-level undergraduate German studies courses to students. The Consortium does not offer degrees, rather enhanced offerings through a distance learning format. However, ECU last offered courses through the Consortium in fall 2009. The Consortium is comprised of a Campus Coordinator from each of the constituent institutions. The Consortium Coordinator, elected from among the Campus Coordinators, is responsible for conducting meetings and a review of the Consortium every two years. In addition student evaluations and peer evaluations are also conducted. The Compliance Report documents the results of students’ assessment of the ECU professor in 2009; however, there is no evidence of a peer evaluation. The report also documents minutes of meetings of the Council, in addition to meetings with the Consortium faculty to discuss the state of the Consortium and entertain suggested for improvement. Finally, the focus of the Consortium is in line with the mission of ECU.

The PhD in Technology Management involves faculty and administrators from five (5) institutions (Indiana State University, North Carolina A&T State University, East Carolina University, Bowling Green State University, and the University of Central Missouri). Indiana State University is the PhD granting institution, with faculty from the Consortium providing instruction. Program coordination and academic rigor is the responsibility of the Academic Council, which is comprised of one member (Campus Coordinator) from each institution. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could find no evidence of ongoing meetings. The Compliance Certification mentioned that the Consortium Agreement had been re-visited several times by the constituent institutions, but only three (3) substantive meetings were reported since October 2009. To date, there is no documentation of periodic assessment of this Consortium.

The only documented contractual relationship is between ECU and Pitt
Community College. This contractual agreement, signed in late 2007, provided for Pitt Community College to offer remedial math courses to ECU students. Course coordination was the responsibility of the Pitt Community College Coordinator, who would communicate with faculty from both institutions. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not find documentation regarding ongoing evaluations and reviews conducted by the Coordinator.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that: (1) there was no evidence of peer evaluation in respect to the North Carolina German Studies Consortium; (2) there is no evidence of ongoing meetings of the Academic Council (governing body) of the PhD in Technology Management. There is no documentation of periodic assessment of the consortium. In the Focused Report, the institution furnished further evidence and documentation.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee followed up on the focused report and examined supporting documents and interviewed relevant administrators including the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Provost, the University Attorney, the Associate Vice Chancellor for International Relations, and the Chair of the Compliance Certification Counsel. The documentation and interviews demonstrated ongoing assessment and monitoring of both consortial agreements.

3.4.8 The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience. (Noncredit to credit)

ECU offers university credit hours for noncredit specific examinations and military experiences. University credit is offered to students who satisfactorily complete Advanced Placement Examinations (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), Defense Activity Nontraditional Education Support (DANTES), or complete an International Baccalaureate High School Program. Academic credit for HLTH 1000 and 1-credit for EXSS is awarded for students who successfully complete Basic Military Training. Students must submit their military transcript to the Office of the Registrar for verification of experience.

To ensure that the quality of work completed is equivalent to selected coursework, the Faculty Senate’s Resolution #04-20 authorized the Registrar, in conformance with an ACE Guide recommending the awarding of academic credit for military experience, to submit requests from students to academic departments for equivalent credit.

3.4.9 The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Academic support services)

The institution’s Strategic Action Plan 2010-2013 expresses its commitment to student access and success. The institution provides a description of multiple offices that provide services for students from point of entry to graduation, in alignment with the institutional commitment. Examples are:
- Office of Student Transitions and First Year Programs
- Academic Advising Collaborative
- Career Center
- Center for Counseling and Student Development
- Department for Disability Support Services
- Department of Athletics Office of Student Development - online Student-Athlete Handbook; academic mentoring and tutoring
- Information Technology and Computing Services, including IT help desk, Virtual Computing Lab, Blackboard, web conferencing, Second Life virtual world, iWebfolio (electronic portfolio)
- Joyner and Laupus (medical) Libraries
- Ledonia Wright Cultural Center – STEM tutoring services with special interest in the achievement of multicultural students in college science and math
- Office of the Registrar
- Office of Undergraduate Research
- Pirate Tutoring Center - peer academic tutoring
- Testing Center for national college and academic program entrance exams; credentialing, licensure, and certification exams
- University Writing Program, including Writing Across the Curriculum and University Writing Center
- Volunteer and Service Learning Center
- Office of Medical Education & Student Development - academic counseling and career planning
- Child Development Laboratory, an on-site field experience location
- Marriage and Family Therapy Clinic
- Military Programs Office
- Office of International Affairs
- Project STEPP- resources on- and off-campus in academic, social and life-skills for a select number of students with identified specific learning disabilities who have shown the potential to succeed in college

The institution administers a Graduating Senior Survey annually. A table of results for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 indicates that students are largely satisfied with services they receive from the university-wide services included in the survey (advising 75.9%, library 96.2%, technology 93%, career-related 82.2%, employment search 76.5%, counseling 83.7%, community service project opportunities 86.9%). Percentages indicate percent of students rating services as good or excellent. A copy of the 2009-2010 survey was provided as example.

The institution also administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to first-year students (FY) and seniors (SR) currently, every three years. The mean of responses for 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009 and 2012 in academic service related areas indicates institutional means exceeded means of comparable regional public and Carnegie classification institutions (academic success support, 3.23FY*, 3.14SR*; acquiring job/work-related skills, 2.96FY*, 3.30SR*; using technology, 3.28FY*,3.38SR; academic advising, 3.27FY*, 3.15SR*).
The compliance Report includes a description of multiple offices that provide services for faculty. Examples are:

- Office of Academic Program Planning and Development
- Office for Faculty Excellence, including new faculty orientation workshops for general faculty
- Information Technology and Computing Services, including technical training and instructional design support
- Library, including course-specific LibGuides and online training modules, web pages devoted to support for international faculty, a robust library instruction program, and partnerships with campus units to offer faculty workshops and new faculty orientation.
- University Writing Program, including training (e.g., writing across the curriculum) and classroom presentations
- Volunteer and Service Learning Center, including assistance with community partners/projects, orienting students to service-learning activities, course syllabus development
- Department for Disability Support Services - in-service workshops to faculty and staff regarding students with disabilities, policies and procedures

Students and faculty in distance learning and off-campus sites have multiple points of access for student and faculty services, including extensive web site information; online handbooks and manuals; online training, tutorials and resources; online social media, tutoring and mentoring support; e-mail and telephone communication. Distance learning and off-campus students are also supported by the Office of Continuing Studies (OCS) which provides e-mail communication, a dedicated toll free phone number, and a dedicated website (Options for Adult Learners). Program services by this office are evaluated annually, and the division participates in the university's regular cycle of external program reviews. Results of a 2005 Noel-Levitz Priorities Survey for Online Learners indicated that the institution exceeded national norms for student satisfaction. Areas evaluated included program advising, financial aid information, technical assistance, registration, career services, library resources, tutoring services, bookstore services.

ECU has provided an excellent summary of the academic support services offered to students and faculty. There appears to be depth and breadth within the offering, as the narrative highlights programs associated with first-year students, advising, career services, academic affairs, international affairs, veterans, and others. ECU also demonstrated a commitment to assessment and data collection through the use of information technology and NSSE survey tools.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)

The ECU Faculty Manual states that the voting faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum development, approval, evaluation, and improvement. The basic steps in the approval process for the various types of undergraduate curricular
developments involves a progressive process of approval at the department, unit, or program curriculum committee; the department or school undergraduate voting faculty; the chairperson or director of the department or school; the college or school curriculum committee; the dean of the college or program director; the University Curriculum Committee; the Faculty Senate; and the Chancellor.

Graduate curriculum proposals must be approved successively by: the department, unit, or program curriculum committee; the department or school graduate voting faculty; the chairperson or director of the department or school; the college or school curriculum committee; the dean of the college or program; the Graduate Curriculum Committee; the Graduate Council, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Council, and the Chancellor.

A number of Faculty Committees are designated to make curricular recommendations to the University Curriculum Committee, including the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee, the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, the Distance Education and Learning Technologies Committee.

A seven year cycle for program assessments ensures that programs are assessed on their ability to meet learning outcomes identified in their curricula. Assessment reports are documented by the Office of Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research in the University’s institutional tracking system (IPAR Assessment Resources).

*3.4.11* For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. *(Academic program coordination)*

The institution indicates that it assigns responsibility for academic program coordination and curriculum development and review to qualified faculty members in each of its degrees, minors, concentrations, and certificates. Chairs or deans determine if coordinators (sometimes referred to as program directors) have satisfied the unit’s academic credentialing requirement. The institution uses the terms “field” and “discipline” interchangeably. Qualified discipline faculty determine what their subfields are.

The institution indicates that activities of individual coordinators vary but identified three responsibilities that are germane to most academic coordinator positions: (1) assessing the academic quality of programs and courses; (2) service on academic program and/or curriculum committees; and (3) leadership in curriculum development and review.

The Office of the Provost (Office of Academic Program Planning and Development) conducts an annual survey to update credential information for academic program coordinators. An updated roster, as well as professional qualification statements, is posted online by the Office of Academic Program Planning and Development.
A list of Academic Program Coordinators was provided, including the terminal degree(s) for each that was determined to satisfy the unit’s academic credentialing requirement. In addition, professional qualification statements (PQS) were provided which were structured in such a way as to enable further clarification of degrees, experience, research and publications related to the programmatic field. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that clarification tended to be broad without specific detail (e.g., no course credits/titles listed related to the programmatic field, no examples of research/publications/presentations or work experience related to the programmatic field). Based on the documentation provided, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not find sufficient evidence of program coordinator qualifications for the following programs:

- Ethic Studies, minor – no information on the PQS
- Women’s Studies, BA, minor – course credits comprising the “focus” in gender
- North Carolina Studies, minor – no justification on PQS
- TESOL, certificate – course credits /certification in TESOL
- Film Studies, minor – course credits /experience/research in film studies
- Business and Technical Communication, certificate; PhD in Technical and Professional Discourse; Professional Communication, certificate – course credits /experience/research in technical and professional communication
- Economic Development, certificate – course credits /experience/research in economic development
- Public Administration, MPA, minor – course credits /experience/research in public administration
- Health Care Management, certificate; Community Health Administration, certificate - course credits /experience/research in health care management/administration
- Health Informatics, minor - course credits /experience/research in health informatics
- Health Care Administration, certificate - course credits /experience/research in health care administration
- International Management, certificate – examples of publications/presentations in international management
- BFA, all concentrations - course credits /experience/research/exhibitions in area of concentration
- Gerontology, certificate, minor - course credits /experience/research in gerontology
- Microbiology and Immunology, PhD - course credits /experience/research examples in microbiology and immunology
- Biomedical Sciences, MS - course credits /experience/research examples in biomedical sciences
- Computer Game Development, certificate – define “familiarity”; provide examples of course credits/experience/research in computer game development
- Architectural Design Technology, minor; Mechanical Design Technology, minor - course credits/experience/research in architectural design technology and mechanical design technology
The institution addressed the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s concerns in the Focused Report by providing additional information including the professional qualification statements of the programs in question. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the Interim Director of Sponsored Programs, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Emerging Academic Initiatives, Director Institutional Research, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, and the Coordinator of Academic program Development. The Committee concluded that the additional information sufficiently documented the qualifications of all program coordinators.

3.4.12 The institution’s use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. (Technology use)

The Compliance Certification outlines programs and services provided to support students in their use of technology to enhance learning. The report outlines the philosophical structure supporting technology services, including mission statements, governance, and how activities are reviewed by the institution’s Information Resources Coordinating Council. The institution makes extensive use of online courses, and the report stresses efforts to ensure that the learning management system remains vigorous. Similarly, the institution utilizes a web conferencing tool that is used extensively to provide academic classes, and to support meetings and professional development. The institution also makes use of various social networking tools to promote university initiatives, share news, and support student portfolios. A variety of training options are in place. The reviews suggest that the institution document faculty training programs and sessions for all areas. The reviewers note that the College of Business is the only college or program that requires ongoing training of faculty who teach online courses. The report describes on-site technology based in classrooms, labs, the libraries, and highlights efforts to provide assistance to students and faculty through the ACE Students Computer Support Center, IT Help Desk, Office of Faculty Excellence, and other initiatives. The report describes ongoing efforts to install and upgrade technology in campus facilities, and to support distance education.

The institution provides evidence that technology is integrated into program objectives, and that technology is utilized effectively to enhance these objectives. Reports are provided for the various campus academic divisions. Each academic unit employs an Instructional Technology Consultant tasked with promotion, providing support and assistance with integrating and implementing technology to support the academic program and faculty training efforts. The University Multimedia Center supports faculty in course development and redesign.

Services provided by Information Technology and Computing Services are outlined, with an emphasis on describing services and the assessments in place to determine their effectiveness. Assessment indicators show faculty and staff perceptions regarding technology-related services and equipment, and efforts to improve.
3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. (General education competencies)

In 2005, the institution approved and adopted a policy entitled, “Goals of the Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum.” This policy identifies the intended outcomes or college level competencies addressed in the general education curriculum of the institution. In 2008, the institution adopted “Guidelines for Outcomes Assessment of Foundations Courses,” a plan for assessing the effectiveness of the general education curriculum. Three goals were identified that are common to all general education, or foundations courses: disciplinary content, research methodology, and relevance of disciplinary scholarship outside the discipline. Courses in Health Promotion and Physical Activity, writing, and mathematics must meet goals specified in the “Goals of the Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum.” Courses included in the foundations curriculum must be approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee. Approved courses are then considered by the Faculty Senate and finally by the Chancellor.

The report included documents relating to the approval of Sociology 1010 as a foundations course as evidence that this process is followed by the institution. Evidence included curriculum and foundations credit proposals, Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee minutes, and Faculty Senate minutes.

Implemented in 2008, “Guidelines for Outcome Assessment of Foundations Courses” defines the assessment steps to be followed, the timeline of the assessment cycle, and the format required in assessment reports. The report provided assessment reports for each core area: Fine Arts, Humanities, Basic Sciences, Basic Social Sciences, Writing Competency, Math Competency, Health, and Exercise and Sports Science. A table was included that aligns general education/foundations core areas with goals in the strategic plan of the institution. Convincing evidence was provided in each core area assessment report of the extent to which students were attaining the identified competencies and that the institution is engaged in an ongoing, campus-wide process of outcomes assessment.

3.5.2 At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (See the Commission policy “Collaborative Academic Arrangements.”) (Institutional credits for a degree)

A required graduation audit ensures that students earning an undergraduate degree from ECU will have taken a minimum of 25% of their total credit hours and earned 50% of the credit hours for their major from ECU. The website for the Office of the Registrar includes information on the undergraduate graduation process for advisors that outlines the process for graduation audit and the undergraduate graduation process for students, both including the Senior
Summary Form. These processes ensure that graduates of East Carolina University meet the requirements for institutional credits for all degrees awarded.

3.5.3 The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. *(See the Commission policy Collaborative Academic Arrangements.)* *(Undergraduate program requirements)*

The institution publishes undergraduate degree requirements in the Undergraduate Catalog which is posted on the website in both online and PDF formats. The online format is interactive and updated regularly. Program information published in the catalog is organized alphabetically by major and includes information on program goals, degree requirements, Foundations curriculum (general education) course requirements, course requirements for the major, and any additional academic requirements for the degree. Undergraduate degrees require that a minimum of 30 semester hours and at least one-half of the total hours required in the major discipline be completed through enrollment in courses offered by the institution *(Undergraduate Catalog 2012-2013, “Baccalaureate Degree Requirements”)*.

The Office of Academic Program Planning and Development (OAPPD) edits and oversees the publications of the University’s Undergraduate Catalog and other curriculum-related materials (e.g., school-level recruitment materials, web sites, handbooks, degree check sheets). The office also reviews University academic publications and web pages to ensure that they are accurate and in compliance with policies of the institution. Examples were provided of office direction of catalog and website reviews and of review and edit of web page and advising materials.

The Liberal Arts Foundation Curriculum is the general education program at the institution. The undergraduate catalog includes a rationale and program goals. The curriculum is distributed in four core disciplinary areas (humanities, arts, natural sciences, and social sciences); one multidisciplinary area in health promotion and physical activity; and two areas of competence (writing and mathematics).

The institution’s Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee evaluates courses requested to be included in the Foundations Curriculum to ensure that they are consistent with published goals. A Request for Foundations Credit form requires applicants to describe how the course’s content will meet the three Foundations Goals and to list examples of required course textbooks or other required materials that address the content. A sample course syllabus is required; it must reflect coverage of Foundations Goals including readings and assignments that meet the goals. Course requests are reviewed by the committee, and those courses that meet the requirements are so designated by “FC” in the Undergraduate Catalog listings.

The institution uses comprehensive and systematic program development and review processes to ensure that each degree program presents a coherent body
of knowledge and skills at the collegiate level, including an appropriate general education component. Program and curriculum changes may be initiated, prepared and presented for review by voting faculty. Procedures and documents for program and curriculum development proposals are available on the Office of Academic Program Planning and Development’s website.

Section VII of the institution’s Faculty Manual (Academic Program and Curriculum Development) indicates that undergraduate curriculum changes undergo multiple levels of review and approval, beginning with the curriculum committee of the department/school and ending with the Chancellor. Review also includes oversight of special function committees such as the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee (if requesting Liberal Arts Foundations Curriculum Credit); the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (if requesting Writing Intensive credit); the University Service-Learning Committee (if requesting Service-Learning credit); and the Council on Teacher Education (for Teacher Licensure Areas).

New degree program development goes through three phases: 1) Request for Authorization to Plan, 2) Request for Authorization to Establish and 3) Curriculum/Course Approval. The comprehensive process is designed to ensure quality and integrity of the degree, as well as its compliance with institutional, state and accreditation policies. Requests for the development of new programs must include indication of societal need as well as other institutions identified, visited, or consulted in developing the proposal.

Academic programs are required to be reviewed every seven years. The review is conducted according to the institution’s Procedures for Unit Academic Program Review. The review includes a self-study and on-site review. An outcomes assessment plan and results are included in the self-study, and the results of the review are used in the unit’s operational and strategic action planning.

A list of accredited academic programs is published in the undergraduate catalog. Accreditation review includes evidence of the program’s compliance with professional standards established for the discipline.

3.5.4 At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Terminal degrees of faculty)

The institution provided tables for AY2010-2011 and 2011-2012 listing the number of student credit hours in the major or concentration and percentage taught by faculty with an appropriate terminal degree in the discipline. Tables were generated by the institution’s Operational Data Store (ODS), using the academic course offerings for the spring and fall terms, the faculty credentialing database and degree audit software for determination of courses that are included in the calculation of major credit hours, as defined within the 2011-2012 undergraduate catalog. Both location and modality of course delivery were included.
Both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 listings indicate that all courses had at least 25% of course hours in each major taught by faculty with terminal degrees. Percentage distribution ranged from 33-100% in 2010-2011 and from 30-100% in 2011-2012.

3.6.1 The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program rigor)**

The Compliance Report clearly demonstrates that the institution emphasizes program rigor in each of the five (5) categories of post-baccalaureate programs offered: Master's, Certificate of Advanced Study/Specialist (CAS, Ed.S), Professional Doctorates (MD, AuD., DMD, DPT), Doctorates (Ph.D., Ed.D.), and departmental certificates.

Program effectiveness and rigor are ensured with they undergo periodic review based on procedures published in the Graduate Program Director's Handbook. This Handbook includes a section entitled, "Procedures for Academic Program Review." These procedures describe academic unit review, including a provision for external review. There are multi-levels of program review and approval to ensure quality, resource availability and academic rigor. The levels of review include faculty, college review, graduate school, Faculty Senate, Academic Council (Provost and Vice Chancellor), Chancellor, and the UNC System.

To address the issue of program rigor further, discipline-specific accrediting bodies accredit several graduate programs. These accrediting organizations identify specific standards and requirements that must be satisfactorily addressed by the program.

3.6.2 The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. **(Graduate curriculum)**

The vision of the institution’s Graduate School states that graduates “will provide the intellectual capital that will enhance the reputation of [the institution] and be capable of providing the leadership necessary for societal progress in a 21st century, globally-competitive world.”

A University-wide Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC), as well as the Graduate Council of the Faculty Senate, review and approve program curricula and courses. The GCC’s Course Proposal Form requires identification of course objectives and textbook(s) and/or readings, as well as assessment of library resources. The form also requires a listing of course assignments. All of the above assist the GCC and Graduate Council to ensure that degree program curricula include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.
A review of degree requirements for all graduate degrees listed in the Graduate Catalog indicates that every graduate program includes coursework based on the literature of the discipline. All graduate programs require students to complete a discipline appropriate comprehensive assessment. The assessment may include a comprehensive examination (written and/or oral), a research project, thesis, capstone course/project, portfolio and/or equivalent. Theses and dissertations require literature review. Faculty chairing or serving on thesis or dissertation committees must have appropriate graduate faculty status, and at least three members of a thesis or dissertation committee must have either associate graduate faculty status or full graduate faculty status.

Graduate faculty are expected to have earned the highest degree in the field and to demonstrate evidence of success in research/creative activity, of successful graduate teaching and of successful supervision of research or creative activity, if applicable. Continuing tenured faculty must reapply for graduate faculty status every five years.

The comprehensive assessment also includes demonstration of ability to interpret research data and synthesize results in meaningful contexts relative to the discipline. Programs require completion of a research skills component and/or appropriate professional practice and training component, defined by the academic program.

3.6.3 At least one-third of credits toward a graduate or a post-baccalaureate professional degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. *(See the Commission policy “Collaborative Academic Arrangements.”) (Institutional credits for a degree)*

Graduate Programs at ECU require that more than 100%, 80%, 70%, or 66% of credits (depending on degree program) required for a graduate degree are earned at ECU. The Graduate Catalog and Graduate Program Directors and Coordinators Handbook publishes these transfer credit policies, and — in all but three instances — at least 80% of graduate credit hours must be earned at ECU in order for an ECU degree to be awarded.

The three exceptions that require less than 80% of courses to be taken at ECU include: the Master of Business Administration (students are allowed up to 30% transfer credit), Master of Social Work Advanced Standing students are allowed up to 30% transfer credit, and the Master of Public Administration students are allowed up to 33% transfer credit, or 15 of 45 semester hours. The Brody School of Medicine and the School of Dental Medicine do not accept transfer students.

The Graduation Summary Form provides documentation of any accepted transfer credits, and the Graduate School and Registrar conduct systematic audits of transfer credits and certification of credit needed for a degree.

3.6.4 The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-graduate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly
accepted standards and practices for degree programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program requirements)**

The institution publishes post-baccalaureate degree requirements in the Graduate Catalog ("Academic Programs") which is posted on the website in both online and PDF formats. The online format is interactive and updated regularly. Program information published in the Catalog is organized alphabetically by college and department and includes information on degree requirements, course requirements, course descriptions and any additional academic requirements for the degree.

All master’s degree programs and the Educational Specialist intermediate degree include a minimum of 30 semester hours of graduate work, successful completion of a comprehensive assessment, and require that at least one half of the credits earned be in 6000 level courses or higher. All doctoral programs require at least three to four years of study beyond the bachelor’s or master’s degree and successful completion of a comprehensive assessment. All graduate programs require maintaining a GPA of at least 3.0 in addition to time limit requirements, continuous enrollment requirements, and residency requirements for graduation (Graduate Catalog, “Residence and Graduation Requirements”).

The Office of Academic Program Planning and Development (OAPPD) reviews annually all publications related to program requirements (print, electronic, and University websites, including all departmental web sites). OAPPD reviews all projects submitted to University Marketing and Publications for design, production and printing when the content includes information about programs or program requirements.

The OAPPD, in conjunction with the Graduate School, coordinates new graduate degree program planning and establishment, graduate curriculum proposals and changes, and graduate program review. The OAPPD also provides faculty workshops through the Office of Faculty Excellence to assist academic units creating new courses or programs. The academic unit curriculum committee and Graduate faculty initiate proposals of new graduate program or changes to an existing graduate program. The proposal review process is described in the Graduate Curriculum and Program Development Manual. Faculty are guided through the proposal review and approval process by degree approval check sheets.

New degree program development goes through three phases: 1) Request for Authorization to Plan, 2) Request for Authorization to Establish, and 3) Curriculum/Course Approval. The comprehensive process is designed to ensure quality and integrity of the degree with review at multiple levels within the college/school (program, department, graduate faculty, chair, college curriculum committee, dean); at the institutional level (Graduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, appropriate vice Chancellor, Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Chancellor); and by the University system and Board of Governors.

Academic programs are required to be reviewed as part of a seven-year unit program evaluation. The unit Academic Program Review is conducted according
to the institution’s Procedures for Unit Academic Program Review. The review includes a self-study and on-site review. An outcomes assessment plan and results are included in the self-study, and the results of the review are used in the unit’s operational and strategic action planning. Programs complete biennial progress reports.

The institution conducted a review of online university information from twelve University system-approved peer institutions and two comparable in-system institutions. The review demonstrated comparability of the institution’s graduate education policies with common accepted standards in the institutions reviewed.

Thirty-four professional associations/councils/societies accredit graduate programs at the institution. The institution provided a list of accredited programs, including dates of the last review and next scheduled review. Accreditation reviews include evidence of the program’s compliance with professional standards established for the discipline.

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”) (Faculty competence)

The East Carolina University Faculty Manual defines minimum qualifications for faculty appointment, and the institution employs a system that uses Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes to align faculty qualifications and teaching assignments. Credentials and assignments are reviewed each semester to ensure compliance with appropriate standards. Each department completed a Department Information Sheet (DIS) that has been approved by appropriate administrators and the Faculty Credentials Advisory Council. The DIS identifies the terminal degree for each teaching discipline and related disciplines.

The institution accepts two alternate methods of credentialing for its faculty, apart from the appropriate terminal or master’s degree in the teaching discipline. “Equivalent Alternate Credentials” include experience and other credentials considered to be equal to the terminal degree. “Standard Alternate Credentials” include extensive experience and/or research expertise in the subject matter of the specific course.

The report identified units or courses in which faculty qualifications may vary. These include Freshman Seminar, Honors College, College of Business, School of Dental Medicine, ROTC, and Dissertation, Thesis, Research, and GRAD courses. An adequate explanation and appropriate faculty credentials were provided for each.
While the institution has methods for determining faculty qualifications, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine adequate qualifications for a number of faculty members. These individuals are identified on the “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty.”

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documentation for faculty credentialing including: faculty credentials guidelines, the one-stop faculty credentialing application, GTA evaluations, executive summaries of faculty credentials, annotated faculty transcripts, and faculty CVs. The Committee also interviewed the Associate Provost and SACS Liaison, the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council. Based on this thorough review, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that ECU employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the institution’s mission and goals.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

The institution has policy, guidelines, criteria, and processes in place to enable regular evaluation of faculty, regardless of contractual or tenured status. University system policy on tenure (Policy Manual, 100.1, Section 602), adopted 2001 and revised 2009, establishes the authority of the President and Board of Governors to grant tenure, locus of tenure, and institutional responsibility for adoption of board of trustees policies and regulations and establishment and publication of criteria and procedures.

System policy (Policy Manual, 400.3.1.1[G]), adopted 1993, provides direction by the system Board of Governors for institutions to establish “clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department).” No designation of difference among full- and part-time faculty is articulated. The policy further states that among the three major functions of teaching, research and service, teaching “should be the first consideration” in tenure decisions. The policy indicates that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are to be included in teaching evaluation procedures.

Academic units may develop unit-specific Codes of Operation that are approved by the Faculty Senate Code Committee, the Senate, and the Chancellor. The codes are accessible on the Faculty Senate website, “Academic Unit Codes of Operation.” Examples of individual unit codes were provided.

Minimum required qualifications for academic ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor (the only ranks which may involve a permanent tenure commitment) are provided in the Faculty Manual, Part VIII, Personnel Policies and Procedures. Faculty appointed at these ranks are evaluated on performance in teaching (including activities beyond the classroom setting; scholarship (research, creative activity/Innovation, engagement and/or
outreach); and service to the university, the academic profession and the community. Titles of fixed-term appointments, as well as minimum qualifications, are also provided for faculty with duties primarily in instruction, research, clinical teaching or others (e.g., artist/writer in residence, adjunct, affiliate, or visiting faculty).

Faculty are reviewed annually by the unit administrator. Each faculty completes an annual report of the activities that fulfilled their contractual duties for the academic year. Academic units can stipulate relative weight given to teaching, research/creative activity, service, clinical and other activities; however, service cannot be weighed more heavily than either teaching or research/creative activity (Faculty Senate Resolution, December 1997).

Evaluation of teaching includes use of data from the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS) and formal peer review, including direct observation of teaching. Peer review procedures and Peer Review Instruments are published on the Faculty Senate and Office of Faculty Excellence (OFE) websites. Faculty who conduct peer review are required to undergo training provided by the OFE. Results of peer review are reflected in the annual evaluation and, for tenure-track faculty, in the annual progress-towards-tenure letter.

Annual evaluations determine pay raise increments (examples of criteria for salary increments were provided); rehiring of fixed-term part and full-time faculty members; annual progress towards tenure evaluations of probationary term faculty members; five-year post-tenure review of faculty members with permanent tenure; amount of reassigned time from teaching to research (reduction in course load to engage in research); and responses to disciplinary problems, as appropriate. One example of an annual evaluation was provided for a fixed-term faculty member, a tenured faculty member, and a tenure-track faculty member.

The institution’s tenure and evaluation policies is accessible online in the Faculty Manual, Parts IX and X, and in individual college and academic unit codes. The institution makes information in the Faculty Manual available to all faculty at the time of employment. Each spring semester the unit tenure committee and unit administrator review the annual reports of each probationary term faculty member. On the basis of this review, the unit administrator, in consultation with the unit tenure committee, writes a progress toward tenure letter which is reviewed with the faculty member.

A faculty member requesting consideration for promotion and/or tenure completes a Personnel Action Dossier (PAD), a collection of documents and lists of accomplishments in summary form that provides a record of the accomplishments. Directions for the PAD and the tenure and promotion schedule are included in Part X of the Faculty Manual. The PAD is reviewed by external faculty within the discipline, qualified faculty members in the unit, the unit administrator, the dean and the appropriate vice Chancellor who makes a recommendation for approval or disapproval to the Chancellor. The Chancellor makes a recommendation on each candidate to the Board of Trustees.
System policy (Policy Manual, 400.3.3, adopted 1997 and amended 2008) establishes requirements for post-tenure review. The Faculty Manual includes post-tenure guidelines adopted by the Faculty Senate (2009). The review is required of all tenured faculty five years after receiving tenure and thereafter in five-year intervals. Unit administrators, deans and administrators at the division or university level are excluded until after returning to full-time teaching/research responsibilities when they are evaluated in their fifth year and thereafter in five-year intervals. Each academic unit’s tenure committee decides whether all tenured faculty will be reviewed in the same year or according to a serial plan determined by the unit.

A Performance Review Committee elected by the unit tenure committee reviews the faculty member’s professional performance. An initial review is conducted by the unit administrator who forwards to the PRC the evaluative report, the faculty member’s annual reports and annual performance evaluations for the period under review, a copy of the faculty member’s current curriculum vita, and any other material the faculty member wishes to provide to the review committee in support of his/her professional performance over the review period. The PRC either agrees or disagrees with the findings of the unit administrator. The Faculty Manual Appendix B provides procedures for actions to be taken when agreement or disagreement is reached, opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the evaluation, and establishment of reward or faculty development plan. One example of a post-tenure review was provided.

3.7.3 The institution provides evidence of ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. (Faculty development)

Faculty professional development is supported at the institution through opportunities on campus, travel to conferences, workshops, and online webinars. Professional development activities are included in each faculty member’s annual report, and discussed in goal setting and annual evaluation meetings with department chairs. The UNC System provides online opportunities at no cost and various campus units offer development opportunities, including the Brody School of Medicine Faculty Development Office, Information Technology and Computing Services, and Human Resources. A significant provider of professional development opportunities is the Office for Faculty Excellence, offering workshops throughout the year, peer reviews of teaching, teaching portfolio assessments, new faculty orientation, and other support for teaching excellence. Data compiled by the Office for Faculty Excellence indicates steady participation from 2008-2009 through 2010-2011. The office engages in ongoing assessment of its programs and their effectiveness.

The Division of Research and Graduate Studies also supports faculty research and grant-writing through the Faculty Research Development Services and the Research Development Award Program. Although the report focuses heavily upon the development of faculty as teachers, the accompanying documents suggest more attention is given to research and scholarly activities than the report indicates.
3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. *(Academic freedom)*

The institution defines academic freedom for faculty in accordance with the University of North Carolina Code, Chapter VI, Section 601 and the ECU Faculty Manual, Part V (approved by Faculty Senate January 2012). Policies protecting academic freedom are set forth in the University of North Carolina Code and the Faculty Manual of the institution. The policies are made available on the ECU website, the ECU Faculty and Staff webpage, and during new faculty orientation sessions.

A faculty member who believes any of these policies have been violated may file a grievance. The grievance proceeds through a seven step process, culminating in a hearing before the Faculty Grievance Committee (Faculty Manual, Part XII). A subsequent appeal process concludes with a decision by the ECU Board of Trustees.

An appeals procedure is described in the ECU Faculty Manual for faculty denied reappointment or tenure, suspended or terminated, or for those upon whom sanctions have been imposed. Such appeals are considered by a Hearing Committee, Due Process Committee, or by the Reconsideration Committee, depending upon the nature of the alleged violation. All appeals may then be considered by the Chancellor and the ECU Board of Trustees.

In 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the Faculty Grievance Committee considered a total of nine grievances, with at least one complaint of a violation of academic freedom. The current Hearing and Due Process Committees have received no complaints on violations of academic freedom.

Academic freedom for students is defined in the ECU Student Conduct Process (approved August 17, 2010) and the ECU Creed. Policies are available on the Dean of Students Policies and Procedures webpage, and the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities web page.

3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. *(Faculty role in governance)*

East Carolina University publishes policies that define the responsibility of faculty in academic and other governance matters in the East Carolina University Faculty Manual. The manual explains the role of the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council in recommending academic policies for the institution.

The Policies, Rules and Regulations website provides documentation of approved and revision of policies. There are examples of completed curriculum changes forms, a current listing of faculty involved in governance committees and clear definitions of faculty committee rolls in ECU governance.

Policies and procedures related to the curriculum development and approval process are published in the Faculty Manual, the Undergraduate Curriculum and
3.8.1 The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission. (Learning/information resources)

The Compliance Report outlines the facilities, services, and collections of the Joyner Library, which supports the main campus and its academic offerings, and the Laupus Library, which supports the Health Sciences Campus and areas of study. The libraries have separate reporting structures and budgets within the University, appropriate to their missions, but maintain coordinated catalogs and access to resources. Each library provides access and facilities tailored to its user clientele, with specific support provided for distance education and users with disabilities.

3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. (Instruction of library use)

The Joyner Library maintains a nuanced instruction program, referencing information literacy standards developed by the Association of Colleges and Research Libraries. Course-integrated information literacy skills development is supplemented with more specialized instruction at the request of faculty, and through online tutorials, in-person and online reference services, and individual appointments. The library plays a key role in new faculty orientation. Classrooms and equipment are described in the Compliance Report, and off-site instruction, including support for the Wells Fargo Partnership East initiative, and instruction for distance education are referenced. Instruction statistics reflect the growth in number of sessions and participants over a five year period. Laupus Library’s instruction is provided to students, faculty, off-site community affiliates, and distance education affiliates. Statistics show a decline following a high number of sessions and participants aligned with the opening of the new library, with a rise in the past year.

3.8.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources—to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Qualified staff)

East Carolina University libraries provide evidence to support faculty credentials and years of professional/ECU service, and five years of data related to the library faculty’s professional development. FTE equivalents for staff, graduate assistants, student assistants and part-time security support staff are referenced in the Compliance Report. The report provides comparative analysis of ECU staffing and salary expenditures with peer institutions. LibQual+ analytics associated with user satisfaction regarding services provided by faculty and staff were also cited. The staffing levels for the Information Technology and
3.9.1 The institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement of student rights and responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. \textit{(Student rights)}

The policies related to student rights and responsibilities are under the authority of the Chancellor, and were established and approved on August 17, 2010. ECU has provided an overview of matters related to student rights and responsibilities using examples related to The Student Code of Conduct, The East Carolina Creed, and academic integrity. In addition, the narrative highlights individual program standards such as those in the Brody School of Medicine.

ECU documented the dissemination of information via the Student Handbook, Campus Living Resident Handbook, Student Conduct Code, academic integrity policy for student and faculty, and the Faculty Manual. The primary form of distribution is through the internet.

3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. \textit{(Student records)}.

ECU provided a detailed summary of how it handles student records in an appropriate manner. The institution adheres to FERPA guidelines and the UNC records retention and disposition schedule. The document is clear with regard to how student records are handled, stored, and purged by University personnel. The following serve as examples and resources associated with student records:

- Privacy of Student Educational Records Policy
- University Business Manual (retention and disposition of records)
- Secure log-in required to access student records
- Information security website
- University Student and Staff Computer Use Policy
- IT Compliance and Regulations web page
- Employees cannot access records without FERPA training.

3.9.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. \textit{(Qualified staff)}

ECU provided detailed information with regard to mission via the Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan (2011-14). The institution employs 283 student affairs professionals, and demonstrated qualifications, education, and level of experience via the Qualified Student Affairs Staff Table. The Compliance Report further documented the qualifications of staff members by noting that 87% have at least one graduate degree, 26% have a terminal degree, and 16% are
pursuing a terminal degree. Based upon comparison with peer institutions, ECU has sufficient, qualified student affairs staff members.

ECU has a 24 step process for hiring qualified staff, and engages in a number of professional development programs – which include:

- New Student Affairs Educators “Onboarding"
- Performance Evaluations
- Continuing Career Development
- Professional Involvement and Development (participation in professional organizations)
- Divisional Semester “Kick-Off” Meetings
- End of Year Celebration and Awards

3.10.1 The institution’s recent financial history demonstrates financial stability. (Financial stability)

Based on data that are over a year old, the previous five fiscal years (2007 – 2011) show sustained growth with consistent increases in assets, revenues, expenses, and net assets. Working capital increased $40 million from fiscal 2007 to fiscal 2011. Long-term debt is at very manageable levels. The institution employs a chief financial officer with appropriate credentials. Efforts to be more efficient in the face of static or declining state support are documented.

* 3.10.2 The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. (Financial aid audits)

The institution audits its financial aid programs as required by federal law. The North Carolina Office of the State Auditor (NCOSA) is responsible for auditing the East Carolina State University’s financial aid program annually. Statewide Single Audits for fiscal 2009 through 2011 included coverage of the institutions programs and did not disclose any material weakness. In March 2010, the institution had a U.S. Department of Education Program Review. The “Expedited Final Program Review” letter dated March 15, 2010, states that the purpose of the review was to evaluate ECU’s compliance with statutes and federal regulations pertaining to the institution’s administration of Title IV, Higher Education Act (HEA) programs. Of the files selected for students who withdrew, those who were selected for verification, and those who received a “0” grade point average, no significant findings were identified.

The institution provided the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee with various financial aid audits from the state of North Carolina as well as the Department of Education. ECU recently concluded an audit from the state of North Carolina in December 2012. The institution was able to provide documentation of this audit, which reflected no major findings.
3.10.3 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its financial resources. (Control of finances)

The institution has a structure for controlling its financial resources, however; the “University of North Carolina Finance Improvement and Transformation Project, Assessment of Internal Controls Over Financial Reporting for Fiscal 2011,” listed several issues with financial controls. Among the concerns was the finding that improvement was needed in “management providing the necessary resources to insure accountability and appropriate controls over information processing, accounting, and reporting functions.” Also, a number of prior years’ recommendations listed in the report have not been completed. Administrators hired to perform finance and accounting functions have appropriate credentials and experience.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed financial documents and conducted interviews to address the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s concerns. The primary evaluation of financial controls at the institutional level occurs during an annual audit. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, the North Carolina Office of the State Auditor (NCOSA) reported the following for East Carolina University:

“The results of our tests disclosed no deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses in relation to our audit scope or any instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.”

As part of an UNC system-wide initiative each university identified areas for continuous improvement and to further strengthen areas where controls are already in place. Examples from ECU are as follows:

- Creation of 4 new senior level positions: Student Accounting Services manager, Tax expert, E Commerce expert, Disbursements Manager
- Creation of 5 accountant positions
- Reorganization to establish separate Compliance section within Financial Services

These additional staff members and reorganization reflect a willingness of the University to assess operations and use feedback to improve effectiveness.

3.10.4 The institution maintains financial control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs. (Control of sponsored research/external funds)

Financial control over sponsored programs is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies (VCRGS) and the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance (VCAF). Both positions report to the Chancellor. Post-award administration of sponsored programs is the responsibility of the Office of Grants and Contracts. Sponsored Program Administration policies cover the expected controls and should provide
appropriate oversight. Support for principle investigators is strong in the area of award set-up, expenditures, and post award compliance. There is good evidence of strong communication regarding control and compliance. Recent audits covering federal awards have indicated no material concerns.

3.11.1 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. *(Control of physical resources)*

The governance and administrative structure insure the appropriate controls over the physical resources of the institution. The institution employs classic management processes in managing its physical resources. Regular evaluation occurs. There are plans for development and maintenance, as well as a program of risk management and safety. Assets are appropriately insured, and contingency plans exist. The institution tracks and reports deferred maintenance through the North Carolina State Construction Office Facility Condition Assessment Program. The current assessment indicated approximately $72 million in needs with funding requested for approximately $12 million.

3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. *(Institutional environment)*

There is very strong evidence of a commitment to provide an environment that is healthy, safe, and secure. The institution has well-formed emergency management procedures. The institution provided evidence that is also very effective in the communication of safety and health issues. The Office of Prospective Health is responsible for providing quality health and safety services to all employees related to biological safety, employee health, employee wellness, infection control, and radiation safety. Campus Living and the University Police department hold programs aimed at campus residence safety. Regular drills and emergency management exercises are conducted. Regular safety inspections of high risk areas are conducted.

Procedures that address the health, safety and welfare of the institution’s public published and readily accessed. The institution provides methods of emergency notification and communications branded as ECU Alert System. Tools including the ECU Alert Web page, ECU Pirate email, PC Pop-up boxes that display icons and messages, ECU hotlines, outdoor and indoor speakers, OP phone speaker interfaces, digital LCD/plasma screen messages, Twitter, and cell phone text messaging notices.

*3.11.3 The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. *(Physical facilities)*

The institution provided the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee with evidence that it has continued to build, transform, and acquire facilities that support its mission. The institution consists of approximately 1390 acres; approximately 535 acres
are located on the Main Campus, 206 acres are located on the Health Sciences Campus and 649 acres are located on the West Research Campus. The university utilizes 206 facilities comprised of over 6,606,987 million gross square feet in support of daily operations. In February 2012, the ECU Board of Trustees approved the comprehensive ECU Master Plan. The two-year master planning process was comprehensive. Detailed studies were conducted on space utilization, space needs, building condition and deferred maintenance, campus safety and security, utilities and infrastructure, traffic, transit, parking, academics, research, clinics, athletics, housing, dining, and recreation facilities.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification, took a campus tour of facilities, and confirmed the finding of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee through interviews with appropriate campus officials (i.e., the Associate Vice President for Campus Operations, the Director of Institutional Planning, and the Space Planning Associate in the Office of Institutional Planning). The institution provided evidence that it has continued to build, transform, and acquire facilities that support its mission. The institution consists of approximately 1390 acres; 535 acres are located on the Main Campus, 206 acres are located on the Health Sciences Campus and 649 acres are located on the West Research Campus. The university utilizes 206 facilities comprised of over 6,606,987 gross square feet in support of daily operations.

Strong evidence is presented to indicate that the institution extensively and comprehensively evaluates space through qualitative and quantitative criteria. Benchmarks are part of these assessments. Detailed studies were conducted on space utilization, space needs, building condition and deferred maintenance, campus safety and security, utilities and infrastructure, traffic, transit, parking, academics, research, clinics, athletics, housing, dining, and recreation facilities.

Practices supported by policy and participation of key leaders and constituents advise the administration on allocation/reallocation of space. In February 2012, the ECU Board of Trustees approved the comprehensive ECU Master Plan. The two-year master planning process was all encompassing, providing a roadmap for future campus improvements. Recent commitments to the technology infrastructure to support on-line education are laudable.

3.12.1 The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission’s substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. (See the Commission policy “Substantive Changes for Accredited Institutions.”) (Substantive change)

ECU provided documentation of institutional and UNC system-wide policies and procedures concerning substantive changes, and provided specific documentation of adherence to those policies. This narrative presents the policies and procedures, and the examples of adherence to those policies and procedures, which demonstrate that ECU notifies the Commission of substantive changes, and, when required, provides notification prior to the implementation of substantive changes.
As outlined in the institution’s internal policies, the University notifies the Commission of any significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of changes and seeks prior approval of changes as required. The Office of Academic Programs in the Division of Academic Affairs reviews program and curricular changes for instances that constitute substantive change. Academic program development workshops are held regularly and substantive change requirements are included in the agenda.

The Office of Academic Planning coordinates requests for authorization to establish new degree programs and makes recommendations to the UNC Board of Governors’ Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs on requests to establish these programs. The Office of Academic Planning also coordinates requests to discontinue a degree program and the planning and authorization of new joint degrees as well as distance education degree programs in accordance with regulations established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

The Division of Academic Affairs’ Office of Academic Programs facilitates university-wide undergraduate and graduate degree program development and refinement in the academic affairs and health sciences divisions. The office assures that new and revised academic programs are in compliance with the rules and regulations of East Carolina University, the University of North Carolina system, our regional accrediting body, and the state legislature.

The Academic Program Development Collaborative Team (APDC Team) is an advisory body to the Academic Council. A unit proposing a new degree program begins the on campus review process by presenting the appropriate documents to the APDC Team, which collaborates with the unit to strengthen the proposal. The APDC Team advises the provost on all new academic program proposals submitted, and the Team advises the dean of the Graduate School on graduate programs under consideration. The Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) is informed of those recommendations (details are located below concerning the EPPC).

The Academic Program Development Collaborative Team identifies proposed degree programs that constitute a substantive change as defined by SACS at the planning stage. If the proposed program constitutes a substantive change, the office of the Provost notifies SACS through written correspondence. If it is unclear whether a substantive change will occur, ECU proceeds on the side of caution and notifies SACS of the proposed degree program. If SACS requests further information, the Office of the Provost forwards a copy of the request for authorization to establish a new degree program (Appendix C), when it is submitted to UNC-GA for final approval.

The Academic Program Development Collaborative Team is also charged with identifying off-campus sites and distance learning programs that constitute a substantive change as defined by SACS when the notification of intent to plan a new distance education degree program is submitted for review. If the proposed program constitutes a substantive change, the Office of the Provost notifies SACSCOC through written correspondence and if further information is requested, the Office of the Provost forwards a copy of the request for
authorization to establish a new distance education degree program when it is submitted for final approval.

During the period since the university’s last accreditation, East Carolina University has submitted specified substantive change notifications. In 2002, ECU received notification from SACS “Inasmuch as these degree programs are well established at the institution and given the Commissions’ approval of technology-mediated instruction at ECU, this delivery mode [distance education] is included within the scope of the institution’s accreditation. No further information is requested.”

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy compliance)

(Note: Institutions are responsible for reviewing the following Commission policies and providing evidence of compliance with those that are applicable. Those that have asterisks are policies that include a federal mandate.)

*3.13.1. “Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies”

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Documentation: The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

ECU describes itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and keeps each institutional accrediting body apprised on any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

ECU provided information on the cycles of its accredited programs. With the adoption of SACSCOC new Comprehensive Standard in January 2012, the institution developed a standard description of ECU to be used in all accreditation reports. The description was approved by the Academic Council in July 2012, sent to each accrediting body representing ECU Program’s, and is a standard operating procedure for preparation of reports to all accrediting bodies.

The Associate Provost, who also serves as the university liaison to SACS-COC, has as part of his responsibility overseeing and coordinating all accreditations
within the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs. The Associate Provost regularly meets with the Chancellor and Academic Council to provide accreditation, accountability and policy updates.

3.13.2 “Collaborative Academic Arrangements: Policy and Procedures”

**Applicable Policy Statement.** Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy). These arrangements must address the requirements set forth in the collaborative academic arrangements policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC-accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

**Documentation:** The institution should provide evidence that it has reported to the Commission all collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy) that included signed final copies of the agreements. In addition, the institution should integrate into the Compliance Certification a discussion and determination of compliance with all standards applicable to the provisions of the agreements.

The institution indicates that it has no dual educational programs or joint educational programs. The institution does participate in consortial arrangements and contractual agreements. Letters of notification to SACSCOC, responses and approvals were inconsistent. The required SACS accreditation disclaimer, assurance of quality of credits, and compliance with accreditation requirements is not included in all agreements.

The institution has shared responsibility for course and program development following mutually agreed-upon standards of academic quality in a university system German Studies Consortium (since 2002) and in an inter-institutional arrangement to offer the PhD in Technology Management (since 1998). The German Studies Consortium is not a degree-awarding entity. The consortium’s primary focus is coordination of German Studies courses offered through the institutions participating in the consortium. Consortium courses are cross-listed at participating institutions. Students pay tuition at their home campuses, regardless of the institution delivering the course. There is no exchange of tuition funds among participating institutions. A Consortium Council
oversees a course evaluation process; results are used to improve course offerings and teaching methods. A copy of the agreement was provided. In the agreement there is no disclaimer statement regarding SACSCOC accreditation or statement regarding assurance of quality of credits when evaluating, accepting or transcripting credits. No notification of SACS or response by SACS was provided.

The PhD in Technology Management is hosted by Indiana State University, the degree-granting institution. Course offerings, research initiatives and faculty leadership are provided through a consortium of nine universities. Administrative oversight in provided by Indiana State University working with the Graduate Consortium Coordinating Council, comprised of program coordinators of the consortium universities. Integrity and quality of graduate courses rests with each member institution. A copy of the agreement was provided. In the agreement there is no disclaimer statement regarding SACSCOC accreditation or statement regarding assurance of quality of credits when evaluating, accepting or transcripting credits. An August 2012 notification of SACSCOC was provided but not a SACSCOC response.

The institution participates in the University System's Comprehensive Articulation Agreement with the state’s community colleges, approved by the Board of Governors in 1996 and last revised in 2010. A copy of the agreement was provided for review. It states “All courses designated as approved for college transfer under this agreement will be taught by faculty who meet Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges credential requirements.”

The agreement allows for the block transfer of the general education core completed at the community college. Transfer of credits for students who transfer from a community college to a constituent institution is established by the articulation agreement. A Transfer Advisory Committee, an eight-member committee appointed by the presidents of the Community College System and institution’s University System, is responsible for interpreting all comprehensive articulation agreement policy. The institution provided a list of current articulation agreements.

The institution’s policy on Approval and Review of Bilateral Agreements (2004) calls for a University Bilateral Agreements Committee (UBAC) to be established by June 2012. The committee is responsible for review and approval of all collaborative programs. In addition, the institution’s internal policy on Notification of Substantive Change articulates the institution’s commitment to notify the SACSCOC of “any significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of changes and seeks prior approval of changes as required.”

Other agreements. The institution recently (2011) began a collaborative academic arrangement with La Meridiana International School of Ceramics in Tuscany, Italy. The agreement enables students to have a semester-long "study abroad experience" while enrolled in courses taught by the institution’s faculty. La Meridiana provides lodging, meals, studio space, classrooms, and class supplies. During the semester, the institution’s students have access to classrooms with academic faculty in Art History, Italian language, and
communication classes. On-site Italian support faculty are previously approved and credentialed by the institution’s School of Art and Design. A copy of the December 2010 notification of SACSCOC letter was provided, as well as SACSCOC response letter (January 2011) and acceptance of the agreement (March 2012). A copy of the agreement was not provided for review.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification report as well as the focused report and conducted meetings with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Vice Provost, the University Attorney, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs. Using this information, the Committee confirmed that the institution is correct in stating that it has no dual or joint degree programs.

*3.13.3. “Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions”

Applicable Policy Statement. Each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized. (See FR 4.5). The Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request. This record will be reviewed and evaluated by the Commission as part of the institution’s decennial evaluation.

Documentation: When addressing this policy statement, the institution should provide information to the Commission describing how the institution maintains its record and also include the following: (1) individuals/offices responsible for the maintenance of the record(s), (2) elements of a complaint review that are included in the record, and (3) where the record(s) is located (centralized or decentralized). The record itself will be reviewed during the on-site evaluation of the institution.

The Dean of Students is responsible for directing academic and non-academic complaints and concerns to appropriate University personnel. The Dean of Students is also responsible for the maintenance and storage of student complaint documents. The policies are posted on-line via the Dean of Students’ web page. Students are required to file concerns in writing via the Student Complaint Form. The institution also outlined the right of students to address concerns which are not resolved at the university level with “The University of North Carolina General Administration, Post-Secondary Education Complaints.” ECU provided three appropriate examples of complaints and action taken as a result of the complaints.

After conversations with representatives from the Office of the Dean of Students and the Office of the Chancellor, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verified that the University has procedures for addressing and resolving student complaints. The Committee examined reports and logs, which resulted in the demonstration of application of their complaint policy.
3.13.4. “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports”

*3.13.4.a. Applicable Policy Statement. An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification.

Documentation: In order to be in compliance with this policy, the institution must have incorporated an assessment of its compliance with standards that apply to its distance and correspondence education programs and courses.

Using Appendix C of the Resource Manual, Guidelines for Addressing Distance and Correspondence Education, as a guide for reviewing the Compliance Certification in relation to this standard, overall ECU demonstrates overall that it ensures distance and correspondence education courses and programs comply with the Principles of Accreditation in the following areas:

- Mission
- Organizational Structure
- Institutional Effectives
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Academic Support Services
- Student Access to Policies
- Faculty
- Library/Learning Resources
- Student Support Services
- Facilities
- Finances for Distance Learning and Technology
- Federal Requirements

After review of the compliance audit, the Off-Site Report, and consideration of meetings with administrators from the Office of Sponsored Programs and Emerging Academic Initiatives, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee confirms the Off-Site Committee’s findings as to appropriate documentation.

3.13.4.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If an institution is part of a system or corporate structure, a description of the system operation (or corporate structure) is submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. The description should be designed to help members of the peer review committees understand the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system and the individual institution’s role within that system.

Documentation: The institution should provide a description of the system operation and structure or the corporate structure if this applies.

In North Carolina all the public educational institutions that grant baccalaureate degrees are part of the University of North Carolina system. The UNC Board of Governors is the policy-making body legally charged with “the general determination, control, supervision, management, and governance of all affairs of
the constituent institutions.” Each of the constituent institutions is headed by a Chancellor, who is chosen by the Board of Governors on the President’s nomination and is responsible to the President. The institution has a Board of Trustees, consisting of eight members elected by the Board of Governors, four appointed by the Governor, and the President of the student body, who serves ex-officio. The Board of Trustees holds extensive powers over academic and other operations of its institution on delegation from the Board of Governors.

3.13.5. “Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution”

*a. Applicable Policy Statement. *All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.

**Documentation:** For institutions with branch campuses: (1) The name of each branch campus must include the name of the parent campus—the SACSCOC accredited entity. The institution should provide evidence of this for each of its branch campuses. (2) The institution should incorporate the review of its branch campuses, as well as other extended units under the parent campus, into its comprehensive self-assessment and its determination of compliance with the standards, and indicate the procedure for doing so.

The Off-Site Committee noted that this standard was not addressed in ECU’s Compliance Certification Report, but the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review concluded that the institution has no branch campuses.

**b. Applicable Policy Statement.** If the Commission on Colleges determines that an extended unit is autonomous to the extent that the control over that unit by the parent or its board is significantly impaired, the Commission may direct that the extended unit seek to become a separately accredited institution. A unit which seeks separate accreditation should bear a different name from that of the parent. A unit which is located in a state or country outside the geographic jurisdiction of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and which the Commission determines should be separately accredited or the institution requests to be separately accredited, applies for separate accreditation from the regional accrediting association that accredits colleges in that state or country.

**Implementation:** If, during its review of the institution, the Commission determines that an extended unit is sufficiently autonomous to the extent that the parent campus has little or no control, the Commission will use this policy to recommend separate accreditation of the extended unit. *No response required by the institution.*
The Off-Site Committee noted that this standard was not addressed in ECU’s Compliance Certification Report, but the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review concluded that the institution has no branch campuses.

3.14.1 A member or candidate institution represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. (Publication of accreditation status)

East Carolina University publishes, both in hard copy and electronically, the name, address, and telephone number of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

The information appears as follows:

East Carolina University (ECU) is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degrees. Contact the Commission on Colleges at 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097 or call 404-679-4500 for questions about the accreditation of ECU.

This information appears in all versions of the ECU catalog as well as in printed publications for distance education students. This information is also found on official ECU transcripts.

D. Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements

*4.1 The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations, student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. (Student achievement)

ECU evaluates success with respect to student achievement using a variety of measures, including enrollment data, improvement in retention and graduation rates, licensure exams pass rates, course completion rates, and job placement rates. The primary method for ongoing documentation and evaluation of these indicators is the University Dashboard, a reporting tool that includes all of the measures indicated.

The institution set a retention benchmark of 82%. It has progressed, from 75.9% in 2004-05, reaching an 81% retention rate for the past two years, which is the first time that ECU has reached a retention rate greater than 80%. The increase in retention rate is a reflection of increased academic support services.

ECU’s most recent four-year undergraduate graduation rate is 30.8 (Fall 2007 cohort). This rate was slightly lower than the previous year which was 32.7% however, as of 2012; ECU no longer uses four-year graduation rates as a core performance funding metric.
The rates for degrees conferred are collected by the Office of institutional Planning, Assessment and Research, communicated via the University Dashboard and used for decision-making purposes. The information is disaggregated by department as well as by college.

The Career Center collects employment data on graduates from the institution by gathering the information when students and alumni report via the “Took a job” link from the Career Center homepage Quick Links section. At the institutional level and as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration, the ECU's Office of Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research administers the Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) each spring semester. Additionally, summaries of job placement data are reported by a representative sample of academic programs in the Academic Programs Reviews conducted in 2010-2011. Licensing examination pass rates are collected and reported by multiple departments.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the Associate Provost and other members of the faculty and staff and confirmed the Off-Site Committee’s findings.

*4.2 The institution’s curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. (Program curriculum)

The institution’s mission statement, approved by the Board of Governors (2009), expresses its dedication to “serving as a national model for public service and regional transformation.” Academic programs are intended to prepare students to “compete and succeed in the global economy and multicultural society.” The institution aspires to distinguish itself “by the ability to train and prepare leaders.”

In its strategic plan (2010-2011) the institution establishes a strategic direction for Education for a New Century. Academic programs will 1) increase students’ global awareness, diversity and cultural competence; 2) provide a strong liberal arts foundation to support intellectual growth, lifelong learning and informed and ethical decision making; 3) increase students’ engagement in research opportunities; 4) increase the number of students entering and succeeding STEM and health science disciplines; and 5) contribute to a national model for preparation of quality teachers.

The institution offers 102 baccalaureate degree programs, 77 master’s degree programs, 16 doctoral programs and four first professional degree programs (MD, DMD, DPT and AUD/PhD). Program degree and course requirements are listed by college in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. Course descriptions, including prerequisites, are provided in the catalogs as well.

Degree programs have residency requirements that assist in ensuring that students have learning, research and community engagement opportunities consistent with the institution’s mission. Undergraduate degrees require a that minimum of 30 semester hours and at least one-half of the total hours required in
the major discipline be completed through enrollment in courses offered by the institution (Undergraduate Catalog 2012-2013, “Baccalaureate Degree Requirements”). Graduate degree programs require that students earn at least eighty percent of the required degree credits through enrollment in courses offered by the institution (Graduate Catalog 2012-2013, “Residence and Graduation Requirements”).

Institutional planning documents for requests for the development of new programs must include justification of the program’s support of the institutional mission and strategic plan. Mission alignment is reviewed by the Academic Program Development Collaborative Team and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate as part of the degree proposal review and approval process. The planning documents must also specifically request evidence and discussion of similar programs at institutions of higher education in the state and nation and include indication of societal need as well as other institutions identified, visited or consulted in developing the proposal.

Curriculum development, review and approval processes are multi-level, involving faculty and administrative participation to ensure that curricula are maintain coherence with the institutional mission, as well as the missions of the academic units responsible for their delivery. Three Board of Governors policies guide academic program planning, review and approval. Academic Program Planning (Policy Manual, 400.1, 2009) requires that development and approval of new academic programs involves faculty in the disciplines, campus and university administration, and the Board. Among criteria that must be addressed in the request for a new program is the relation of the program to the distinctiveness of the campus and the mission of the campus. Regulations on Long Range Planning (Policy Manual, 400.2.1.1, 2005) also require demonstration of program contribution to institutional mission. Guidelines for Academic Program Development (Policy Manual, 400.1.1.1[G], 2009) require each campus to have a clearly defined process for campus review and approval of proposals to plan and requests to establish new academic degree programs. Appropriate campus committees and authorities must be involved in the review and approval processes.

The Faculty Manual states that curriculum development is the responsibility of faculty (Part V, Academic Information). The manual clearly articulates the multi-level development, review and approval procedures, involving faculty and campus administration and governing bodies. Both the Notice of Intent to Plan and the Request for Authorization to Plan require description of the contribution of the proposed program to the institutional mission and strategic plan.

To ensure continuous program improvement and contribution to the institutional mission and strategic plan, the institution established Guidelines for Academic Program Review (2008). The process includes programmatic self-study, an on-site review committee comprised of both internal and external reviewers, and outcomes assessment. Programs are reviewed on a seven-year cycle.

Some programs and/or academic units hold specialized external accreditation as well. Reviews by these bodies include a review of both undergraduate and graduate programs in relation to standards established for the discipline,
including curriculum content. The institution also provided a list of degree programs accredited by professional associations, boards, commissions, councils and societies, along with the years of last and next accreditation review.

Distance education programs must adhere to the same requirements. Online degree program curricula are required to be identical to programs delivered on campus.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee determined that the institution's procedures for program review and development of new programs are adequate to support the programs. Also, several programs hold accreditation in their professional disciplines, which require an adequate number of faculty members to support those programs. Reviewers met with the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Emerging Academic Initiatives, the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, a Research Associate in the Office of Institutional Research, the Chair of the University Curriculum Committee and the Coordinator of Academic Program Development.

*4.3 The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. (Publication of policies)

ECU has provided evidence that academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies are available to faculty, staff, students, and the public via the internet and campus documents.

The academic calendar is developed by Faculty Senate Calendar Committee, presented to the Faculty Senate, and sent to the Chancellor as a recommendation. The Chancellor has final approval of the calendar. The academic calendar is published in the Graduate Catalog, Undergraduate Catalog, Registrar's web page, and the University calendar website.

The Faculty Senate develops grading policies and they are sent to the Chancellor for approval. Approved grading policies appear in the Faculty Manual, Part VI, Graduate Catalog, Undergraduate Catalog, and the Brody School of Medicine student affairs website.

Refund policies are established by federal guidelines and University policy. Information regarding refund policies is available in the Refund and Withdrawal Policies, Registrar's website, Graduate Catalog, Undergraduate Catalog, Campus Living Refund Policies, Campus Dining Refund Policies, Dowdy Student Stores Refund Policies, and Geology Department Field Course Refund Policies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that ECU disseminates all academic calendars including UG, graduate, and those for the Brody School of Medicine and the School of Dental medicine. These are made available on appropriate web sites and are included in the compliance certification. The institution also disseminates grading policy and refund policies and furnished documentation of all such policies.
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents pertaining to the publication of academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. In addition, members of the team conducted interviews with administrators including the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Provost, the University Attorney, and the Chair of the Compliance Certification Counsel.

*4.4 Program length is appropriate for each of the institution’s educational programs. *(Program length)*

The institution ensures appropriate length of each academic program through the UNC Academic Program Development Procedures, periodic program review (7 year cycle), professional accreditations, program assessment, state licensure, advisory boards, and the faculty approval process. Undergraduate programs require a minimum of 120 semester hours and graduate programs require a minimum of 30 semester hours. The four first-professional degrees offered by the institution require appropriate semesters for each discipline.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification report and conducted meetings with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Vice Provost, and the University Attorney. Based on the information provided in the report and interviews, the On-Site Committee verifies and confirms the findings of the Off-Site Committee.

*4.5 The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. *(See the Commission policy “Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions.”) *(Student complaints)*

The Dean of Students is responsible for directing academic and non-academic complaints and concerns to appropriate university personnel. The Dean of Students is also responsible for the maintenance and storage of student complaint documents. The policies are posted on-line via the Dean of Students’ web page. Students are required to file concerns in writing via the Student Complaint Form. The institution also outlined the right of students to address concerns which are not resolved at the University level with “The University of North Carolina General Administration, Post-Secondary Education Complaints.” ECU provided three appropriate examples of complaints and action taken as a result of the complaints.

After conversations with representatives from the Office of the Dean of Students and the Office of the Chancellor, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verified that the institution has procedures for addressing and resolving student complaints. The Committee examined on-site reports, which resulted in the demonstration of application of their complaint policy.
*4.6 Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution’s practices and policies. *(Recruitment materials)*

In publication of all recruitment materials, East Carolina abides by the professional policies and ethical standards as set forth by national, regional, and state professional associations.

ECU’s Department of University Publication (DUP) has primary responsibility for admissions materials, student recruitment materials, and fund-raising materials. All student recruitment pieces including those for distance education must be created or approved by the (DUP) in keeping with ECU’s guidelines for writing and editing publications. All publications listing courses and degree requirements must go through the publications office for submission to academic review by the institution’s division of Academic Affairs and the Graduate School.

Documentation included in the Compliance Certification provided an appropriate summary and sample gallery of recruitment materials. The narrative appropriately highlight technology, training, and other resources used to enhance recruitment materials. The institution strengthens recruitment materials and publication by adhering to standards established by state professional organizations.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review of the compliance certification and interviews with ECU officials (i.e., Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Director of Admissions, Associate Provost for Enrollment Services, and Coordinator in the Office of Continuing Studies) led to its concurrence with the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee and to its determination that recruitment materials accurately represent practices and policies of the institution.

*4.7 The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended. *(In reviewing the institution’s compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the U.S. Department of Education.)* *(Title IV program responsibilities)*

The institution provided evidence of its compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act as amended. The institution is in good standing with the United States Department of Education Title IV programs. There are no existing conditions with the institution’s Title IV programs. There are no unresolved complaints filed with the Department of Education. The institution received a “finding free” program review by the in its most recent (March 2010) review. Also, the North Carolina Office of the State Auditor conducts an annual financial statement audit of ECU in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Auditing Standards, as required by OMB Circular A-133. The institution provided a copy of the audit for Fiscal 2011, and the audit did not reveal findings that would be required to be disclosed in the Single Audit Report. Also, the current US Department of Education Eligibility and Certification Approval Report and Program Participation Agreement were provided.
Based on its review of relevant documents and on-site meetings with the Vice Chancellor for Financial Services, University Comptroller and Director of Student Financial Aid, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verifies and concurs with the findings of the off-site review.

**4.8** An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following: *(Distance and correspondence education)*

**4.8.1** demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

The institution verifies the identity of a student participating in a distance or correspondence course or program through the use of a web-based authentication system that requires unique user identification and a unique user-determined passphrase. A password expiration policy ensures that a student’s passphrase is changed every 90 days to prevent unauthorized access. Distance education students must logon and verify their identities to utilize Blackboard and other electronic systems.

The institution utilizes a state-wide proctoring network to verify student identity for online examinations and other assessments. The Distance Education Proctoring Center is accessed through a website and is available to students enrolled in distance education courses within the University of North Carolina system.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification report and met with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Vice Provost, and the University Attorney. This led the On-Site Committee to confirm the findings of the Off-Site Committee.

**4.8.2** has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.

The institution’s Policies, Rules, and Regulations include an explanation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) policies. It addresses specifically the implications for privacy and security of student identity and records in an online environment (section 5.4.1).

The Faculty Manual includes sections governing access to student educational records and privacy of student records. *(Faculty Manual:
Part VI. Section IV.IA., Access to Student Educational Records, and Section IV.IB., Privacy of Student Educational Records).

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification report and met with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Vice Provost, and the University Attorney. This led the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee to confirm the findings of the Off-Site Committee.

4.8.3 has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.

The institution does not charge any fees specifically related to verification of student identity. However, students may be charged a fee for proctoring of online exams, depending upon the proctoring service chosen. A statement regarding this potential fee is in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Catalog, on the institution cashier website, on the Distance Education Options website, and in the Tuition and Fee Brochure. A statement also appears on screen when a student registers for a distance education course.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance certification report and met with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Chair of the Compliance Certification Council, the University Registrar, the Senior Associate Vice Provost, and the University Attorney. This led the On-Site Committee to confirm the findings of the Off-Site Committee.

*4.9 The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education and to Commission policy. (See the Commission policy “Credit Hours.”) (Definition of credit hours)

All degrees awarded by the institution require the completion of a minimum number of semester credit hours; there is no other means of determining academic credit for degrees. University system policy (400.1.6, Academic Calendar, adopted 1996 and amended in 2002 and 2007) requires all campuses to ensure that every course offered for academic credit adheres to the standard of a minimum of 750 scheduled minutes of instructional time or the equivalent per credit hour. The time may include required examination days but cannot include study days.

The institution’s regulation 02.07.01 Definition of a Semester Credit Hour (2011) follows federal guidelines and is accessible in the institution’s policy manual:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an
institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

2.1 One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time, or

2.2 At least an equivalent amount of work as required outlined in item 2.1 above for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. (34 CFR 668.8, July 1, 2011)

Procedures and practices for new program development, review and approval, academic program review, professional accreditation and state licensure requirements for some professions broadly involved academic unit, institutional, University system and state offices/agencies in assuring that determination of credit hours conforms to regulation, commonly accepted practice in higher education, and SACS COC policy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review determined that the institution has demonstrated that policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs follow commonly accepted practices in higher education and adhere to Commission policy. All degrees awarded by the institution require the completion of a minimum number of semester credit hours. The team met with the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, a Research Associate in the Office of Institutional Research, the Chair of the University Curriculum Committee and the Coordinator of Academic Programs.

E. Additional Observations regarding strengths and weaknesses of the institution. (optional).
Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

A. Brief description of the institution’s Quality Enhancement Plan

As the Eastern Carolina University QEP webpage explains,

ECU’s Quality Enhancement Plan—"Write Where You Belong"—is a multi-faceted, multi-year project to integrate, align, and reinforce writing instruction for students from the day that they begin their first classes at ECU to the day that they complete their degrees and transition into the workplace or advanced study.

To develop this plan, ECU invited proposals, staged a proposal presentation process, and conducted a vote of campus participants and of the Faculty Senate, with the selection being made by the Chancellor.

The “Write Where You Belong” QEP includes three principal components: (1) a revised curriculum; (2) faculty support; and (3) student support.

Curriculum

A new set of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) was created:

1. Use writing to investigate complex, relevant topics and address significant questions through engagement with and effective use of credible sources.
2. Produce writing that reflects an awareness of context, purpose, and audience, particularly within the written genres (including genres that integrate writing with visuals, audio or other multi-modal components) of their major disciplines and/or career fields.
3. Demonstrate that they understand writing as a process that can be made more effective through drafting and revision.
4. Proofread and edit their own writing, avoiding grammatical and mechanical errors.
5. Assess and explain the major choices that they make in their writing.

To support students meeting these outcomes, the two first-year composition courses are revised: the first one, offered in both terms in the first year, will focus on the transition to college writing; and the second one, offered in the second year, will provide a transition from the first year into writing-intensive courses in the disciplines by focusing on writing in different fields. In addition, to foster transfer, teaching strategies incorporating metacognition, focused on student’ self-analysis of writing, are being incorporated across the curriculum.

Faculty Support includes establishing professional development opportunities through several mechanisms, including “Faculty Learning Communities” and departmental “Writing Liaisons.”

Student Support includes a new writing center and a new Writing Mentors program interfacing with writing-intensive courses.
Assessment draws on writing samples created in courses; will be included in a university-wide ePortfolio; and will engage some faculty in scoring their own students’ work and other faculty in a collective scoring activity.
B. Analysis of the Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan

1. **An Institutional Process.** *The institution uses an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.*

During the period between September 15, 2010, and April 26, 2011, ECU undertook the process of identifying issues on campus that qualified for the kind of focused and sustained attention inherent in a QEP. The campus community was invited to submit proposals for the QEP, with the result that twelve proposals came forward from this initial call. A QEP Topic Selection Council, consisting of faculty and staff, evaluated the proposals using predefined rubrics that the institution linked back to its strategic plan, *ECU Tomorrow: A Vision for Leadership and Service*, adopted by the board in 2007. Five successful proposals resulted, and these were further developed into lengthier white papers, which were then subject to a period of review and comment. The process culminated in voting by faculty, staff and students as well as rank-ordering by the Faculty Senate. The Chancellor and SACS liaison made the final choice, selecting the topic receiving the highest rating by the community and the Senate. At this point, a QEP Council, again composed of faculty and staff, undertook a second phase and explored best practices through the use of consultants’ services; surveys of students, faculty, and employers; and focus groups both internal and external to the university. This investigation, in turn, led to three successive phases involving (1) developing initiatives and assessment plans, (2) writing and publicizing the QEP, and (3) laying the groundwork for implementation. In sum, the institution, grounding the selection process in its strategic planning objectives, employed an inclusive and deliberative process for selection that included broad consultation of and input from the campus community.

2. **Focus of the Plan.** *The institution identifies a significant issue that (1) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and (2) accomplishes the mission of the institution.*

The QEP’s topic is directly related to student learning at ECU, clearly addresses student learning, and is appropriate in scope. The student learning outcomes--focused on documenting effective writing that incorporates the use of credible sources; the reflection of context, purpose, and audience; the necessity of revision and proofreading; and the ability to assess and explain choices made in writing--respond to needs identified by ECU students, faculty members, and local employers.

ECU has developed an environment that will support student learning as defined in the QEP. Support for students is provided in the new writing center expansion; the writing mentors program with embedded tutors, the Writing at ECU website, the sophomore writing bridge course, and the web portfolio. Support for faculty is provided through writing liaisons, writing mentors, faculty learning communities, faculty senate participation, WAC seminars, the WAC Academy, the Community College and K12 Symposium, and writing resources on the Writing at ECU website.
3. **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.

The institution reports a systematic process of constituent engagement and assessment to select its Quality Enhancement Plan – “Write Where You Belong” – and allocated adequate resources to initiate implementation. The start-up resources included support for a Director, part-time administrative director, faculty contributions, external consultants, travel and other related expenses. A renovated University Writing Center was planned and completed at a cost of $400,000.

An itemized five-year budget for full implementation is presented. The cost estimates and total estimated budget of $1,958,500 seem most reasonable.

4. **Broad-based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies.** The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.

East Carolina University has a very well prepared and thought-out Quality Enhancement Plan. To assist with the development of the plan, ECU engaged numerous community members; in addition, students both served as interns to work with the QEP and played a vital role on committees in selecting and beginning to create “Write Where you Belong.” Likewise, ECU created faculty liaisons from all departments on campus. Representing academic disciplines across campus, liaisons have the responsibility of sharing information about the Quality Enhancement Plan with their colleagues. Students seem to understand the importance of writing on ECU’s campus and after graduation, and faculty, staff and administrators at ECU understand what the QEP is and how the QEP will be implemented, an implementation that will employ a similar strategy for implementation.

5. **Assessment of the Plan.** The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals.

The institution has planned a number of direct and indirect assessments to measure the student learning outcomes for the QEP. The writing portfolio is the primary assessment tool for collecting student work and for assessing student achievement: writing portfolios will be rated annually each summer. There is no mention, however, of a portfolio monitoring process between summative assessments.

The validity of the assessment approach is clear and based in authentic student writing in courses, but reliability is an issue that requires additional attention. There is a plan to calibrate the rubrics, which is necessary. However, there is no reference in the plan regarding the analysis of the rubric data. Additionally, there is no mention of reliability analysis by having a percentage of the portfolios, for
example, scored by external expert examiners, so that the results of the external reviewers can be compared to the on-campus faculty ratings.

The direct and indirect data should be triangulated to provide the most robust and valuable results. The plan is unclear on this process, when it will take place, and who will do this. For example, the plan states:

The results of WI section assessments will be shared among the administrators in the hub of the QEP administrative structure and, through these administrators, with the University Writing across the Curriculum Committee, the QEP Steering Committee, and, as appropriate, the broader university community. The Director of the University Writing Program and the QEP Director will work with Writing Liaisons to develop recommendations for addressing any gaps revealed through a program’s WI assessment. These recommendations, along with the results of the assessment, will then be presented to program faculty for their consideration and, if desired, implementation. Writing Liaisons will provide the Director of the University Writing Program and the QEP Director with periodic reports on the progress of any actions taken to address gaps revealed by WI assessments. (p. 64).

This outlines the groups involved in the process and to a degree the sequence of results review, but does not address the data review or analysis process through which the recommendations will be formed. The authority for the implementation of recommendations is with the faculty, so there is no clear expectation that the recommendations will be accepted or followed. The institution should consider both (1) if the plan should include clear expectations for implementation of the recommendations and (2) a process to monitor the fidelity of implementation of the recommendations as a measure of program success.

The committee could not determine that a means of identifying goals and assessing their achievement was fully developed. Specifically, the committee was unable to determine (a) a process and timeline for monitoring the portfolios between summer rating sessions; (b) the approach to analyzing the quantitative and qualitative data, and then triangulating the data to develop data-based findings that will transform into recommendations for improvement, and (c) a process or procedure for tracking and ensuring the fidelity of implementation of these recommendations.

**Recommendation 3:** The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution provide a comprehensive assessment plan that includes one or more mechanisms for continuous improvement.

**Strengths of the QEP**

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee commends the institution for developing an innovative and broad-based Quality Enhancement Plan that is appropriate in scope and addresses an important student learning issue. The processes used to identify the topic, as well as the additional process to design the plan, were inclusive and engaged faculty, students and staff.
The plan is based on sound research findings and includes two approaches that are distinctive and thus have the potential to contribute to the overall body of knowledge on student writing success. The first approach, that of vertical integration through the curriculum, has the potential to enhance the transfer of learning from the basic foundations courses in the Freshman and Sophomore year to the upper-division discipline-specific courses. The second approach, that of curricular design with metacognition, also promises to support student learning. The Student Learning Outcomes are appropriate, and the Committee believes that they can be achieved through full implementation of the plan.

There also seems to be strong support among the faculty for the QEP. Many of the faculty that the committee spoke with expressed ownership in and support for the initiative. The plan design relies on faculty participation, but also provides several mechanisms that will better support faculty. In addition, the plan uses a familiar infrastructure, the Faculty Liaison model, to provide backward and forward communication. Faculty are active in the management of the plan, with Faculty Liaisons having a seat on the Writing Leadership Hub. As important, faculty seem to be learning as part of this process such that everyone is positioned as a learner.

**Challenges to successful implementation of QEP**

At the same time, there are several issues that we think need to be addressed so that the QEP at ECU realizes its full potential:

- There is limited evidence demonstrating that some of the preliminary work towards the QEP addresses all of the necessary components. For example, the templates for the e-Portfolio that will be used have not been developed or tested yet.
- The level of authority of the QEP director was not clear. There is a need for a governance structure with clear lines of authority that would ensure proper implementation of the QEP and the assessment of its efficacy.
- The institution does not convincingly describe how transfer students will be supported; plans for systematic transition into ECU need to be developed.
- Appreciating the time and attention put into the re-design of the Writing Foundations curriculum, we encourage ECU to use the same systematic approach in planning, implementing, and monitoring the writing-intensive curriculum (though the WAC Academy, etc.).
Part IV. Third-Party Comments

If an institution receives Third-Party Comments, the institution has an opportunity to respond to those comments and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the response as part of its comprehensive evaluation of the institution.

The Committee should check one of the following:

**X** No Third-Party Comments submitted.

___ Third-Party Comments submitted. *(Address the items below.)*

1. Describe the nature of the Comments and any allegations of non-compliance that may have been part of the formal Third-Party Comments;

2. Indicate whether the Committee found evidence in support of any allegations of non-compliance.

If found to be out of compliance, the Committee should write a recommendation and include it in Part II under the standard cited with a full narrative that describes why the institution was found to be out of compliance and the documentation that supports that determination. In this space, reference the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and the recommendation number cited in Part II.

If determined to be in compliance, explain in this space the reasons and refer to the documentation in support of this finding.
## APPENDIX A

### Roster of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louise J. Clark</td>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>College of Business Jacksonville State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert E. Brown</td>
<td>Vice President for Business &amp; Administration</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G. Pamela Burch-Sims</td>
<td>Director of Institutional Effectiveness &amp; Research, Title III and Acreditation Liaison</td>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lorene Flanders</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries, Ingram Library</td>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dana L. Gibson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karla M. Hull</td>
<td>Interim provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Kevin S. Koett</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President/Dean of Students</td>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard C. Miller</td>
<td>Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer</td>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Judith A. Ponticell</td>
<td>Professor, Education Leadership and Policy Studies</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jocelyn B. Sanders</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison</td>
<td>The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SACSCOC Staff Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robin W. Hoffman</td>
<td>Vice President, SACSCOC</td>
<td>Florida State University Tallahassee, FL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roster of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bert C. Bach</td>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs East Tennessee State University Johnson City, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Timothy S. Brophy</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Assessment, Professor, Music Education</td>
<td>University of Florida Gainesville,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eli I. Capilouto</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>University of Kentucky Lexington, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Diane Z. Chase</td>
<td>Executive Vice Provost</td>
<td>University of Central Florida Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lowell K. Davis</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students and Assistant to Vice President Academic Affairs</td>
<td>The University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Krisellen Maloney</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries</td>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Susan D. Martin</td>
<td>Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel A. Wubah</td>
<td>Vice President and Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>Virginia Tech Blacksburg, VA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QEP Evaluator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kathleen Blake Yancey</td>
<td>Kellogg Hunt Professor, Distinguished Research Professor</td>
<td>Florida State University Tallahassee, FL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SACSCOC Staff Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven M. Sheeley</td>
<td>Vice President, SACSCOC</td>
<td>Florida State University Tallahassee, FL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed

Each of the three ECU teaching sites visited is located within about a one-hour drive of Greenville.

1. ECU at Craven Community College. 800 College Ct, New Bern, NC 28562 (252) 638-7200.
2. ECU at Wayne Community College. 3000 Wayne Memorial Dr, Goldsboro, NC 27534 (919) 735-5151
3. ECU at Gateway Technology Center. 3400 N. Wesleyan Blvd. Rocky Mount, NC 27804 252-977-6226

The ECU teaching site at Craven Community College provides signature programming from the College of Education at ECU. That programming is a part of Wells Fargo Partnership East, a consortium deriving historical support from the Wells Fargo Foundation. Programming includes (1) the Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education (K-6) with K-12 reading licensure, (2) the Bachelor of Science in Special Education (K-12) with K-12 reading licensure, and (3) the Bachelor of Science in Middle Grades Education (6-9). Interviews with the administrative head of Partnerships East (from the ECU College of Education) and with the ECU site coordinator in New Bern confirmed that staffing for the programs reflects ratios of full-time faculty similar to that of programming in Greenville. Space allocated for the programming appeared quite appropriate—and technology access and linkage to campus resources are exemplary. The focus of programming is to prepare teachers who will help meet the demand for well-trained professionals in classrooms of North Carolina. The consortium involves partnerships with community colleges and public schools across eastern North Carolina. The average age of students is thirty (30), and ECU is very aggressive and effective—through a one-stop-shop approach—in providing library, academic support, administrative support, and the opportunity to bond as students in the off-campus cohort while enjoying also concomitant access to specified campus services and enrichment opportunities (students in the cohort visit Greenville about six times during the program). Services provided at the site include on-site coordination and advising, evening classes, online course delivery, and tuition savings.

The ECU teaching site at Craven Community College also houses a blended Graduate Master’s program in Counseling Education. It is a 60-hour program which the student pursues (2 courses a semester) over two years. Two full-time faculty have major responsibilities for staffing the program, and this results in a profile similar to that on the main campus.

The only ECU off-campus programming at Wayne Community College in Goldsboro (also a partner in Wells Fargo Partnership East) is essentially identical to that at Craven—likewise serving cohorts in the same programs. Characteristics of the site are similar, and responses of students are likewise positive. An interview with the community college president resulted in her noting that ECU does “a better job” than other universities in communicating to off-campus sites timely information (e.g., concerning academic policies and course sequences).

The ECU site at Gateway Technology Center (in Rocky Mount) offers an MSW cohort. The Center provides classroom and field office space through a lease arrangement, and classrooms
and related space are quite appropriate. Other universities are offering programming at the site, and ECU shares an employee with North Carolina State University to provide site coordination. The MSW cohort is offered 90% on-ground with staffing similar to that on the main campus. A distinctive feature of the 60-hour program is that it is offered on Saturdays only for three years in order to meet the needs of working adults.
APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations
Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee

CS 3.2.14 (Intellectual property rights), Recommendation 1
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that its policies are clear concerning the ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies should address intellectual property for students, faculty, and staff.

CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional Effectiveness: Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes), Recommendation 2
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it makes improvements in its educational programs that are based on the analysis of assessment results.

CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan), Recommendation 3
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution provide a comprehensive assessment plan that includes one or more mechanisms for continuous improvement.