

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

October 22, 1974

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 22, 1974, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Eagan, Wang, D. Collins, Distefano.

The minutes for September 9, 1974 and for September 24, 1974 were approved as written.

### SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

The Chairman pointed out that on the Faculty Senate Academic Committees list, the dates for the last five members listed under the Instructional Survey Committee should be 1976 instead of 1977 since appointments to this committee are for two year terms. He announced the appointment of B. A. Bishop to the Faculty Affairs Committee for a two year term and the appointment of Caroline Ayers to the Instructional Survey Committee for a one year term replacing David Lunney who resigned.

The Chairman stated that Appalachian State University was having a seminar on collective bargaining and had invited ECU's Chairman of the Faculty as a representative. Due to the conflict with the Senate meeting, Anne Briley was asked to represent ECU at the meeting and had consented to do so.

The Chairman then presented the report of the Faculty Assembly. The UNC Faculty Assembly met in Chapel Hill on October 11 and 12, 1974. The meeting opened with comments by President Friday and some of the Vice-Presidents. The floor was opened for questions and a number of questions were addressed to President Friday concerning salaries. In particular, a number of questions were asked concerning "across the board" raises versus "merit" raises, and concerning just what "merit" was on the various campuses. President Friday indicated that each campus was free to distribute its "merit" raises as it saw fit. On Friday night, a resolution concerning raises was passed unanimously. (See attachment). Both Friday night and Saturday a number of other resolutions were passed. (See attachment).

The Chairman asked the Senate members to please postpone any controversial or emotional issues until at least February or Spring Quarter due to the work that would be necessary to get all the departmental codes approved. He stated that the Ad Hoc Screening Committee had met from four o'clock to seven o'clock on Thursday on one code and had turned it down. Ms. J. Shea asked why it was rejected. Mr. Campion stated it did not clearly describe operations but otherwise the Screening Committee had thought it was good. Mr. C. Adler asked what the procedure was if the Screening Committee turned down a department's code. The Chairman answered that it went back to the department for further consideration unless the department appealed to the Faculty Senate.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Champion presented the Faculty Affairs Committee report concerning financial exigency (see attachment to the Faculty Senate Agenda for October 22, 1974). Mr. Howell commented that he felt the statement did not come to grips with the question and that when it became necessary to appoint such a committee it would be too late. Mr. T. Williams stated that one of the problems was that we don't know the form it will take and therefore cannot perceive the precise circumstances that will occur. Mr. Grossnickle agreed with Mr. Howell and asked if anything concerning financial exigency will be written into the Greater University Code and thus will the General Administration write the detail. Mr. C. Adler stated that the original plan submitted last year was a good plan but needed more work. Mr. Brown stated that he was under the impression that we had been told to formulate such a plan by the Greater University and that we needed procedures for guidelines. Mr. Brown moved that the proposal be sent back to committee and that more procedures be formulated for each guideline. Mr. Howell seconded. Mr. Howell stated that one form the financial exigency might take would be for the University to lose more positions than could be taken care of by letting the non-tenured faculty go and that this notification would come in November to be effective the next September. Thus, the proposal as presented could not work since it would be virtually impossible to appoint a committee, formulate the plan and have it approved by all the bodies involved before the administration would be forced to make a decision. Also, the tenured faculty member released would have a very short notice. It was stated that the Faculty Assembly could raise the question about positions available at other constituent institutions. Mr. Moeller stated that he felt the interests of the faculty are better protected if they have shared in the determination of the procedure. Mr. C. Adler asked if this meant that every non-tenured faculty would have to be dismissed regardless of how valuable the person is. Mr. Howell stated that the non-tenured simply do go first. Mr. Hoots moved to call the question. The motion to call the question was seconded and passed. Mr. Brown's motion passed.

## NEW BUSINESS

The first item concerned the definition of Mr. Calder's relationship to students and faculty. The Chairman stated his inquiries had revealed that Vice Chancellor Moore was Mr. Calder's immediate superior and that Mr. Moore had stated that if the Senate would send him some well-defined questions, he would come to a later Senate meeting to answer them. Mr. Ferrell stated that one of the problems had concerned a properly authorized student group which had had publications removed from a desk in Wright and which according to Mr. Calder were politically inflammatory. Since this seemed to concern academic freedom, his job description and his limits were questioned. Also, a point of concern was the off-hand manner

in which faculty are treated by his office. Following are some of the points and questions brought up: Was the removal initiated by a complaint or was it on his own? Does his authority come from Moore or is some assumed by default or is he given authority to handle things as he does? Can the information taken up be distributed now? What are the duties of Vice Chancellor Moore, thus, what can he authorize? Are guns necessary on campus? What are their rules for drawing and firing guns on campus? Who can distribute things on campus? What procedures should be followed? Persons dealing with student groups need to know what can be done. Is Dean Tucker connected to Calder's activities? Mr. Ferrell made the point that the questioning deals with Mr. Calder's position, not his personality. Mr. Caspar stated that there seemed to be a problem in communications and moved that an ad hoc committee be appointed by the Chairman to meet with Vice Chancellor Moore to examine the questions posed and to bring back information. Ms. Koldjeski seconded. The motion passed with 22 for and 21 against. The Chairman asked if there were any instructions. Mr. P. Adler moved the committee be instructed in inquiring about 1) the incident, 2) Calder's job description and interpretation, 3) treatment of faculty, 4) view on what is politically inflammatory and what should be distributed. Mr. Hoots seconded. Mr. Rees moved to amend the motion to include the definition of the scope and authority of Calder and the police force with regards to faculty and students. Mr. Hoots seconded. Mr. Rees' motion to amend passed with one dissent. Mr. Ross moved to amend the motion to instruct the committee to also ask their own questions. Mr. P. Adler seconded. Mr. Martinez stated that he thought the committee should go in as a fact finding group to get information. Mr. Ross' motion passed with two dissents. The main motion as amended passed. Mr. Woodside then appointed Mr. Phillip Adler as chairman of the committee with Carl Adler, Atkeson, Wilder, and Jannis Shea as members; Mr. Ferrell declined to serve on the Committee.

The next item of business was the resolution addressed to the University Library Committee regarding departmental allocations (see attachment to Faculty Senate Agenda for October 22, 1974). Mr. Ross moved the Senate adopt the resolution. Mr. Rees seconded. Ms. Wilder moved the word "staff" in the last sentence be changed to "administration." Mr. Williams seconded. The motion passed. Ms. Wilder moved and Ms. Kares seconded that further explanations and/or complaints should be taken up with the Library Committee. The motion failed. Mr. C. Adler stated that he understood the Library Committee had asked to Committee on Committees if it could distribute the Library Committee minutes to all faculty. The resolution as amended passed.

For the last item of business, Mr. Grossnickle moved that the Faculty Governance Committee review the relationship of the Graduate Faculty to the Graduate Council for information. Mr. Castellow seconded. A handout was distributed concerning the Graduate School organization. It was stated that the Southern Association had specified that the Graduate Faculty had to be separate. It was also pointed out that the Graduate Faculty is a subset of the General Faculty and that there is overlap such as the G-level courses. Mr. C. Adler pointed out that undergraduates in G-level courses can drop the course only the first twenty days while graduate students can drop up to the last two weeks. He also asked if the Faculty Senate had any authority over the Graduate Council. The Chairman stated that the Senate could only review for information. The call for the question was moved, seconded, and passed. The motion passed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella Daugherty, Secretary

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY FACULTY ASSEMBLY

1. Be it resolved that President Friday and the Board of Governors ask the Legislature for the following raises:

For 1975-76	15%	12% across the board 3% merit
For 1976-77	11%	8% across the board 3% merit

2. Be it resolved that the Code with amendments be published by each institution and distributed to each faculty member.

3. Be it resolved that President Friday seek from the Board of Governors a request to the Legislature that the law be changed so as to allow a faculty member elected by the faculty to sit as an ex-officio member of each of the respective Board of Trustees.

4. Be it resolved that the President press for significant continual participation by faculty in long range planning activities on the constituent campuses.

5. Be it resolved that the Board of Governors not approve the additional program of State aid to private institutions, proposed by the North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.