

AGENDA
ECU Board of Trustees
University Affairs Committee
September 20, 2012

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| I. Approval of Minutes (July 19, 2012) | Action |
|
 | |
| II. Closed Session | |
|
 | |
| III. Student Affairs | |
| A. New Drug Policy and Code of Conduct | |
| B. Student Affairs Assessment Report | |
| C. Proclamation: Celebrating 50 Years of Desegregation at ECU | |
|
 | |
| IV. Academic Affairs | |
| A. College Rankings Update | |
| B. Enrollment Update | |
|
 | |
| V. Research and Graduate Studies | |
| A. Chancellor's Task Force on the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Grants and Contracts 2011-2012 Final Report | |

University Affairs

July 19, 2012

Minutes

Mr. Brinkley, Chairman, called the meeting to order and read the conflict of interest statements. No conflict was reported.

Mr. Brinkley read a motion to go into closed session to consider the qualification, competence, performance, character, fitness or conditions of appointment of employees. Mr. Brinkley thanked the attorney's office for their diligence in distributing such comprehensive materials to the Board.

Following the closed session, the committee returned to open session.

Dr. Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty presented revisions to Part 8 of the Faculty Manual (formerly Appendix C). Part 8 of the Faculty Manual addresses the evaluation of teaching, specifically the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SPOTS). Mr. Bobby Owens made a motion to approve the revisions to Part 8 of the Faculty Manual. Mr. Lucas seconded the motion. The motion was approved with no negative votes.

Dr. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies gave a brief Program Prioritization Committee update. Dr. Mitchelson reported that the university is deep into the implementation stage. Of the six recommendations presented by the committee, five are in the implementation stage. Thus far, there has been approximately \$1 million in savings and well as improved efficiencies.

Dr. Virginia Hardy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs said that the Structure for Success program is ready for Fall 2012. Participants in the program will be moving into Umpstead Hall in mid September/early October. Belk Hall is ready for demolition in 2014 and the construction of two new residence halls will be coming 18 months later.

Other agenda items, such as the STEPP Program, and Extended Jurisdictions are tabled until the September meeting due to time constraints.

Hearing no further business, Mr. Brinkley adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

**ECU BOARD OF TRUSTEES
UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

September 20, 2012

CLOSED SESSION MOTION

I move that we go into Closed Session:

1. to prevent the disclosure of confidential information under N.C. General Statutes §126-22 to §126-30 (personnel information) and the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act;
2. to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, or conditions of appointment of one or more prospective and/or current employees and/or to hear or investigate a complaint, charge, or grievance by or against one or more individual employees; and
3. to consult with an attorney to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the attorney and the Committee.



Policies, Regulations and Rules

Authority	Chancellor
Title	Student Conduct Process
Classification	11.30.01
PRR Subject	Student Discipline
Contact Info	Contact for Info: Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, 252-328-6824

History: 17, 2010, to be effective August 23, 2010.Revised August 21, 2012.

Related Policies:

UNC Policy Manual 700.4.1 - Policy on Minimum Substantive and Procedural Standards for Student Disciplinary Proceedings

UNC Policy Manual 700.4.2 - Policy on Student Conduct

UNC Policy Manual 700.4.3[G] - Guidelines on Student Disciplinary Proceedings: Meaning and Effect of Expulsion

ECU Policies Regarding the Possession and Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages on the Campus of East Carolina University

ECU Policy on Drug Abuse

ECU University Policy and Procedures Concerning Weapons on Campus

ECU University Student and Employee Computer Use Policy

ECU Hazing Policy

ECU Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy

ECU Policy on Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Conflicts of Interest

Additional References: Student Conduct Process Outline

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose Statement

As an academic community, East Carolina University is dedicated to providing a safe and vibrant learning and working environment for all its members. Under Section 502 D of the Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, the Board and the President of the University of North Carolina have delegated the responsibility to manage student conduct to the Chancellor of each constituent campus. ECU's Chancellor, in turn, charged the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs with overseeing the student conduct process. The Office of

Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Conduct Board have been created to assist in this effort.

1.1.1. The Student Conduct Process regulation and supporting policies and procedures have been approved by the Chancellor and are based on input from students, faculty, and staff of East Carolina University. They are intended to aid in the fulfillment of ECU's mission and in securing the broadest range of freedom for each member of the community. These policies and procedures set behavioral standards that protect the health, safety, welfare, property, and human rights of all members of the community as well as the property of the University.

1.2. Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities

The Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) administers the Student Conduct Process (Student Code of Conduct or Code). OSRR fosters student growth by promoting students' awareness and understanding of their rights and responsibilities as community members. It addresses student conduct and creates developmental learning opportunities in an effort to engage students in ethical decision-making. Any questions regarding the student conduct process should be directed to the Director of OSRR.

1.3. Scope of the Student Conduct Process

As members of the ECU community, students have the right to be treated with respect and consideration, have freedom of inquiry, and have reasonable use of services and facilities. The University embraces and strives to uphold the freedoms of expression and speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the North Carolina Constitution. The University has the right under appropriate circumstances to regulate the time, place, and manner of exercising these and other constitutionally protected rights.

1.3.1. All students are responsible for conducting themselves in a manner that helps enhance an environment of learning in which the rights, dignity, worth, and freedom of each member of the academic community are respected. Upon acceptance of admission to ECU, each student agrees to abide by the policies of the University and to conduct her/himself on- and off-campus in a manner consistent with its educational mission. Students have a responsibility to review the Student Code of Conduct and other policies and to seek clarification if necessary from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The relevant policies and procedures may be found in the Undergraduate Catalog, the Graduate Catalog, the Student Handbook, the University Policy Manual, and other manuals. In addition, various academic units and administrative departments have policies specific to their area of responsibility. It is the responsibility of each student to be familiar with University policies and procedures. The Student Code of Conduct and related policies and procedures are available on-line. Printed copies are available in the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

1.3.2. Students are subject to the Student Code of Conduct and related policies from the time they accept admission until they graduate from the University. This means that conduct occurring before classes begin, including New Student Orientation, or after classes end, during the academic year, and during periods between terms of enrollment is governed by this Code. This policy pertains to anyone enrolled in an academic course at the University, including but not limited to, undergraduate and graduate students who are classified as degree or non-degree

seeking, as well as visiting students, medical students, dental students, professional students, and individuals not currently enrolled who are continually seeking a degree from the University.

1.3.3. In addition to Student Conduct Process regulation consequences, students who represent units within the University community, such as medical students, graduate students, student athletes, and residential students might be subject to additional behavioral consequences under the standards set by those units. The Student Conduct Process regulation also applies to student behavior, which violated University policies, but which was discovered after the student has left the University or has graduated. Depending on the circumstances of the case, degree revocation might be a consequence.

2. Student Code of Conduct

The University reserves the right to take necessary and appropriate action to protect the safety and well-being of the campus community and to support the mission of the University. Such action may include taking disciplinary action as outlined in this Code against students for their on- and off-campus conduct.

East Carolina University students are expected to refrain from the following behaviors.

2.1. Alcohol: Illegally possessing, consuming, having consumed, and/or providing alcoholic beverages to those under the legal drinking age. Being intoxicated in public.

2.2. Drugs, Drug Paraphernalia, and Other Controlled Substances: Possessing, using, distributing, buying, selling, facilitating a sale, delivering, manufacturing, and/or abusing illicit or illegally obtained substances. Misusing prescription or counterfeit drugs. Consuming, including huffing or sniffing, any substance not intended for such use. Possessing or using drug paraphernalia.

2.3. Endangerment: Acting in a manner that could or did endanger or injure a person or the ECU community. Examples of endangerment include, but are not limited to, fighting, operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and engaging in non-consensual sexual contact.

2.3.1. Non-consensual sexual contact occurs when a person subjects another person to sexual contact without having first obtained explicit consent or when s/he knows or should have known that the person was incapable of giving consent because of mental incapacitation, mental disorder, or physical helplessness. Sexual contact includes, but is not limited to, kissing, touching of the genitalia, anus, buttocks or breast of a person. Sexual penetration includes any insertion, however slight, of the penis, finger(s) or any object into the vagina or anus, or the insertion of the penis into someone's mouth.

2.3.2. Consent requires an affirmative verbal response and/or unmistakable conduct indicating a freely given agreement. Silence and/or lack of protest do not constitute consent. Previous consent does not necessarily apply to future situations. Consent cannot be given when a person's physical or mental control is markedly diminished. Physical or mental control may be diminished by injury, illness, duress, social pressure, and/or the ingestion of alcohol or other drugs.

2.4. Harassment, Threats, or Intimidation: Directing action toward a particular individual or group in a manner which is unwelcome and, under the totality of the circumstances, so severe, pervasive, or objectively offensive that it undermines and/or detracts from the target's academic pursuits, participation in University-sponsored activities, or employment effectively denying equal access to University resources and opportunities.

2.4.1. Engaging in conduct directed at a specific person, group, or entity in a manner that would cause a reasonable person to fear for one's safety, the safety of others, or the loss of or damage to property or that is defamatory.

2.4.2. East Carolina University will also enforce the University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.2, which states:

2.4.2.1.No student shall threaten, coerce, harass or intimidate another person or identifiable group of persons, in a manner that is unlawful or in violation of a constitutionally valid University policy, while on University premises or at University-sponsored activities based upon the person's race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender-identity, creed, disability, or veteran status.

2.4.2.2.No student shall engage in unlawful harassment leading to a hostile environment. Unlawful harassment includes conduct that creates a hostile environment by meeting the following criteria: It is directed toward a particular person or persons; based upon the person's race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender-identity, creed, disability, or veteran status; unwelcome; severe or pervasive; objectively offensive; and so unreasonably interferes with the target person's employment, academic pursuits, or participation in University-sponsored activities as to effectively deny equal access to the University's resources and opportunities.

2.4.2.3.In determining whether student conduct violates these provisions (2.4.2.1 or 2.4.2.2), all relevant facts and circumstances shall be considered. Care must be exercised in order to preserve freedoms of speech and expression, as articulated in current legal standards.

2.5. Hazing

2.5.1. Acting in a manner that would subject another student to physical injury or mental or emotional harm as part of an initiation, or as a criterion of membership, into any organized University group, including any society, athletic team, fraternity or sorority, or other similar group. Planning or preparing to engage in hazing activity is also a violation of the Code. The expressed or implied consent of participants will not prevent disciplinary action. Examples of hazing activities include, but are not limited to, forced consumption of any solids or liquids, acts of humiliation or disgrace, paddling, damaging/destroying private or public property, or being forced or coerced to violate laws or University policies.

2.5.2. Any recognized student organization wishing to implement a new member intake process must submit its plan to the respective University department responsible for the organization, such as, Greek Life, Campus Recreation and Wellness, or Student Activities and Organizations.

Once the plan is approved by the department, the organization cannot deviate from it without prior authorization from the department. A deviation from the approved plan may constitute a violation of the Code. Conducting a new member intake process without an approved plan is a violation of the Code.

2.6. Weapons: Possessing, distributing, using, manufacturing, assembling, storing, transporting, selling, purchasing, or acquiring any weapons as defined in this policy on property owned or controlled by the University, including ECU vehicles, or any illegal weapons, including nuclear/biological/chemical weapons, or home-made weapons on- or off-campus. This provision also applies to students on the way to and present at any off-campus curricular and extracurricular activity sponsored by the University. Illegally concealing any weapon is a violation of the Code.

2.6.1. Weapons include, but are not limited to, guns, rifles, pistols, bb guns, air rifles, air pistols, paintball guns, crossbows, arrows, fireworks, dynamite, bombs, grenades, mines, powerful explosives, bullets or ammunition cartridges, nun chucks, slingshots, leaded canes, blackjacks, metallic knuckles, martial arts weapons, throwing stars, Kamas, axes, razor blades, ice picks, dirks, daggers, swords, bowie knives, switchblade knives, butterfly knives, other knives with blades three or more inches in length, tasers, and stun guns.

2.6.2. Any item used or possessed for purposes of use as a weapon will be considered a weapon under this policy.

2.7. Disruptive Conduct: Being disruptive or disorderly in a manner that interferes with the function of the University or interferes with conduct of others, including law enforcement officers, who are on-campus or off-campus. Refusing or failing to submit appropriate identification or refusing to comply with a request from an identifiable University official acting on behalf of the University.

2.8. Theft: Stealing or attempting to steal property, including intellectual property, or services of any person or entity. Receiving, possessing, or selling/giving away such property when the student recognizes, or should have recognized, that the property was stolen. Selling books or helping sell books without the owner's permission is an example of theft.

2.9. Vandalism, Defacement, or Misuse of Property: Defacing, destroying, damaging, or misusing private, University, or other public properties.

2.10. Trespassing and Unauthorized Use of Property: Entering or using university facilities and/or the personal property of others without explicit permission. This includes but is not limited to, unauthorized access to residence halls, vehicles, stadiums and fields, as well as unauthorized possession, duplication, or use of the property of others or the University.

2.11. False Information, Forgery, and Fraud: Publishing and/or circulating false information that is harmful to others. Providing false information to the University or withholding information from the University which has been appropriately requested.

2.11.1. Altering, forging, or misusing documents or property which might include, but is not limited to, money, charge cards, checks, personal information, ECU One Cards, grade reports, transcripts, and parking tags. Possessing altered or forged documents or property, such as a fictitious driver's license. Deceitfully using personal information of others.

2.12. Having Knowledge of or Assisting with a Violation: Having knowledge of, being present during, instigating, encouraging, or facilitating a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. Failing to discourage, prevent, or report a violation of the Code.

2.13. Gambling: Placing a bet or wager on an uncertain outcome for money or other items of value unless permitted by law.

2.14. Hindering the University Conduct Process: Coaching, intimidating, retaliating against, or otherwise influencing witnesses, Conduct Board members, conduct administrators, and other participants in the conduct process. Failing to provide the University with relevant information regarding a conduct case. Failing to meet with University representatives conducting case evaluations. Failing to abide by sanctions, including bans.

2.15. Violation of University Policies: Violating University policies including, but not limited to, University Student and Employee Computer Use Policy; Residence Hall Policies and Guidelines; University Policy and Procedures Concerning Weapons on Campus; Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy; Policy on Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Conflicts of Interest; and Canvassing, Peddling, and Solicitation Policy. Violations of campus or University policies, rules or regulations, or federal, state, or local law may result in a violation of the Student Code of Conduct and imposition of sanctions.

3. Sanctioning Violations of the Code will result in educational and/or disciplinary consequences called sanctions. Sanctions are designed with the intent of educating respondents and protecting the ECU community. No sanctions will be enforced until all reviews have been exhausted with the exception of administrative actions taken to protect members of the ECU community. Each student who has been found responsible for violating the Student Code of Conduct shall be notified in writing of the appeal rights as they pertain to her/his case.

3.1 Immediate Administrative Actions

The Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, in conjunction with appropriate University administrators, may take interim action pending the resolution of a conduct case in order to preserve the safety and well-being of the ECU community and its members. These actions include, but are not limited to, counseling assessment and/or treatment, restriction of access or privileges, no-contact ban or removal from classes, and administrative suspension.

3.1.1. Administrative suspension is the immediate separation of the student from enrollment at the University. Administrative suspension becomes effective immediately whenever there is information that the continued presence of the student on University property poses a substantial threat. A substantial threat might include, but is not limited to, threatening the safety of any person, significantly harming or attempting to harm someone, threatening to cause or causing

significant property damage, and interfering with the stability and continuance of University functions.

3.1.2. If the circumstances permit, an OSRR administrator will meet with the student to be placed on administrative suspension to explain the allegation and to give the student an opportunity to respond. A student on administrative suspension has a right to appeal this administrative action within five business days to the Dean of Students. While the Dean of Students is reviewing the appeal, the student shall remain on suspension.

3.1.3. In order for this action to be modified the student must show that either the action was arbitrary or capricious or that there is substantial new information mitigating the situation. The Dean of Students will review (1) the reliability of the information concerning the student's behavior; (2) whether or not the conduct and surrounding circumstances reasonably indicate that the continued presence of the student poses a substantial threat to others, to property, or to the stability and continuance of normal University functions; and/or (3) whether or not the student has complied with the directives of the conduct administrator placing the student on administrative suspension. The decision of the Dean of Students shall be final.

3.1.4. Students who are administratively suspended are entitled to participate in the ECU conduct process while separated from the University.

3.2. Guidelines for Sanctioning When determining sanctions, conduct administrators and members of the Conduct Board take into account the nature and seriousness of the violation, the impact of the violation on the community, the respondent's past conduct history, as well as the respondent's developmental needs. Multiple sanctions may be imposed for one violation.

3.2.1. Violations of the Code that involve alcohol, drugs, weapons, hazing, substantial theft or fraud, physical harm to persons or property, other actions that create a substantial risk to others or the University, or accumulation of multiple violations of the Code might result in suspension or expulsion from the University.

3.2.2. Determinations made or sanctions imposed under the Student Code of Conduct will not be subject to change solely because criminal charges arising from the same facts giving rise to a violation of the Code were dismissed, reduced or resolved in favor of or against the criminal law defendant.

3.2.3. The University reserves the right to enhance sanctions for violations which are believed to have been motivated based on the victim's real or perceived gender, gender identity, ethnicity, national origin, race, color, culture, sexual orientation, age, religion, creed, class, disability, or veteran status. In the event a student is found responsible for such a bias-motivated violation, the sanction imposed should be more serious than that appropriate for only the underlying violation. A finding that a violation constitutes a bias-motivated violation requires a separate finding to that effect by the conduct administrator or the Conduct Board.

3.3. Range of Sanctions: The range and explanation of sanctions is provided below.

- 3.3.1. **Warning:** A written notification informing the student that the University considers the student's behavior inappropriate and that the student needs to change this behavior.
- 3.3.2. **Probation:** A period of time during which the student's behavior is under University review. Probation is intended to communicate to the student that the University considers the student's behavior inappropriate and that further violations will result in more severe consequences.
- 3.3.3. **Service:** Service hours completed at an approved service site. A student might be given up to sixty hours of campus service in response to one finding of responsibility and up to sixty calendar days to complete the service.
- 3.3.4. **Educational Task:** A task designed to provide the student with an opportunity to examine her/his actions and their impact on self and/or on the community.
- 3.3.5. **Counseling:** Assessment and counseling and/or treatment provided by the Center for Counseling and Student Development. A student referred for assessment must comply with the recommendations of the counselor. Information shared with a counselor is confidential; however, OSRR is advised about the overall results of the student's assessment, attendance and quality of participation in counseling. Under certain circumstances, the student might be referred for off-campus counseling/treatment. The student will assume all responsibility for off-campus counseling fees.
- 3.3.6. **No Contact Ban:** A ban requiring the student to have no contact with a designated individual. Verbal, written, and physical contact or third party contact is prohibited.
- 3.3.7. **Restricted Privileges:** A period during which the student's privilege of using University facilities or participating in University functions is modified or limited. Depending on the circumstances, restrictions might be structured to allow a student to attend class, participate in a job or internship, or use the library. A student with restricted privileges might not be eligible, for example, for early arrival on campus, extended stays in residence halls, representing the University in competition or other official capacities, campus employment, and campus leadership opportunities.
- 3.3.8. **Restitution:** Reimbursement to the person or entity harmed by the violation.
- 3.3.9. **Suspension:** A temporary separation from enrollment at the University for a defined period of time. Suspended students are banned from the University premises during the period of suspension and might be required to complete specified sanctions prior to reenrollment. Completion of the suspension period and other assigned sanctions does not automatically grant suspended students the right to return to the University community. All suspended students must petition the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities for readmission. The final decision to clear suspended students for readmission rests with a committee led by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

3.3.10. Expulsion: Permanent separation from enrollment at the University and at any other member institution of the University of North Carolina. Expelled students are banned from University premises. Only the Chancellor may amend this sanction to suspension if the student petitions the University demonstrating significant growth and contribution to society indicating that the individual should be given a new opportunity to pursue higher education. Such petitions can be filed with the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities after a minimum of five years of the completion of the conduct case. A student who has been expelled from the University may not be admitted to another constituent institution of the University of North Carolina, unless and until the sanction of expulsion has been rescinded by the University.

3.3.11. Revocation of Degree: Revocation of an awarded degree for serious violations of the Code that occurred prior to graduation, but which was discovered after a student had graduated from the University.

3.3.12. Failure to Comply with Sanctions: Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities monitors sanctions to ensure compliance. Students who do not complete sanctions within the specified time might not be permitted to enroll for courses or might be suspended until they complete their sanctions. Students who leave the University prior to the completion of sanctions might not be allowed to reenroll until proof is provided that the sanctions imposed have been completed.

3.3.13. Sanctions for Student Organizations: Student organizations registered with the Student Organization Center, the Office of Greek Life, an academic department, the Campus Recreation and Wellness Department, or another unit of the University might be sanctioned under the Student Code of Conduct. At the discretion of the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, any allegations of misconduct will be co-investigated by OSRR and the unit administratively associated with the student organization.

3.3.13.1. Any of the sanctions available for individual students might be imposed on an organization except for revocation of a degree. Organizational privileges might be restricted for a stated period of time. Organizations could lose privileges including, but not limited to, access to reserving rooms, use of campus facilities and services, representation at an event, or revocation of student fee funding. Organizational privileges might also be suspended for a stated period of time including, but not limited to, recruiting of new members, participating in intramural sports, and holding events or meetings in campus facilities. The organization might be required to complete specified sanctions prior to having privileges reinstated. Organizations might also have their University recognition revoked as a consequence of a Code violation.

4. Respondent and Complainant Rights and Responsibilities

4.1. Respondent Rights and Responsibilities: A student whose conduct is under review has the following rights and responsibilities. The respondent might forfeit any of these rights if, after being given appropriate notice and opportunity to exercise these rights, s/he fails to do so.

4.1.1. Respondent Rights

4.1.1.1. The right to an objective and impartial evaluation of the complaint.

4.1.1.2. The right to be present during the meeting with a conduct administrator or during the Conduct Board hearing.

4.1.1.3. The right to reasonable access to all information gathered throughout the evaluation pertinent to the alleged violation.

4.1.1.4. The right to present information relevant to the alleged violation, including inviting witnesses.

4.1.1.5. The right to respond to information presented against her/him.

4.1.1.6. The right to a separate meeting with a conduct administrator or Conduct Board hearing in cases involving multiple respondents.

4.1.1.7. The right not to provide information with the understanding that the University will make a determination without the respondent's information.

4.1.1.8. The right to review the outcome of the case.

4.1.2. Respondent Responsibilities

4.1.2.1. The responsibility to be honest and direct in communicating with individuals involved in the conduct process.

4.1.2.2. The responsibility to review pertinent conduct process policies and procedures and to seek clarification if necessary.

4.1.2.3. The responsibility to respond in a timely manner to University requests for information, to promptly schedule meetings when requested, and to arrive on time for scheduled meetings.

4.1.2.4. The responsibility to provide the decision-maker with pertinent information that the respondent would like considered in the review of the alleged violation.

4.1.2.5. The responsibility to participate in the conduct process in a manner that is civil and respectful.

4.2. Complainant Rights and Responsibilities: An ECU student, faculty, or staff member who has been negatively influenced by the alleged behavior of a student, has filed a complaint against that student, and is designated by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities as a complainant has the following rights and responsibilities. The complainant might forfeit any of these rights if, after being given appropriate notice and opportunity to exercise these rights, s/he fails to do so.

4.2.1. Complainant Rights

4.2.1.1. The right to an objective and impartial evaluation of the complaint.

4.2.1.2. The right to present information relevant to the alleged violation, including inviting witnesses.

4.2.1.3. The right to submit a written impact statement.

4.2.1.4. The right to review the outcome of a case if permitted under ECU policies and local, state, and federal laws.

4.2.1.5. The right to be informed of pertinent University-based support services and to be presented with an option of reporting the incident to law enforcement, if appropriate.

4.2.2. Complainant Responsibilities

4.2.2.1. The responsibility to be honest and direct in communicating with individuals involved in the conduct process.

4.2.2.2. The responsibility to review pertinent conduct process policies and procedures and to seek clarification if necessary.

4.2.2.3. The responsibility to respond in a timely manner to University requests for information, to promptly schedule meetings when requested, and to arrive on time for scheduled meetings.

4.2.2.4. The responsibility to provide the decision-maker with pertinent information that the complainant would like considered in the review of the alleged violation.

4.2.2.5. The responsibility to participate in the conduct process in a manner that is civil and respectful.

5. Student Conduct Hearing Procedure

5.1. The student conduct hearing procedure described below is used to address alleged violations of the Code, except for alleged academic integrity violations, which are resolved through the conduct process outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy and any other applicable campus policies and procedures, such as those enforced by the Division of Research and Graduate Studies. Some behaviors described as violations under the Code also may be violations of the rules and policies of organizations to which the student belongs, other university units, of city ordinances, and/or state or federal law. When such violations occur, the student or student organization might be held accountable in multiple venues.

5.1.1. Alleged violations of a minor nature occurring in a residence hall may be reviewed under the Code by Campus Living staff as designated by the Executive Director of Campus Living. Campus Living staff will not address cases involving drugs, weapons, sexual assaults, serious bodily harm or property damage without prior approval from the Director of OSRR. OSRR will address all incidents which might result in suspension or expulsion.

5.1.2. The ECU conduct process functions independent of the criminal justice system. Attorneys

are not permitted to participate in the conduct process unless the respondent is facing concurrent criminal charges stemming from the incident in question. In such situations, the attorney may only advise her/his client. During a hearing, the attorney is not permitted to ask questions or present information. The student will assume all responsibility for attorney fees.

5.1.3. The standard used throughout the conduct process to reach case resolution is preponderance of the evidence. Formal rules of evidence do not apply to student conduct cases.

5.1.4. The respondent has a right to have a non-participating support person present with her/him throughout the conduct process. The support person is not permitted to actively participate in the process, but is simply to provide comfort to the respondent. If the respondent chooses to have an attorney present, if permitted, the attorney will be identified as the support person. In such a situation, the respondent will not be permitted to have an additional non-participating support person present.

5.2. Initial Intake

5.2.1. All complaints will be reviewed by the OSRR Director or designee to determine whether or not the reported behavior is governed by the Code. Anonymous complaints will only be pursued if they contain sufficient information to independently establish a violation of the Code. Each complaint must be presented in writing and include facts supporting the allegation.

5.2.2. The University does not tolerate retaliation against individuals who honestly file a complaint. Students who retaliate against such persons will be held accountable under the Code. It is the responsibility of the target of the retaliation to immediately report the behavior to OSRR.

5.2.3. The determination to initiate a conduct case will be made within five business days of receipt of a complaint. If it is believed that the behavior is governed by the Code, the student will be notified in writing of the charge and will be supplied with a brief summary of the allegation, possible sanctions, and the meeting date and time. In allegations that might result in expulsion, the student will be informed that expulsion precludes matriculation at any UNC constituent institution.

5.2.4. Students have the responsibility to update personal contact information on their OneStop account as soon as it changes and to consistently monitor their ECU e-mail account and telephone answering equipment, as the University frequently communicates through these modes. U.S. Post letters will be sent to the local address provided by the student in the OneStop system or to the permanent address if attempted contact with the student through other means is unsuccessful.

5.2.5. The meeting with the conduct administrator will take place within thirty business days, but no earlier than five business days, after the meeting notice is sent to the student via letter or e-mail, unless the student requests an earlier meeting date. If the alleged violation might result in suspension or expulsion, the meeting with the respondent will take place within thirty business days, but no earlier than ten business days, after the meeting notice is sent to the student via letter or e-mail, unless the student requests an earlier meeting date. If the respondent fails to meet with the conduct administrator after being properly notified, the case will be decided on the basis of information gathered by the conduct administrator.

5.2.6. The respondent may request a reasonable postponement of the meeting by contacting the conduct administrator in writing no less than two business days before the meeting. The respondent will need to explain why s/he is requesting a different meeting date or time and will need to provide an alternate meeting date and time. The conduct administrator will make the final determination of the meeting date and time. If the respondent does not appear for a scheduled meeting, the University reserves the right to make a determination in the student's

absence.

5.3. Meeting with a Conduct Administrator

5.3.1. The respondent will meet with a conduct administrator to discuss the reported behavior. In this hearing the administrator will review all available, relevant information and will determine whether or not a violation of the Code had occurred. If further information is needed, the determination will not be reached during this meeting, but at a time when all relevant information has been reviewed.

5.3.2. If the administrator believes that there was no violation or there is insufficient information to make a determination, the conduct case will be closed. If the administrator believes that the respondent violated the Code, s/he will assign appropriate sanctions within 45 calendar days of the initial hearing. The final administrative decision will be shared with the respondent in writing within ten calendar days of the date the decision was made. The letter will include a brief summary of the information upon which the decision was based and will outline respondent's appeal rights.

5.3.3. If the student does not agree with the determination of the administrator, s/he will have the opportunity to challenge that decision by appealing to a Review Committee. In cases where suspension or expulsion have been assigned as a sanction and the student challenges that decision, a Conduct Board Hearing will be scheduled to independently evaluate the case.

5.4. Scope of Review of Appeals

5.4.1. During an appeal, the respondent has the burden of showing that the conduct decision either (1) materially violates the procedures outlined in this policy, (2) the assigned sanctions are unduly harsh and/or (3) there is a lack of information supporting the decision. The third ground does not imply that information can be reargued on appeal; rather, the respondent needs to show that based on the information present at the time of the decision, no reasonable person could have reached the same conclusion as the decision-maker.

5.4.2. The respondent must specify in writing which grounds form the basis for her/his appeal. The student must provide factual information to support her/his claim and explain what outcome s/he is seeking. The student has a right to be assisted in preparing her/his written challenge by a Student Advisor (a trained student Conduct Board member) or by any other student enrolled at ECU. The Student Advisor's responsibility is to guide the student through the conduct process, to answer any conduct process-related questions, and to assist with the securing of information. This individual may continue to assist the responded throughout the appeal process.

5.4.3. Requests for reconsideration based on new information, sufficient to alter a decision and not reasonably available at the time of the decision, should be directed to the original decision-maker. The respondent has one calendar year after the final imposition of sanctions by the University to present new information.

5.5. Appeal to the Review Committee

5.5.1. The appeal letter must be dated, signed by the respondent, and received by OSRR within five business days from the date that the written decision on sanctions is provided to the student, either by hand delivery or by delivery or attempted delivery through e-mail or postal mail. Appeals should be directed to osrr@ecu.edu or 364 Wright Building. Failure to deliver the written notice of appeal within this time limit will render the decision of the conduct administrator final and conclusive. An extension of time may be requested within the five day limit, but it is within the discretion of the Review Committee to grant or deny such requests.

5.5.2. OSRR will submit the appeal to the Review Committee within ten business days of

receipt. Appeals to the Review Committee will be limited to information presented during the meeting with the conduct administrator and supporting documents provided by the respondent and the conduct administrator. If new information, which was reasonably not available at the time of the original decision, is presented, the Review Committee may send the case back to the conduct administrator for further evaluation.

5.5.3. The Review Committee is composed of three students, one faculty member, and one staff member of the Conduct Board. The Committee will review the written challenge and, based on a preponderance of the evidence standard, determine whether or not the student should be granted a Conduct Board hearing. If Committee determines that a Conduct Board hearing is not granted, the decision of the conduct administrator will go into effect and the student will have no further appeal opportunities. The Review Committee's decision not to grant a hearing is final.

5.5.4. If the Committee determines that a Conduct Board hearing should take place, the case will be forwarded for a Conduct Board hearing in accordance with the procedures below. Prior to the Conduct Board hearing, the respondent may make an appointment in OSRR to review the information and witness lists to be presented at the hearing.

5.5.5. The Review Committee meetings are closed to the public.

5.6. Conduct Board Hearing

5.6.1. As indicated above, Conduct Board hearings will be convened when (a) the respondent requests a hearing and her/his case involves possible sanctions of suspension or expulsion or (b) the Review Committee grants the student a hearing. The student will be notified by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities in writing of the charge, a brief summary of the allegation, possible sanctions, and the Conduct Board hearing date and time. The hearing will take place at least five business days after the student is notified via letter or e-mail, unless the student agrees to an earlier hearing date. If the alleged violation might result in suspension or expulsion, the hearing will not take place for at least ten business days after the notice is sent, unless the student agrees to an earlier hearing date.

5.6.2. The respondent or the complainant may request a reasonable postponement of the hearing by delivering a request to OSRR in writing no less than two business days before the hearing. The person requesting the postponement will need to explain why s/he is requesting a different hearing date or time and will need to provide an alternate hearing date and time. OSRR will make the final determination of the hearing date and time. If the respondent or complainant does not appear for a scheduled hearing after being properly notified, the University reserves the right to make a determination in the individual's absence. The respondent and the complainant have a right to be assisted by a Student Advisor or by any other student enrolled at ECU.

5.6.3. Hearing Panel Composition

5.6.3.1. The hearing panel is composed of three students, one faculty member, and one staff member of the Conduct Board. One of the student members will be the Chair, who will direct the hearing process and make determinations about what information is relevant to the proceedings. The Chair is responsible for ensuring an orderly hearing and, therefore, may remove any person who, in her/his discretion, interferes with the work of the panel. The Chair will facilitate the panel's discussion regarding the case and will vote only in the event of a tie. It is the Chair's responsibility to write a summary of the panel's decision.

5.6.3.2. The respondent or the complainant may challenge the participation of any panel member due to her/his previous knowledge, experience, belief, or emotion that would unduly influence decision-making either positively or negatively. The challenging party will be asked to provide specific reasons for the challenge. The Chair along with the hearing advisor (a professional

OSRR staff member) will determine whether the identified panel member should be removed from the case. If the removal of a panel member results in less than five panel members being able to serve, the respondent will be given an option to continue with the existing panel or to reschedule the hearing in order for the case to be reviewed by a full five-member panel.

5.6.4. Hearing Outline: A hearing will be divided into two parts: (1) the presentation of the facts and, if the panel finds the student responsible, (2) a discussion of sanctions. During the hearing, the panel will review all available, relevant information and determine whether or not a violation of the Code had occurred. A Student Case Presenter (a trained student Conduct Board member) will outline the basic facts of the case gathered by the University. The respondent and complainant will be afforded an opportunity to speak to the panel. The panel will also have an opportunity to ask questions of all involved. If the student is found responsible, s/he may invite two character witnesses to give information during the sanctioning part of the hearing and may submit letters attesting to her/his character. The hearing will be audio recorded; however, recording quality problems and/or malfunctions will not invalidate or nullify the decision of the panel.

5.6.5. Hearing Outcome

5.6.5.1. Once all relevant information has been presented, the panel along with the hearing advisor will remain in the hearing room and all other participants will be dismissed. Based on information gathered throughout the hearing, the panel will determine whether or not the respondent had violated the Code. The panel will reconvene the meeting and announce its decision. If the student is found responsible, the student may present character witnesses and testimonials, as stated above, and then the panel will recess the hearing and deliberate on appropriate sanctions. The decision will be announced at the close of the hearing.

5.6.5.2. The decision of the Conduct Board is a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, who will make the final determination in the case unless one of the sanctions includes expulsion. The Vice Chancellor will communicate the final decision to the student within 30 business days. If the Vice Chancellor determines that the student should be expelled from the University, the student has the right to file an appeal by following the below described process.

5.6.5.3. The Conduct Board hearings are closed to the public.

5.7. Appeal of Expulsion

5.7.1. Should the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs determine that a student should be expelled; the student has the right to appeal the decision to the East Carolina University Board of Trustees. The student should send a written appeal by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by another means that provides proof of delivery to the Assistant Secretary to Board within ten calendar days after the notice of the Vice Chancellor's decision is sent to the respondent. A copy should also be provided to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities and the University Attorney. If the appeal is received in a timely manner, the Board will establish a schedule for its review. If the respondent fails to comply with the schedule, the Board may dismiss the appeal.

5.7.2. Should the Board of Trustees uphold the decision of the Vice Chancellor to expel a student, the student has a right to appeal the decision to the University of North Carolina Board of Governors. The written appeal should be sent by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by another means that provides proof of delivery, to the President of the University of North Carolina within ten calendar days after the notice of the University Board of Trustees' final decision is sent to the respondent. The correspondence should be mailed to Office of the

President, University of North Carolina, c/o Vice President and General Counsel, P.O. Box 2688, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-2688. A copy should also be provided to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities and the University Attorney. The decision of the Board of Governors is final.

6. Records

6.1. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974: Conduct case information is recorded and maintained by OSRR in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). Generally, information contained in OSRR files that personally identifies a student will not be released without the written and dated consent of the student identified in the record. However, disciplinary records may be shared with third parties to the extent allowed under FERPA. Victims of violence will be notified of the final disposition of the case to include the name of the respondent; the letter of the alleged violation committed; the findings supporting the conclusion; the sanctions imposed, if any; the duration of the sanctions; and the date the sanctions were imposed. For specific information on FERPA, please contact the Registrar's Office.

6.2. Maintenance of Records: Conduct records are maintained by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities for at least eight years from the completion of the last sanction imposed. Records of students, who have been suspended, expelled, and of those who have a pending case or have not completed sanctions are kept indefinitely.

6.3. UNC Suspension/Expulsion Database: Information about students who are suspended, expelled, or have serious pending cases is entered into a UNC database, where it is stored permanently. All UNC constituent institutions have access to this information.

6.4. Transcript Notation: Conduct suspensions and expulsions will be permanently marked on the student's transcript.

6.5. Awarding of Degrees: The University does not award degrees solely because a student successfully completed all academic requirements. Violations of the Student Code of Conduct, including academic and non-academic violations, might result in a degree not being awarded. When a student has a disciplinary complaint pending, the awarding of the degree might be delayed until the complaint is resolved and, if imposed, the sanctions have been completed.

6.6. Withdrawal: Students with a pending conduct case will not be permitted to withdraw from the University without first resolving the case or receiving permission from the Director of OSRR to do so.

6.7. Continual Enrollment: Students with a pending conduct case might be prohibited from future enrollment until the conduct matter is resolved by the University.

7. Review of the Conduct Process

7.1. The Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities will convene the Conduct System Review Committee every three years. This committee will assess the effectiveness of the conduct process and related policies and recommend any changes in policy, procedure, or the Code to the Chancellor.

7.2. The Committee shall be composed of two students appointed by the President of the Student Government Association, two staff members appointed by the Chair of the Staff Senate, and two faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Dean of Students or designee shall serve as a chair of the Committee, voting only if there is a tie.

7.3. The Director of OSRR shall present a report reflecting information regarding the state of the

conduct system no later than June 30th of the review year. The Director of OSRR and other staff members directly involved in the conduct process shall serve as non-voting members of the Committee. The Director of OSRR is permitted to convene the Committee outside of the typical three-year review cycle when necessary.

**Moving from One to Many: *Celebrating 50 Years of Desegregation
at East Carolina (1962-2012)***

East Carolina University would like to plan events to celebrate the pioneering students who broke the color barrier for the University, for the faculty that supported them and for all that came after them.

Purpose:

- To celebrate the courage of those who opened the doors to a more diverse ECU.
- To answer the questions:
 - How did the integration of the campus affect the scheme of things?
 - How do we continue the discussion of desegregation/integration as it leads to inclusion/diversity?
- To promote diversity in learning opportunities and nurture a community where the value of inclusion is appreciated

Illegal Drugs

I. Purpose

Illegal drugs endanger the health and safety of members of higher education communities and imperil the integrity of the pursuit of learning. The institutions of the University of North Carolina are not immune to this threat. Illegal drugs constitute such a serious problem nationwide that within the University system certain specific and uniform University policies are warranted. Success in combating the problem depends ultimately on the cooperative efforts of members of governing boards, students, faculty members, administrators and all other employees. Thus, it is on each campus of the University that a properly balanced program of educational efforts and punitive sanctions must be achieved. Accordingly, to support and assist the constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina in their continuing efforts to meet this threat, the Board of Governors adopts this policy.

II. Policies Applicable University-Wide

Each Board of Trustees shall adopt a policy on illegal drugs applicable to all students, faculty and staff. The Board of Governors recognizes that each such policy must address the circumstances and needs of the particular campus. However, the President shall ensure that the policy of each institution incorporates and is fully consistent with the following basic requirements.

A. Education, Counseling, and Rehabilitation

1. Each constituent institution shall establish and maintain a program of education designed to help all members of the University community avoid involvement with illegal drugs. This educational program shall emphasize these subjects:

- a. The incompatibility of the possession, use or sale of illegal drugs with the goals of the University;
- b. The legal consequences of involvement with illegal drugs;
- c. The medical implications of the use of illegal drugs; and
- d. The ways in which illegal drugs jeopardize an individual's present accomplishments and future opportunities.

2. Each constituent institution shall provide information about drug counseling and rehabilitation services available to members of the University community either through campus-based programs or through community-based organizations. Persons who voluntarily avail themselves of University services shall be assured that applicable professional standards of confidentiality will be observed.

B. Enforcement and Penalties

1. University institutions shall take all actions necessary, consistent with state and federal law and applicable University policy, to eliminate illegal drugs from the University community. The institutional policy on illegal drugs shall be publicized in catalogues and other materials prepared for all enrolled and prospective students and in materials distributed to faculty and staff.

2. Students, faculty and staff are responsible, as citizens, for knowing about and complying with the provisions of North Carolina law that make it a crime to possess, sell, deliver, or manufacture those drugs designated collectively as "controlled substances" in Article 5 of Chapter 90 of the North Carolina General Statutes. Any member of the University community who violates that law is subject both to prosecution and punishment by the civil authorities and to disciplinary proceedings by the University. It is not "double jeopardy" for both the civil authorities and the University to proceed against and punish a person for the same specified conduct. The University will initiate its own disciplinary proceeding against a student, faculty member, or staff member when the alleged conduct is deemed to affect the interests of the University.

3. Penalties will be imposed by the University in accordance with procedural safeguards applicable to disciplinary actions against students, faculty and staff, as required by Section 502D(3) and Section 603 of *The Code*, by Board of Governors policies applicable to other employees exempt from the State Personnel Act, and by regulations of the State Personnel Commission.

4. Penalties to be imposed by the University will vary depending upon the nature and seriousness of the offense, and may include a range of disciplinary actions up to and including expulsion from enrollment and discharge from employment. The University may also refer matters to law enforcement for prosecution.

a. For second or other subsequent offenses involving illegal drugs, progressively more severe penalties shall be imposed.

b. A student, faculty member, or staff member found to have violated applicable law or University policies concerning illegal drugs may be required to participate in a drug education and counseling program, consent to regular drug testing, and accept such other conditions and restrictions, including a program of community service, as the chancellor or the chancellor's designee deems appropriate. Refusal or failure to abide by such conditions and restrictions may result in additional disciplinary action, up to and including expulsion from enrollment and discharge from employment.

5. Suspension Pending Final Disposition

When a student, faculty member, or staff member has been charged by the University with a violation of policies concerning illegal drugs, he or she may be suspended from enrollment or employment before initiation or completion of regular disciplinary proceedings if, assuming the truth of the charges, the chancellor or the chancellor's designee concludes that the person's continued presence within the University community would constitute a clear and immediate danger to the health or welfare of other members of the University community; provided, that if such a suspension is imposed, an appropriate hearing of the charges against the suspended person shall be held in accordance with applicable campus judicial policy.

III. Implementation and Reporting

A. Each Board of Trustees shall adopt a policy on illegal drugs, the provisions of which shall be consistent with the requirements of Section II of this policy.

B. Each chancellor shall designate a coordinator of drug education. This person, acting under the authority of the chancellor, will be responsible for overseeing all actions and programs relating to the campus policy.

C. University institutions must comply with applicable state and federal law regarding illegal drugs including, without limitation, the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 and the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Amendments of 1989. In accordance with the latter, each institution must conduct a biennial review of the effectiveness of its educational programs regarding illegal drugs and the consistency of sanction enforcement, and maintain the results of such reviews on file.

Chancellor's Task Force on the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Grants and Contracts 2011-2012 Final Report

The Task Force was appointed by Chancellor Steve Ballard in the fall 2011. The Chancellor personally met with the committee and expressed his desire to improve the performance of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and the Office of Grants and Contracts (OGC). He referred to feedback he had received from a number of sources including the "Gombash Report."

Membership

Task Force members (hereafter referred to as the Task Force): Glen Gilbert, Co-Chair, Dean and Professor, College of Health and Human Performance, Marti Engelke, Co-Chair, Associate Dean and Professor, College of Nursing, Paul Bolin, Chair and Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Brody School of Medicine, David Cistola, Associate Dean of Research and Professor, College of Allied Health Sciences and Professor BSOM, Lisa Clough, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Associate Professor of Biology, Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, Warren Knudson, Professor, Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, Brody School of Medicine, Linda Patriarca, Dean and Professor, College of Education, Kathleen Row, Chair and Professor, Department of Psychology, Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, Mike Wheeler, Associate Professor, Department of Nutrition Sciences, College of Human Ecology.

Data Collection

The Task Force began meeting weekly in October 2011 and reviewed and discussed the Gombash report and decided a good place to start was to examine best practices at other institutions. Each member of the committee looked at the organization of another institution which we considered comparable in some manner and reported back to the full committee on findings of interest. Several meetings focused on these best practices and the structure found at other institutions. Most were outperforming ECU in terms of important numbers and especially the amount of F&A returned per faculty member. Comparable institutions often have similar size offices with a much higher volume of activity. What seems to differentiate ECU from these institutions is that generally they have more help at the unit level.

The Task Force felt it was important to hear from the various users of the offices and decided to hold a series of interviews and forums. The Task Force held an initial open forum for deans and associate deans regarding their concerns and recommendations on January 30th 2012. Task Force members were also asked to talk with appropriate members of their units for input.

The Task Force interviewed the Director of the Office of Sponsored programs, Maryellen O'Brien (February 1) and the Director of the Office Grants and Contracts, Kathie Hall (February

8th). The Task Force also met with the staff of the Office of Sponsored Programs (February 13th), and the staff of the Office of Grants and Contracts (February 15th). The Task Force met with Dr. Bob Lust (February 20th) Interim Associate Dean for Research, BSOM. The Task Force also met with Dr. Deirdre Mageean (February 22nd), Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies who supervises the Directors of these offices. In all cases we felt the input was open, honest and helpful. We were especially pleased with the SPA staff of the two offices under review as they showed loyalty to their leadership, but were open to possible changes and improvements. Their cooperation was commendable.

Definitions

When we refer to offices we are referring to both the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and the Office of Grants and Contracts (OGC). If we are referring to only one office we will make that clear. Most recommendations apply to both offices. When we refer to unit, we are using the term in a general sense to refer to any campus organization involved in Grants and Contracts. This could be a college, school, department, center or institute. We use the term principal investigator to refer to the lead person on a grant or contract realizing that in some cases the grant or contract may not be for research and this title may not be appropriate.

Recommendations

1. Enhance the research climate at ECU.

A major theme that emerged from all discussions **was the importance of spelling out and advertising the research mission of East Carolina University**. To become a first class research institution it is important that this goal not only be stated, but also emphasized through concrete initiatives by all ECU leaders and supported publically by the ECU Board of Trustees. Many individuals interviewed felt that research and research support were undervalued at the institution. Specific examples given to support this belief include the lack of a specific reference to research in the vision statement of ECU, the low expectations related to research, peer reviewed publications, and external funding found in promotion and tenure criteria in many units, and the unusual financial situation at ECU where you can make more teaching in the summer rather than conducting research for 9 month appointees.

The need to recognize the importance of research and other externally funded projects is essential to the future of the institution. We repeatedly heard that new faculty members become disillusioned with research and seeking external funding because of the difficulty in processing and managing grants. However, the issue is not only related to the problems

identified with these two offices. Experienced faculty who have worked at other institutions suggested that the process at ECU is more difficult than in other places where they have worked.

Finally, there needs to be an increased emphasis on recruiting and retaining faculty who have high productivity related to research. This is a difficult task because these people often are recruited to other universities that offer stronger incentives for research. As we consider reorganization and possible changes, it is important that research be a very visible entity with distinct resources and support that can be used to grow the research enterprise at ECU.

2. Evaluate the priorities and core duties of OSP/OGC

The committee recommends that an organizational specialist evaluate each office to identify criteria for priority setting and core duties. Although both offices can benefit from such an evaluation, the OSP is seen as less efficient than OGC. At the present time, OSP is trying to meet the needs of all units and all PIs without always prioritizing the importance of the award to the University. Currently, priority setting is based on the proposal deadline. Factors to be considered related to priority setting include relevance of the proposal to the university, deadline, status of investigator, quality/completeness of the proposal, and amount of money being requested. In addition, the OSP should develop different levels of review for proposal submission. Currently, all proposals receive a full review. The different levels of review might parallel the processes used by the IRB (exempt, expedited, and full review) and relate to the complexity of the proposal. Improving efficiency and effectiveness, particularly as it relates to OSP, will require visionary leadership and excellent skills in personnel management.

Core duties of OSP/OGC need to be clearly identified and publicized and should focus on those activities related to complex, interdepartmental or institutional proposals. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what services are the responsibility of OSP, OGC or the units.

3. *Clearly delineate central vs. unit/college level responsibilities*

A recurring issue is the need to differentiate the responsibilities of OSP and OGC from unit responsibilities. A flow chart for grant submission and award processing needs to be developed with each college and in many cases with specific units and made clear to the principal investigators involved. For some units this will require a major shift in their expectations of assistance from the OSP/OGC offices and possibly, resources to complete this transition. We found that there are many interpretations / opinions on what services OSP and OGC should be

providing. It is for this reason that the core services and responsibilities of both OSP and OGC need to be clarified and agreed upon.

The ability of units to provide meaningful assistance to principal investigators is varied. Some colleges have recently invested a significant amount of unit resources to support proposal development and grants administration. Other units, particularly those with few grants, rely on OSP/OGC personnel for all aspects of proposal development and grant monitoring, even when the amount of the grant is very small. All units need to be assisted in developing the support services at the unit level as much as possible. Further partnerships need to be developed to assist units that currently have little funded activity until the activity reaches the level that such investments in personnel are warranted. As the largest producer of external grants, the Brody School of Medicine has a particular challenge and needs attention. Previously a full-time OSP officer was housed in the BSOM; recently all OSP officers were centralized to increase efficiency but this has not been an optimal arrangement.

In addition, an overall weakness at ECU is that there are insufficient resources dedicated to proposal development. Proposal development is important at two levels. There is a macro level function related to stimulating and coordinating complex multidisciplinary proposals and a micro level function related to helping the PI negotiate the logistics of the submission process. Both of these functions are provided by successful research universities but are not adequate at ECU.

4. Improve Training and Resources Related to Grant Submission and the Administration of Awards.

Many of the issues raised in the previous sections are related to communication and this could be improved with a better website. A review of websites and research offices at other institutions found that they provide significantly more training and a number of resources that are not available at ECU. The website of OSP should include updated templates and linkages for information related to the institution (general description, research space/productivity, student data, faculty data, etc.). Some institutions include links that address not only “what” must be completed by a principal investigator but, “why” these items need to be completed. Such information corrects misconceptions/misunderstandings before they start and provides for more “buy in” by the users.

Some of this is now in place but greater effort needs to be made to insure easy information needed by the customer (in this case principal Investigators). The list of core services and the flow chart for grant submission should be easily accessible at the web site. We suggest once or

twice a year extra personnel are brought in to update web sites of both offices based on feedback from customers (principal investigators).

Another issue is related to training. Once roles and responsibilities are clarified, then training needs to be improved. All new grantees should be required to have training either by meeting with a representative from OGC and/or completing a set of on-line modules. In addition, periodic training related to RAMSeS and grant administration might be offered through the Office of Faculty Development or with on-line modules. There is ongoing training provided to unit level personnel (the ASPIRE meeting). However, unit personnel have not always found this helpful and both the format and attendance need to be reviewed. It may be that with more emphasis on proposal development at the unit level, the central OSP/OCG staff can assume a greater role in effective training and the development of templates and boilerplate resources for principal investigators.

5. Establish an evaluation feedback loop and an organizational structure that promotes collaboration with faculty and a customer-friendly atmosphere.

Both offices should establish a customer feedback process. The PIs should be treated **as valued customers** and their satisfaction should be the most important element in evaluating the performance of the offices and each member of the offices. This system needs to be established so that faculty and unit staff are kept anonymous, the feedback is simple to complete and compliance rates are high. For example, a simple survey might be part of the RAMSeS process at the end of submission and as a part of the grant closure process. An annual or bi-annual meeting of principal investigators should be held with a structured agenda to discuss what is working and what is not working, with a clear focus on seeking approaches for improving the functionality of procedures. This meeting could fit within the scope of the University Research Council. Minutes from these meetings should be shared with all appropriate parties.

The salaries of the directors are competitive and adequate to recruit an executive level person with strong leadership skills. However, the link between the directors and the faculty needs to be strengthened. The task force recommends that the director of OSP and OGC report directly to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, who can be a liaison with the Deans and Associate Deans. Both directors should receive a performance-based annual evaluation that includes anonymous feedback from PIs, Associate Deans for research and other unit administrators. In addition, each office staff member should have an annual evaluation tailored to his/her job assignments. Each office should prepare an annual report summarizing this feedback and publicize it. The goal should be exceptional customer satisfaction.

An improved centralized system should be established to monitor grant and contract budgets. This is needed to protect the institution both from over spending and under spending which have resulted in substantial revenue loss for the institution. A summary of all reports should also be provided to each department chair, Center and Institute director or other appropriate unit director.

Currently all of the staff positions in the offices are SPA which appears to limit the salary and incentives for meritorious work. Consideration should be given to making these positions EPA on a voluntary basis. This would allow more rewards for excellence and also allow greater accountability as these would be EPA non-teaching positions, subject to fixed term rules. If they must remain SPA then a career ladder needs to be developed as well as an appropriate evaluation system to create incentives for optimal performance.

6. Streamline the processes required by Human Resources (HR) related to grants and contracts.

One of the recurring themes found by the task force was that problems attributed to OSP/OGC were really problems related to HR. The processing of new hires is particularly problematic and has resulted in a significant loss of revenue to the university. New positions on grants appear to be treated the same as new state employee hires. Our data gathering suggests that this is not the situation at other Universities in the UNC system. When a grant has been submitted and approved with a specific salary, the ECU HR department will often disallow this pre-approved salary or require significant documentation and review to justify it. Faculty in the Health Sciences Division have an additional layer of approval for positions which often delays the implementation of the grant. Since salaries cannot be paid retroactively, the revenue is lost and is considerable. Further, the lack of needed staff at onset is one of the most aggravating issues, especially for new principal Investigators. One or more HR staff should be trained and identified as the contact personnel for assistance in hiring grant and contract personnel and HR should investigate the more streamlined processes used by other universities in the UNC System.

7. Create a mechanism for preapproval of grant proposals that always includes appropriate personnel.

The task force was told that the approval process through RAMSeS needs to be reviewed and revised so that deans and department chairs must be included in the approval routing. Currently, it is possible for the PI to set up the system so that these key people are by-passed. It appears that OSP personnel have been more attentive to this recently, but this needs continued oversight. In addition, in some cases it appears that the proposal must be routed to

departments that are not relevant. For example, all proposals to Foundations are routed to the Corporate Gifts office in the Foundation for approval. While the task force and faculty value the contribution that can be provided by this office in identifying funding, when a competitive proposal is submitted in response to a RFP, approval from this office should not be required. In the case where there is a limited submission (i.e. only one proposal can be submitted), determination of which proposal to submit should reside in the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research or the designee of this office.

8. Establish a mechanism to evaluate other offices/departments that affect the efficiency of research at ECU.

The charge of the task force was to evaluate OSP and OGC. However, as with HR, we received information that other offices in the University constrain research and need to be reviewed. The HIPAA compliance office and the IT Security Offices seem to create long delays in getting awards approved in a timely manner. Their approval is needed before final IRB approval is received and without IRB approval the receipt of funding is usually delayed. It may be that these offices are understaffed based on national comparisons or their processes do not reflect best practices. The task force was not able to evaluate this, but recommends that this be addressed as soon as possible as these delays often result in lost revenue to the institution.

The philosophy of the compliance office at ECU is considered to be more rigid than that found at other institutions. The committee recommends a more collaborative approach between the compliance office and PIs on how to implement unclear areas related to compliance. Many compliance requirements are ECU “interpretations” of laws and statutes-interpretations that should be re-evaluated on a timely basis. These offices should be evaluated by principal investigators in a manner similar to that recommended for OSP and OGC.

The task force also heard discussion regarding the clinical trials office at ECUSOM. It appears that this is an area where we will see increased growth. However, there is a wide discrepancy in how the individual departments manage clinical trials. Clinical trial proposals do not follow the usual OSP processes. Some of them appear to be very well managed and others never enroll patients and do not generate revenue. This hurts the reputation of the University. This area needs further evaluation but was beyond the scope of this committee.

Summary

Thank you for your interest in this most important enterprise and thank you for the opportunity to provide this input. While the project has been very demanding, it has given each of us a much better understanding of the operation. We would also suggest that such review become a regular approach to the operations. This should be put on a five-year model, as has become

the practice for campus administrator review. We would also recommend that this review be shared widely with everyone interviewed and other interested parties.

See body of report for explanation. This is a brief summary of recommendations.

Check list of recommendations:

1. Publicly emphasize research mission of institution (Chancellor and campus leadership).
2. Add research to campus vision statement and other important documents (Chancellor and campus leadership).
3. Outline and state core responsibilities of OSP.
4. Outline and state core responsibilities of OGC.
5. Develop an improved and articulated work priority system for the OSP.
6. Develop an improved and articulated work priority system for the OGC.
7. Develop different levels of review (exempt, expedited and full review) for OSP.
8. Develop a flow chart with each unit regarding grant submission (cooperative venture OSP and each appropriate unit).
9. Develop a flow chart and system for grant & contract submission appropriate for BSOM (cooperative venture with BSOM and OSP).
10. Enhance website of OSP based on customer needs and input.
11. Enhance website of OGC based on customer needs and input.
12. Required basic training for new investigators (Joint venture OSP and units).
13. Continue on-going training but ensure it is more customer directed (OSP).
14. Continue on-going training but ensure it is more customer directed (OGC).
15. Establish culture in both offices that treat PIs as valued customers.
16. Feedback collection on satisfaction of customers of OSP.
17. Feedback collection on satisfaction of customers of OGC.

18. Seek ongoing (formative) satisfaction feedback from University Research Council for both offices.
19. Seek ways to provide incentives for excellence in performance of staff of OSP.
20. Seek ways to provide incentives for excellence in performance of staff of OSP.
21. Streamline approvals for hiring grant and contract staff through HR (OSP and HR).
22. Insure HR has staff ready to help with timely hires and any other barriers to timely startup of grants and contracts (HR and offices of VCHS and Provost).
23. Insure no proposal can be submitted without the sign off of all appropriate parties.
24. Remove requirement that all Foundation proposals be approved by Corporate Gifts Office except in those cases where submissions per year by an institution are limited (VCRGS and VCUA).
25. Insure that final approval in cases of limited submissions is made by VCRGS or designee and in a timely manner (VCRGS).
26. HIPAA and IT Security Offices need close examination to insure they are operating and being evaluated on customer satisfaction regarding their assistance and timeliness to PIs.
27. Review of operations of clinical trials be examined by an appropriate committee.
28. The Directors of both offices be examined every five years as is done with other senior administrators at ECU.