

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of February 18, 1969

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 18, 1969, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 312, New Austin. The Chairman called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to check the roll by the seating chart. The following members were absent: Kevin Ryan, Donald Durland, Edgar Hooks, Albert Peralion, James Rees, John Davis and Virginia McGrath.

The Chairman stated that there were a number of typographical errors in the minutes of December 17, 1968, and these errors had been noted and corrected. Mr. Price also said that on page 1 of the minutes Mr. Stillwell's name was misspelled. The minutes were then approved as corrected. Since Mr. Hooks, parliamentarian, was unable to be at this meeting, Mr. Price asked Mr. Steelman to act as parliamentarian.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Mr. Price said that Dean Mallory had contacted him concerning the nomination of a special committee to investigate cheating on campus. Mr. Price announced that Ruby Edens, Ray Lanfear and William R. Spickerman would make up this special committee.

Mr. Price said that item B, the selection by the Senate of an advisor for the SGA, was actually new business and he would enter a motion to suspend the rules so that this matter may be taken up at this time. Mr. Everett moved suspension of the rules, and the motion was seconded and the 3/4 vote necessary was voted, and the motion to suspend passed. Mr. Price then introduced Mr. Bill Richardson, speaker of the student legislature.

Mr. Richardson stated that the SGA felt that it would be desirable to have a faculty advisor from the Senate to attend their meetings. He said that at present there were two administrative advisors, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Alexander. However, there was no representative from the faculty at the present time. He said the SGA would like a faculty member, who would be in effect a liaison member coordinating the Senate and the SGA. Mr. Richardson said that this faculty advisor could be a regular advisor and attend each SGA meeting which is held every Monday at 5:00 or he could attend only those meetings which would seem pertinent.

Mr. Price asked that the Senate decide if they would like to have an advisor to the SGA. Mr. Bailey moved that the Senate select an advisor and this motion was seconded by Mrs. Dunn. The vote was taken and the motion passed.

Mr. Price stated that the next question was whether the Senate should select a consultant who might work with the SGA at certain times or an advisor who would attend each meeting. Mr. Grossnickle moved that the chairman of the faculty in consultation with the speaker of the student legislature appoint an advisor from the Senate to the SGA. This motion was seconded by Mr. Gray and the motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Mr. Price said the function of the advisor still had to be clarified. Mr. McDaniel asked Mr. Richardson if their constitution would be affected. Mr. Richardson stated that the SGA Constitution was quite broad in interpretation and at this time it would not be affected. Mr. Stillwell stated that perhaps it would be best to leave the exact functions of this advisor up to the person nominated as to whether he would serve as a consultant or a full advisor.

Mr. Price announced that there would be a hearing Thursday, February 20, 1969, at 4:00 p.m. concerning the question of students on academic committees. This would be an open hearing and he urged all senators to attend this important meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Price said that it had been requested that 300G level courses be sent through to the Graduate Committee only and not go through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Mr. Price asked Mrs. Stella Daugherty, chairman of the Curriculum Committee, to speak on this point. Mrs. Daugherty stated that since undergraduates were able to take these courses and that since a number of 300G level courses are required courses she had reservations concerning this proposal. Mr. Stillwell asked if the rule concerning students being allowed to take courses one level below and one level above was still in effect. It was stated that this rule still applies. Mr. Everett asked Mrs. Daugherty if the Curriculum Committee was against this proposal. Mrs. Daugherty said that it had not been formally presented but she had talked with committee members about it and they were not in favor of the proposal. Mr. Pignani, as chairman of the Policy Committee of the Graduate Council, then spoke to the Senate. He stated that a study of this situation is in progress. One question asked in the questionnaire was whether or not 300G level courses were required for an undergraduate major and/or minor. Fifteen departments and schools answered that at least one course was required for a major.

Mrs. Daugherty said it seemed to her that since these courses were mixed then they should go to both committees. Mr. Grossnickle moved that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee continue to approve 300G level courses. This motion was seconded. Mr. Saunders reminded the Senate of the procedures by which courses pass through the committees with final approval by the Senate. Mrs. Daugherty stated that inasmuch as courses are sometimes approved first by the Graduate Council before they are sent to the Undergraduate Committee this results in pressures frequently being put on the Undergraduate Committee for final approval. Mr. Carlton asked why the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee could not handle a 300 level course then let the Graduate Council attach a G. Mr. Steelman said this would be very difficult. The Senate voted on the motion to let the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee continue to approve 300G level courses. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Mr. Price introduced Mr. Kim who spoke concerning the student course guide publication. Mr. Kim said he was not questioning students rights to evaluate the faculty, but he felt that their recently published guide was below university standards. He said that there was a number of deficiencies in the publication. For instance, there was no indication of how the sampling was done and there was no indication how the data were analyzed. He said that perhaps the Senate should express concern and possibly offer to give

the students some guidance in any future publication of this type. Mr. Kim then moved that the Senate form a subcommittee to investigate the procedures used in the publication. This motion was seconded.

Mr. Hester stated that Mr. Bezanson requested that the Senate be told that although his name was listed as an advisor in this publication, actually he had nothing to do with it and was never consulted on the publication.

Mr. Stillwell said he understood that they may not be able to publish the guide again. Mr. Grossnickle stated that they were preparing for the publication right now. Miss Stapleton inquired if anyone knew how much the students actually used this publication.

It was stated that perhaps the Senate was unduly getting involved in student affairs. Mr. Johnson said that the publication was printed in Raleigh and that it had the administration's name attached to it and, therefore, it was not just a student affair. Mrs. Dunn said the publication was not done right from the beginning and that definite guidelines should be established. She said that a self-evaluation for professors could be valuable. She further stated that the published guide had some stupid questions in it. Mr. Steelman asked if the secretary had recorded the statement concerning Mr. Bezanson. The secretary stated that it had been recorded.

Miss Potter said that actually the student course guide had been written from a telephone survey and the information was not taken from prepared questionnaires. Mr. Ragan asked if the administration had endorsed the student course guide. Mr. Price said that the administration had taken no stand concerning this publication.

Miss Chauncey stated that a number of years ago there was a very valuable questionnaire used to evaluate teachers and that it appeared to be successful. She said that students liked to evaluate their professors. The question was called and the vote was taken on the motion that the Senate form a subcommittee to investigate the student course guide. The vote was taken and the motion failed.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES

Mr. Everett reminded the Senate of the proposal from the Agenda Committee, copies of which had been passed out to Senate members. (See attached.) He moved that the Senate approve this general order of procedure for the Agenda Committee. This motion was seconded.

Mr. Steelman said he felt that the Agenda Committee was going to have to decide what should be brought to the Senate, that trivial matters were often presented to the Agenda Committee which should be sent to standing committees instead. Mr. Steelman then read from the faculty manual (1968-69) page 83.

"Matters to be brought before the Faculty Senate shall ordinarily be considered in the order set forth by the Agenda Committee. Matters for consideration may be taken out of order and/or new matters considered in any order upon a two-thirds vote of faculty Senators present and voting at any meeting of the Faculty Senate."

He said it seems that matters could be taken up and voted on and therefore not put on the agenda.

Mr. Everett said that the constitution stated specifically that matters concerning curriculum and faculty welfare had to be taken up by the Senate. Mr. Price reminded the Senate that any senator may place an item on the agenda. He said the constitution committee should study these procedures. The vote was taken on the motion to adopt the proposal from the Agenda Committee and the motion passed with two dissenting votes.

Mr. Steelman asked if this proposal did not involve a change in the constitution. Mr. Price stated that it did not involve a constitutional change and Mr. Steelman asked why not. Mr. Price said that this proposal simply clarified agenda procedures and that it was an effort only to clarify what had been fuzzy in the past. Mr. Grossnickle, chairman of the Constitution Committee, was asked for his opinion on the constitutional question. He said that he did not have a constitution with him; however, the procedure appeared to be in order and would not constitute a change in the constitution. The chair ruled that the motion previously passed was in order.

Mr. Price called on Mr. Calhoun, who was substituting for Mr. John Davis, to give the Faculty Club Committee progress report. Mr. Calhoun said that the Faculty Club had been officially incorporated, and that the University had a Faculty Club at least on paper, and he announced that there would be a meeting concerning the Faculty Club on February 20, 1969.

Mr. Price introduced Stella Daugherty who explained that German 218 had been inadvertently left off of a list of approved courses which had been distributed to the faculty. Mr. Gray moved that the Senate approve this course. This motion was seconded and passed.

Mr. Price mentioned that according to Robert's Rules of Order if no one calls a quorum, a quorum exists. He then called on Mr. Donald F. Bailey who presented the report from the Admissions Committee.

Mr. Bailey explained Part I of the report stated that it was an effort to cut down on appeals and that he asked the Senate to approve this report. Mr. Sanderson moved that Part I of the Admissions Committee report be approved. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Bailey explained that Part II of the proposal for the admission of marginal students was an experimental alternate program to what now exists. Mr. Weigand stated that he would answer questions regarding this program.

Mr. Horne said he was 100 per cent in favor of the proposal. He stated that the administration had wanted to do away with the "summer school only" program in the past; however, the trustees had urged the university to keep the program. He said with Senate approval this proposal would establish a two year experimented program, that the Senate would have an opportunity to re-evaluate it again after this period of time.

Mr. Bellis asked Mr. Horne how many students would be involved in this program. Mr. Horne said he would guess around 200 in the Fall. Miss Herrin asked what percentage of the entering freshman class would be involved? Mr. Horne answered perhaps 10 per cent.

Miss Larsen asked why the 2.0 average was required. In answering the questions that followed, Mr. Horne said that these students in the marginal program would have reduced loads, tutorial help, and counseling. Miss Stapleton asked if there would be a floor on admission such as the SAT. Mr. Horne said that under the present program these students admitted to "summer school only" had to have certain subject matter and the recommendation of the school counselor and principal. He said that many of these students came from small high schools and were unable to score satisfactorily on the SAT.

Mr. Weigand stated that in his experience he has found that marginal students have a tendency to work up to expectations. He said that these students would achieve regular status if they can work up to a 2.0. He said that this incentive plan has worked well at the University of Maryland. He stated that marginal students must prove themselves.

Mr. Bellis asked how this program would be financed and staffed and he asked if it was fair to provide tutorial services for these students and not for the regular students. Mr. Weigand answered that the University has had tutorial services in the past but this program fell apart, but at present it is being built up again. He said they hoped to be able to handle a large number of students not presently in the marginal program. He said that financial aid would have to come from private sources and that perhaps the normal staff with additional tutors could handle the program. Mr. Price inquired if finances have been assured for this program. Mr. Bailey said it had not.

Mr. Grossnickle said that there is no entrance requirements in the community colleges. He asked if it is the policy of the University to admit these students since he understood that we were overcrowded at the present. He said if we adopt this program it should be a scientific research experiment to see if this remedial program does really improve a student.

Mr. Steelman said that he was opposed to the proposal. He said the University's admission requirements were fair and reasonable. He said there are community colleges, technical institutes, and junior colleges available for marginal students. He stated that we need students who are intelligent and who will graduate. He said that matriculation was high now. He stated that he understood that there were discipline problems among these marginal students and that it appeared that we were playing the numbers game, for the sole purpose of enrolling more students even though they showed inadequate interest in academic achievement.

Mr. Horne said the matriculation rate was actually going down. He stated that approximately 14 per cent of the freshman class flunked or dropped out. He said these students in the marginal program would have to meet the regular standards. He gave the example of a girl coming from a high school approximately the size of Rose High School who was in the top 10 per cent of her class, but for some reason could not score satisfactorily on the SAT. He said if we had plenty of community colleges perhaps the situation might be different. Mr. Steelman said then we are lowering academic standards. Mr. Leith asked if the university was turning away people like this girl which Mr. Horne mentioned. Mr. Horne said for those applying from in-state no, but those out-of-state, yes. Mr. Johnson said that since the university was funded through state aid we had no right to decide not to take marginal students and that students from in-state have the right to try to graduate

from college. Mr. Donald E. Bailey was recognized and stated that for the record he came to support the proposal.

Mr. Grossnickle moved that the Senate refer the proposal back to the Admissions Committee so that they may make a more specific proposal which would:

1. establish the number of persons involved
2. investigate methods of selection
3. identify the specific procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

This motion was seconded.

The question was asked how many students might fall into this category and Mr. Horne said that approximately 400 applications were on file which would apply. He said that perhaps 150 to 200 may be interested. He said there were many considerations, including grades. Mr. Grossnickle asked about a control of the Hawthorne effect. A senator asked what this was and Mr. Horne explained that in an experiment conducted by Western Electric they found that subjects just by virtue of being in an experimental group did better than the control group.

Mr. Carlton suggested an admendment to the motion, adding the question of staffing and adequacy of financing. The senators who introduced and seconded the original motion were consulted and since this was satisfactory, the admendment on staffing and adequate financing was added.

Mrs. Dunn asked if the Admissions Office turned down anyone who qualified. Mr. Horne stated that just some of the qualified students from out-of-state were turned down. Mr. Steelman asked if it was still possible for a dean or chairman to request that a student be admitted who does not meet minimum requirements. He was answered that this was possible in art, music, drama, and athletics.

In the discussion that followed, the expense of the program was again mentioned with Mr. Horne answering that the expense was not the important thing. Mr. Price called for a motion to allow Donald E. Bailey to speak. This motion passed and Mr. Bailey said that there seemed to be various things which frighten the Senate. He said the program would not be unfair to the regular students since we are not turning down regular students and that as far as the financing, he said the program cannot operate without outside support.

The Senate then voted on the motion that the Senate refer the proposal back to the Admissions Committee so that they could make a more specific proposal which would:

1. establish the number of persons involved
2. investigate the methods of selection
3. identify specific procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the program
4. investigate the question of staffing
5. investigate the adequacy of financing.

The motion carried a vote of 21 in favor and 20½ opposed.

A quorum was then called and there being no quorum the meeting was adjourned.

Respectively submitted,

Emily Boyce, Secretary

A Proposal From the Agenda Committee

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate is clear in stating that the Agenda Committee shall collect all recommendations of academic policy from standing or special faculty committees and that these recommendations must be placed on the agenda of the Faculty Senate within a certain prescribed time.

The Constitution is not clear on the responsibilities of the Agenda Committee in handling recommendations concerning academic policy or faculty welfare from members of the faculty or from members of the Faculty Senate. It has been suggested that this matter be turned over to the Constitution Committee for study.

In the interim, in order to clarify matters and to adopt a standard operating procedure, the Agenda Committee would like to submit the following proposals for discussion and possible approval.

1. Proposals or recommendations from members of the faculty should be submitted to a member of the Senate who in turn will forward it to the Agenda Committee.
2. Proposals from members of the Senate will be discussed at the regular meeting of the Agenda Committee and placed on the agenda of the Senate.
3. When the proposal is brought to the floor of the Senate during the regular order of business, the Chairman of the Agenda Committee will make a recommendation as to the disposition of the proposal.
 - a. The proposal should be assigned to a committee for study.
 - b. The proposal should not be considered because it does not fall within the authority of the Faculty Senate.
 - c. The proposal should be discussed by the Faculty Senate.
 - d. The proposal should be tabled.