

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 24, 1974

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 24, 1974, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Bruton, J. Jones. The following alternates were present: Fabisch, Sanders.

The minutes of May 14, 1974 and of May 15, 1974 were approved as written.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Ms. P. Daugherty asked the Chairman to recognize Ms. S. Daugherty who then presented the Chairman with a gavel. The Chairman introduced the new office secretary Ms. Sharon Johnston. The next order of business was the election of two members and two alternates for the Due Process Committee. Wilbert Ball and Tinsley Yarbrough were nominated as members. Mr. Rees moved nominations close. Ms. Eagan seconded. The motion passed. Mr. Brown moved the nominations be accepted by acclamation. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Carl Adler, Nancy Mayberry, and Jo Ann Jones were nominated for alternates. Ms. Wilder moved nominations close. The motion was seconded and passed. The vote was by secret ballot. Mr. Grossnickle and Mr. Ferrell acted as tellers. Adler and Jones were elected.

The Chairman announced the following appointments to vacancies which have occurred on the various committees: Admissions Committee--George Bissinger to replace M. Lee Bennett, a one year term; Curriculum Committee--Mary Susan Templeton to replace Richard Padgett, a two year term; Library Committee--Douglas McMillan to replace Douglas McReynolds, a two year term; Student Guidance Committee--Jannis B. Shea to replace Margaret Blanchard, a one year term, and Elizabeth Ross for a three year term; Student Scholarship, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee--Herbert Carlton to replace Marjorie Harrison, a two year term; Faculty Governance Committee--F. David Sanders to replace Robert Woodside, a three year term; Course Drop Appeals Committee--Wilbur Castellow, Lala Steelman and Donald Jeffreys were appointed to two year terms.

The Chairman then reported to the Senate that while in Boone he had attended a meeting of Appalachian State University's Faculty Senate. Mr. Woodside first took note of the fact that the ASU Faculty Senate met twelve times a year, including three summer meetings; he also noted that they met at night and on the evening of July 8 at 7:30 had a quorum present. Among the items discussed was a proposal from their Committee on Committees that committee members not accepting their responsibilities should be replaced by the Senate upon recommendation of the Committee on Committees. The ASU Chairman later pointed out that the January 14 Faculty Senate meeting had directed him to talk with representatives of NEA, AFT, AAUP and other relevant organizations concerning a possible visit to the ASU campus to discuss collective bargaining with the faculty; it was suggested that the Chairman and the Vice Chancellor make arrangements for such a meeting. There was discussion of a faculty-administration evaluation and of who should receive copies of this evaluation. Further discussion centered around faculty members who were not meeting professional obligation on campus because of such outside activities as consulting, etc. Mr. Woodside was welcomed early in the meeting and invited to participate in the discussion. The outstanding difference noted in the meeting was that the ASU Faculty Senate was smaller and less formal; their concerns seemed in general to be the same as the Faculty Senate of ECU.

September 24, 1974

The Chairman stated that he wished to reply to the remarks made by Donald Leggett at the General Faculty meeting on September 9, 1974 in effect that the Senate did not see fit to furnish the Alumni Office with information required to allow the two outstanding faculty members to be chosen for the Alumni Award. Mr. Woodside stated that neither he, as Chairman of the Senate, nor the Chairman of the Instructional Survey Committee, had been contacted. The Senate had never indicated that it did not see fit to cooperate with Mr. Leggett and in fact was striving within the limits of its abilities to cooperate. Mr. Woodside suggested that in the future the communication between the Alumni Office and Senate should be improved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. James Joyce presented the report of the Library Committee (see Attachment to the Faculty Senate Agenda for September 24, 1974). Mr. Heckrotte asked how the weights were determined for the allocation of library funds. Mr. Joyce stated that several things were considered, such as the Humanities use the library as a laboratory and therefore were weighted heavier, also, new departments usually needed to build their library resources and were given a higher factor. Mr. P. Adler asked if there were any variations in the allocations this year as compared with last year's. Mr. Joyce said that there were some slight differences. He also stated that any school or department that fails to spend their total allocation can expect that fact to be considered in the next formula for allocation. Questions were asked about the Committee's assessment of the Acquisitions Approval Plan, the allocation formula, and converting from the Dewey system to the Library of Congress system. Mr. Joyce stated that the assessment of the Approval Plan and the allocation formula had not been completed and that no decision had been made as yet to convert to the Library of Congress system.

Ms. Virginia McGrath presented the recommendations of the General College Committee (see Faculty Senate Agenda for September 24, 1974). Mr. Fabisch moved that in item 1 the words "may be" be replaced by the word "is". Mr. Hoots seconded. Mr. P. Adler asked why the statement was needed. Ms. McGrath stated that the committee wanted it to be clear to the faculty that if they were assigned an advisee or to General College then advising is part of their responsibility. Mr. Ferrell moved that "is normally" replace "is" in Mr. Fabisch's motion. Mr. Keusch seconded. Mr. Fabisch and Mr. Hoots accepted the change. The motion passed making the statement read "Academic advising, including advising in the General College, is normally considered part of a faculty member's duties." In regard to item 2, Ms. P. Daugherty moved that the heading on Page 39 of the Faculty Manual be changed to "Academic Advising and Counseling". The motion was seconded and passed. Mr. Ferrell asked if there were any plans to petition for additional funds for those who advise General College. Mr. Howell stated that it had been requested but that there may be no money available. The recommendations of the General College Committee as amended passed.

The Chairman stated that Mr. Wes Hankins was not able to attend to present

a report of the Ad Hoc Traffic Committee. A member of the Committee commented that there had only been one meeting of the entire committee.

Mr. Loren Campion presented the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Screening Committee. (See Addendum to the Faculty Senate Agenda for September 24, 1974). Mr. C. Adler questioned whether guideline 5 reflected the intent of the Board of Trustees. Mr. Martinez moved that guideline 5 be deleted. Ms. Bell seconded. Mr. T. Williams commented that it was important for decisions and recommendations to be forwarded up the chain of command. Ms. Wilder stated that guideline 5 seems to be an interpretation of the Code and in a different way from that apparently intended by the Board of Trustees. The question was called. The motion to delete guideline 5 passed. Mr. Ferrell stated that a guideline was needed for the issue raised in guideline 5. Mr. Rees stated that he hoped the Screening Committee would recognize the differences in departments and that a code suitable for one department would not necessarily be suitable for another. Ms. Koldjeski moved that guideline 7 be amended to read "Unit Codes shall describe in detail the decision-making processes and implementation procedures for governance of the unit affairs as well as the procedures for submission of recommendations to authorities above the unit level." Mr. Ross seconded the motion. The motion passed. It was stated that one of the purposes of the Ad Hoc Screening Committee was to advise the departments if it felt their codes were deficient.

Mr. Hoots moved that guideline 2 be amended to read "The Committee shall ascertain that each unit code was democratically developed." Ms. Hampton seconded. Ms. Wilder pointed out that in some departments the tenured faculty were a minority. The question was called. Mr. Hoots' motion did not pass. Mr. T. Williams moved that the sentence "Such recommendations shall be those democratically arrived at through appropriate departmental code procedures" be added to guideline 7. Mr. Brown seconded. Mr. Caspar made a motion to amend the amendment with the statement "Since unit codes shall reflect the ECU Code's concept that faculties of units ultimately decide unit affairs, recommendations made by unit faculties to unit administrators should be passed on along with that administrator's recommendations to the next higher administrative level." Mr. Hoots withdrew his motion. The question was called. The motion made by Mr. Williams passed. Mr. Brinn noted that the deadline mentioned in the guidelines might be impossible for the School of Medicine to meet due to special problems. Mr. Adler called the question. The guidelines proposed by the Ad Hoc Screening Committee as amended were approved. The guidelines as approved follow:

1. Completed unit codes shall be in the hands of the Ad Hoc Screening Committee by December 1, 1974.
2. When scrutinizing the submitted code drafts, the Committee shall ascertain that each unit code was drawn up by a democratically elected, democratically functioning code committee, and that it was approved by a majority of the unit's tenured faculty.
3. Unit codes should be free of ambiguous passages.
4. Unit codes shall specify that faculty affairs will be conducted according to Roberts' Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

5. Unit codes shall be specific in listing categories of concerns and affairs subject to democratic procedures.

6. Unit codes shall describe in detail the decision-making processes and implementation procedures for governance of the unit affairs, as well as the procedures for submission of recommendations to authorities above the unit level. Such recommendations shall be those democratically arrived at through appropriate departmental code procedures.

Mr. Woodside noted that two questions concerning the ECU Code had been brought to him and he wished the advice of the Senate on them. First, it had been asked that within a unit, could the Code Committee and the Evaluation Committee be one and the same. Mr. Woodside ruled that if it were the will of the unit, it could be; there were no objections from the Senate. Next, it had been asked if a department chairman could serve on a Code or Evaluation Committee within one of the professional schools (that is, serve on the School Code or School Evaluation Committee); Mr. Woodside ruled that such a person could so serve if it were the will of the School. Once again there were no objections from the Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. McDaniel presented the Annual Report of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina. (See Attachment). Mr. Ferrell commented that the Senate might be interested to know that the Board of Governors was considering a revision to Chapter 6 of the University Code to include faculty governance at all sixteen institutions and that he understood they were moving toward unitary faculty salaries.

Mr. Donnalley moved the meeting adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella Daugherty
Secretary

1973-74 Annual Report of the East Carolina University
Delegation to the University of North Carolina
Faculty Assembly

During the academic year 1973-74, the UNC-Faculty Assembly met on four occasions at which the Faculty Assembly Delegates of East Carolina University, Henry Ferrell, William Grossnickle, James McDaniel, and Robert Woodside were in attendance or represented by their alternates. The full minutes of each meeting are available in the ECU-Faculty Senate Office.

All four meetings of the Faculty Assembly for this academic year were held in the UNC-General Administration Building in Chapel Hill.

The first meeting was held on October 5, 1973. President William C. Friday stated the items occupying the time of the administrative staff were tenure, license procedures for non-public institutions offering post-secondary education, the university budget, and affirmative action. He indicated the annual budget had just been completed for action by the Board of Governors at its October meeting. President Friday told the Assembly that no funds had been included for salary equalization and none were contemplated. He said the work done and the responsibility held would determine the salary. Vice-President Dawson reported the recently established structure of the Board of Governors as standing committees of Budget and Finance; Educational Planning, Policies and Programs; Personnel and Tenure; and University Governance. Vice-President Joyner indicated the enrollment in the university was below projections by 0.6%. East Carolina University was specifically mentioned as being the only campus on which the enrollment actually dropped. The specter of the loss of faculty positions due to financial exigency was raised. The ECU placed two resolutions on the floor and both passed the Assembly. The resolutions concerned full faculty representation on local boards of trustees and a recommendation for faculty pay raises to be 10% (not 8% as submitted).

The second meeting of the Faculty Assembly was held on December 7, 1973. A representative from each campus gave a report on how his (or her) campus had met the Board of Governors directive to review statements on academic tenure. The degree of faculty participation in these reviews was characterized, although Dr. King, President Friday's Special Assistant, noted that the resolution from the Board of Governors requires faculty participation but not faculty approval. A nominations committee was elected and James McDaniel of ECU was elected Chairman of the committee. When a discussion of faculty participation in preparing university budgets developed, Dr. King stated that it is assumed that budgetary processes begin at the departmental level with faculty participation and that President Friday would use his good offices to bring this to the attention of the Chancellors. Reports to the Assembly included changes in the University Code to recognize the Faculty Assembly and local faculty governance, and a faculty representative on local Boards of Trustees.

The third meeting of the Faculty Assembly was held February 21 and 22, 1974. President Friday informed the Assembly that faculty salary increases should average 7 1/2%, that he had requested the Chancellors to allow an elected faculty representative to attend meetings of Boards of Trustees and to speak to issues pertinent to the faculty, and that he has encouraged the development of faculty governance units

on all campuses of the University. Vice-Presidents Joyner, Dawson, and Sanders spoke on budget, Chapter Six of the Code and the HEW desegregation order respectively. In answer to questions Sanders stated that: (1) tenure is granted by the Board of Governors; (2) tenure is limited to a single campus; and (3) tenured faculty could be moved among campuses. Procedural problems that had earlier prevented easy and rapid consideration of business were solved by a series of bylaw adjustments. The Assembly then passed resolutions on faculty salaries that would lead to a rationalization of faculty compensation so that future increases in compensation would divide into cost of living adjustments, competency, and merit awards; that a minimum wage scale be established by the General Administration to assure the application of the compensation scales at a valuation of one suggested for the various institutional categories by the American Association of University Professors; that action be taken to separate compensation for administrative and auxiliary service personnel from the instructional budget so that a true student-faculty ratio might be determined; to urge the inclusion of a faculty grievance procedure in the Code of Operations; to support faculty participation in the preparation of University budgets; to define what the phrase "Commitment to the welfare of the institution" in the Board of Governor's tenure statement means to the Faculty Assembly; to invite the head of the State Retirement System to appear before the Assembly; to create an inter-campus publication for information regarding coming events; and to establish a program of research leave and instructional improvement grants to individual faculty.

The fourth meeting of the Faculty Assembly was held on April 26 and 27, 1974. Vice-President John Sanders discussed the problems of meeting HEW requirements and long-range planning. Vice-President Joyner presented an overview of the '74-'75 budget which included a note that appropriations decreased \$17 million due to enrollment declines. A Chapel Hill study shows the college age population in North Carolina decreasing rapidly after 1980 (about 14%). Presidential Assistant, Dr. Arnold King spoke at length of the troubles encountered in Wisconsin public higher education due to rapidly declining enrollments. It was indicated that if North Carolina universities are to escape these problems considerable planning must be begun now. Assembly business included resolutions on the selection of an American Indian to the Board of Governors, a model minimum base salary schedule for academic personnel, and faculty status for librarians. Elections were held for the new Faculty Assembly commencing 7/1/74. Professor Henry Ferrell was elected Chairman. Professor Gerald E. Gray of North Carolina A&T was elected Vice-Chairman. Professor William Grossnickle was elected Secretary. Professor Robert Woodside was elected as Chairman of the Committee on Committees and to the Executive Council.

The ECU delegation would like to express a special note of appreciation to Professor James McDaniel for the very effective way in which he represented East Carolina during the past two years of the formation of the Faculty Assembly and to welcome the newly elected delegate, Professor Thomas A. Williams.

In summary, the ECU delegation has observed the following during the past year of operations of the UNC-Faculty Assembly:

1. The tendency is for the Assembly to be a joint Administrative/Faculty body since some institutions still elect their administrative officers to the Assembly.

2. The absence of faculty governance mechanisms on several campuses result in the selection rather than the election of delegates and a hesitancy to specify the rights and responsibilities of faculty persons on the sixteen campuses.
3. The informal coalition between UNC-CH and the smaller institutions was eroded significantly by the latter part of the year as most institutions began to support proposals for the good of all.
4. There was no significant alteration of the advisory nature of the Faculty Assembly.
5. The future of the Faculty is not secured and seems to depend upon:
 - (A) President Friday's willingness to continue to present significant faculty problems to the Assembly for suggestions.
 - (B) The membership of the Assembly to show increasing seriousness and a willingness to deal with substantive problems.
 - (C) President Friday's willingness to support and act on the recommendations of the Assembly.
6. The ECU delegation and its viewpoints were accepted with increased trust and confidence this year culminating in election of each of the returning ECU delegates to positions of leadership in the next Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Ferrell
William Grossnickle
James McDaniel
Robert Woodside