

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of May 16, 1972

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, May 16, 1972, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 102B, Social Science Building. The Chairman called the meeting to order and the roll was checked. The following persons were absent: Fabisch, Ball, Hayek, Donnalley, Eagan, Martinez, Shank, Marshall, Erber.

The minutes for April 25, 1972, were approved as written.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

The chairman announced the appointment of Dr. Charles Bland to the Program Committee Advisory Board.

Mr. McDaniel announced that he had received word from Dr. Jenkins that the Director of Student Teachers had been approved as an ex-officio member of the Teacher Education Committee, and that the wording change concerning campus committee work with reference to promotion had been approved.

Mr. McDaniel announced that all annual committee reports were due May 15, 1972, and asked that all committee chairmen be advised.

He announced that due to the length of the agenda that debate would be limited according to Robert's Rules of Order.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Joe Davis of the Credits Committee reported that the proposal concerning dropping and adding courses which had been referred to the committee by the Senate (see minutes of the meeting of April 25, 1972) had been discussed. The committee recognizes that inequities exist but was unanimously opposed to the proposal for liberalizing drop procedure as submitted to the committee and felt more time was needed to study the implications. He stated that the registrar objected to having to record WP or WF. Mr. Ragan moved that the Credits Committee report its recommendation to the next Senate. Mr. Resnik seconded. The motion passed.

The recommendation concerning 180 hours for graduation was presented by Mr. Conley, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee. Mr. Keusch moved that the catalogue statement on page 100 be amended to read "when the student has received the minimum of quarter hour credits required for a specific degree, and has met other requirements." Mr. Yeh seconded.

Miss Patricia Daugherty asked if the curriculum committee had checked to see if in some areas the minimum number of hours for graduation might go below 180. Mr. Conley said they had not. Mr. Satterfield asked if the wording would not

allow some area to go below 180. Mr. McDaniel answered that it would. Mr. Capwell reported that the chairmen of the College of Arts and Sciences had requested that he present their opposition to lowering the number of hours required for graduation. Other points were discussed, such as, requiring all areas with general education courses to give by-pass examinations for credits; the fact that 180 quarter hours was in line with the requirements at a large number of universities; and that 120 semester hours converts to 180 quarter hours. The question was called and the motion passed 27½ for, 20 against. Mr. Holt moved that the minimum numbers of hours for graduation be 180. Miss Weaver seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Holt moved that the proposals presented by the School of Business and the Department of Social Welfare to lower their hours for graduation to 180 be approved. Mr. Woodside seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. McDaniel explained that the curriculum committee had held a special meeting on May 15, 1972, at which time some curriculum changes were approved which were desired for the fall. Since this was not on the agenda, and under the usual procedure for approval, the changes would not take effect until winter quarter, the chair would accept a motion to suspend the rules in order to clear all curriculum matters. Mr. Williams moved to suspend the rules, Mr. Keusch seconded. The motion passed with 44 for.

Mr. Holt moved the curriculum changes approved by the curriculum committee on May 15, 1972, be accepted. Mr. Satterfield seconded. The motion passed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Admissions Committee report was presented by Mr. Herman Phelps, Chairman. There were two items requiring Senate action. Mr. Horne moved that the following statement be added to the catalogue:

Scholastic Requirements for a Second Undergraduate Degree

The student must maintain a grade point average of 2.0 or better. In determining the grade point average, only hours taken from the time of admission to a second degree program will be counted. Quality points earned in the first degree will not apply in determining scholastic eligibility while enrolled for a second degree.

The student must also meet the curriculum requirements of the catalogue under which he enters for the second degree or of some subsequent catalogue, provided that no student will be permitted to complete second degree under a catalogue issued more than three years prior to the date of completion of the second degree.

The student must be enrolled in a regular program at East Carolina University for his last quarter of study. Mr. Keusch seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Keusch moved that the policy concerning readmission and appeals be adopted. Mr. Horne seconded. The motion passed. The motion replaces the first paragraph under readmission and appeals on Page 91 of the catalogue with the following paragraph:

Students who have been out of school for at least one quarter must apply for readmission. Students who fall below minimum requirements to continue at East Carolina University and who wish to appeal to the Admissions Committee for readmission must present their appeals in writing no later than two calendar weeks prior to registration day. Students who have attended the second term of the summer session in order to qualify for the fall quarter must present their appeals no later than one calendar week prior to registration day. No appeals will be accepted after these deadlines.

The remainder of the policy remains the same.

The credits committee report was presented by Mr. Davis, Chairman. Mr. Phelps moved that the proposal for credit with no grade on the language by-pass (see attachment to May 16, 1972, Faculty Senate Agenda for details) be approved. Mr. Horne seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. McGee moved that the recommendation concerning transfer credit (see attachment to May 16, 1972, Faculty Senate Agenda for details) be approved. Mr. Lawler seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee, was unable to attend the meeting and the Committee report was presented by Mr. Aliapoulios (see attachment to May 16, 1972, Faculty Senate Agenda).

Mr. Reilly moved that the University discontinue the practice of classifying credit in courses offered off-campus as extension credit. Mr. Keusch seconded. To make clear the fact that this was to apply only to undergraduate courses Mr. Middleton moved that the motion be amended to exclude courses numbered 300G and above. Mr. Holt seconded. It was pointed out that the practice is no longer required by accrediting agencies. Due to budgetary purposes the courses will continue to be recorded as having been taken through the Division of Continuing Education. The motion as amended passed.

The report of the Committee on Committees was presented by Mr. Ferrell, Chairman.

Miss Chauncey, Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the proposed code for the operation of schools and departments for consideration by the Senate. Mr. Snyder moved that the code be referred back to the Faculty Affairs Committee for resubmission to the next Senate with the suggestion that the recommendations of the Administrative Council (see attached) be considered. Mrs. Rosenfeld seconded. Miss Steer asked how the committee felt about the possibility of a University Code being considered by the Board of Governors. Miss Chauncey replied that the committee felt that the two codes were not necessarily the same and that the University Code would probably not attempt to govern operation of schools and departments. Mr. McDaniel stated that it really was not known at this time exactly what the Board would do. Mr. Satterfield stated that he felt it would be a good idea for the Board to know our opinions. Mr. Williams stated that he felt the Departmental Code was not clearly defined. Mr. McDaniel stated the suggestions of the Administrative Council were not intended to interfere with Faculty Senate business and were submitted to the Senate for its information only. Further study over the summer might possibly give a greater measure of governance to the faculty. It was suggested that the Chairman of the Faculty should be included in any further

discussions.

Mr. Ferrell moved to amend the motion, 1) that the Faculty Affairs Committee be informed that the Faculty Senate endorses the concept of faculty review of chairmen of departments and deans of professional schools and endorses the concept that, 2) departmental and school business be conducted by Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised. Mr. Snyder and Mrs. Rosenfeld accepted the motion as amended by Mr. Ferrell. The motion passed.

Miss Chauncey would like to receive in writing any suggestions for improvement from the Senate, Administration, and Faculty.

NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Steelman presented a recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. (see attachment to May 16, 1972, Faculty Senate Agenda). Mr. Ferrell suggested that the sentence reading "The ten faculty members are to be appointed totally by the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Senate" be changed to read "The ten faculty members are to be nominated totally by the Committee on Committees for the approval of the Faculty Senate." Mr. Kim moved that the recommendation of the committee be accepted as changed by Mr. Ferrell. Mr. Keusch seconded. Mr. Grossnickle questioned the purpose of the evaluation. Mrs. Steelman replied that it was to improve teaching and select teachers for the annual alumni award. In answer to a question about evaluation of graduate courses she answered that these courses were so diverse in approach that no single questionnaire could apply. Mr. Grossnickle commented that he had helped with two prior attempts with no usable results, and that according to the literature on evaluation, the bulk of the evidence implied evaluation had no effect on teaching. Also, the interaction between teacher and class size is usually ignored.

It was apparently the consensus of the Senate that there will be a teacher evaluation committee regardless of who directs its operation. Mr. Lawler asked if there was a pressing need and if the committee can serve any purpose. Miss Steer stated that there is no assurance that a teacher will not get worse nor any assurance that they will get better and periodic review might be a good thing. Mr. Williams said that when the results of previous student attempts are considered such a committee would help assure that a reasonable job would be done of evaluation. Also, accrediting agencies are now asking about teacher evaluation procedures. Mr. Ferrell stated that the AAUP has some procedures on this and he would be happy to supply them for the committee. He then called for the question. Mr. Kim's motion passed.

Mr. Ferrell moved a vote of thanks to Mr. McDaniel for his performance of Faculty Senate duties during the year. The Senate gave Mr. McDaniel a standing ovation.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella Daugherty
Secretary

Resolution Passed by Administrative Council May 10, 1972

WHEREAS, "A Code for the Operation of Schools and Departments in East Carolina University" has been submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Affairs Committee, and WHEREAS, the departmental chairmen of the College of Arts and Sciences have unanimously gone on record in opposition to the "Code" as it is now formulated, be it,

RESOLVED, by the Administrative Council that, while wishing to express its belief in, and support of, faculty involvement in university governance, the Council also is opposed to the "Code" in its present form and wishes to go on record as supporting the stand of the chairmen of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Council's opposition is based on two considerations: (1) that, before acting itself, East Carolina University should wait for the "University Code" for all of the state universities to be issued; and (2) that the document as now formulated contains fallacies and ambiguities, and that, if it were adopted, it would cause misunderstanding and irreparable damage to the present governmental structure of this institution.

Some of the fallacies and ambiguities that the Council objects to are as follows:

1. The document does not distinguish and make clear any distinction between dean of a school and chairman of a department.
2. The document sets forth two possible ways that chairmen (and/or deans?) may be selected with no provision for which way is to be used.
3. According to the procedure for establishing an Advisory Council and other committees as set forth in the document, it is not only possible, but likely, that untenured personnel would be helping make decisions about the granting of tenure.
4. In the same ways, the document would allow persons not going to return the following year to help choose chairmen and to decide issues of tenure, promotion, and the like.