

## FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 1972

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 24, 1972, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The Chairman called the meeting to order and the roll was checked. The following persons were absent; Pritchard, Eagan, Steer, Lunney, Stanforth, Bishop, Schmidt, Distefano, Hampton, Jones.

The minutes for September 26, 1972, were approved as written.

### SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

The Chairman announced that he had received word that ECU was the eleventh campus to ratify the Charter for the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina and that at that time 13 of the 16 campuses had ratified. Therefore, the charter is in effect. The first meeting of the Faculty Assembly has been tentatively set for December 2, 1972.

### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEES

#### A. Curriculum Committee

Mr. Grossnickle, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee presented the Curriculum Bank Proposal (see attachment to Faculty Senate Agenda for October 24, 1972). He commented that it was a conceptual rather than procedural proposal which would preserve courses which otherwise would have to be deleted and that to put one of the courses back into the active course list would require only a memorandum from the Department concerned. No representative of the department would have to attend the Curriculum Committee meetings for this procedure. Representatives must still be present when new courses are proposed. Mr. Grossnickle stated that hopefully obsolete courses would be deleted rather than banked. In answer to a question concerning duplication he indicated that the Curriculum Committee must check the Curriculum Bank to see that duplication does not occur. Mr. Yeh asked about the sentence which stated that the University Curriculum Committee would make the ultimate decision to reactivate a course. Mr. Grossnickle replied that this would be relatively automatic and routine.

Mr. Ellis moved that the Curriculum Bank proposal be adopted. Mr. Melvin Williams seconded. The motion passed.

#### B. Committee on Committees

Mr. James McDaniel, Chairman, made a few statements relative to the need for making the change requested. (See attachment to Faculty Senate Agenda of October 24, 1972). Due to the new importance for Career Education the faculty could not afford to abdicate its responsibility to serve at least an advisory capacity. He explained that there is a move to establish an office of Director of Career Education and also a move toward providing an economically useful education. Mr. Keusch moved

that the recommendation of the Committee on Committees be accepted thus restructuring the Vocational Education Committee as a new committee, the Career Education Committee. Also that the Teacher Education and Career Committee name be changed to the Teacher Education Committee to avoid confusion. Mr. Lawler seconded. The motion passed.

#### C. Faculty Affairs Committee

Miss Patricia Daugherty, Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee presented the proposal concerning appointment of members of the same family (see attachment to Faculty Senate agenda, October 24, 1972). The matter had been referred to the committee at the last meeting of the Senate. Miss Daugherty moved the statement, "East Carolina University has no prohibition against appointment of members of the same family to the faculty nor any limitations on their subsequent advancement. Faculty members should neither initiate, nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate families" appear in the Faculty Manual. It was pointed out that the AAUP considers the last part as an acceptable restriction and that HEW would probably also consider it acceptable. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

#### D. Ad Hoc Governance Committee

Mr. John Richards, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee presented the report of the Committee (see attachment to Faculty Senate Agenda, October 24, 1972). He stated that the report should be considered in two parts. The first 6 items would require action and the last three items were presented as suggestions for advisement. Mr. Adler asked if the advice of the Faculty Senate was to be binding. Mr. Richards replied that the Committee felt that it was not. Mr. Steelman pointed out that the third item would require a change in the Faculty Senate Constitution. Mr. Richards stated that the basic idea was that the Faculty Assembly delegates needed to attend and be informed. Mr. Yarbrough moved that item 3 be changed to read "In addition to attending the meetings of the Faculty Assembly the delegates who are not members of the Faculty Senate shall attend the meetings of the Faculty Senate and the meetings of the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee". After some discussion in which it was pointed out that if these delegates were assigned seats and were given floor rights, the Faculty Senate would be more aware of their participation, Mr. Yarbrough withdrew his motion. There was considerable feeling that item 3 needed to be clarified. Miss Pat Daugherty moved that item 3 be deleted and the Ad Hoc Governance Committee be directed to bring back an amendment to cover it. Mr. Yarbrough seconded. The motion to delete item 3 passed. Mr. Steelman asked how the distribution of the Faculty Assembly minutes and the written report of the delegates would be handled. It was replied that this was a statement taken from the Charter and the exact procedure would probably depend on how the Faculty Assembly handled it. However, the Faculty Senate Office would most likely take care of it. Mrs. Spickerman asked why the election would be done by the Faculty Senate rather than the entire faculty. Mr. Richards said that considering what had occurred when this type of thing had been attempted in the past, it was too time consuming. The Chairman called for a vote on the 5 remaining items. The proposal with item 3 deleted was approved.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the three items of advisement. The motion passed.

## NEW BUSINESS

Miss Patricia Daugherty presented the item on Faculty Manual interpretations. The interpretation involved the precise meaning of the definition of probation and the notification of rehiring under the provisions of the Faculty Manual. Considerable discussion ensued. Mr. Ferrell, who had been on the original committee concerned with drawing up the statement, stated that the intent was to follow the guidelines of the AAUP as stated originally in a 1940 publication and reviewed in 1969 by a joint committee of the Association of American Colleges and the AAUP. According to these documents the decision concerning tenure must be made twelve months prior to the conclusion of the probationary period. Mr. Lawler moved that the Faculty Affairs Committee draw up a statement to clarify the Faculty Manual, following the 1940 statement. Mr. Ellis seconded. Mr. Martinez felt that it was not necessary to refer the matter to a committee but could be handled immediately. Mr. Lawler replied that a hasty statement might not solve the problem whereas the committee could avoid any ambiguity. Mr. Willcox asked what the policy was if an assistant were promoted to associate at the end of his 4th year. Would this extend his probationary period? Mr. Ferrell read the 1940 statement. The question was called. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Miss Patricia Daugherty moved that the Faculty Affairs Committee include the consideration of the contents of the letter to untenured faculty. Mr. Ellis seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Martinez moved that the last item "Consideration of a Review Committee for Untenured Faculty" be sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee for action. Mr. Moeller seconded. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella Daugherty, Secretary

SD/lis