

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

May 13, 1975

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, May 13, 1975, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Moeller, Eagan, Brinn, Distefano, Knight. The following alternates were present: Frances Daniels for Hoots, Ruth Broadhurst for Koldjeski, Terri Malmgren for Bell, Ronald Henderson for Bruton, Tom Johnson for Grimsley, and Tora Larsen for W. Collins.

The minutes of April 22, 1975 were approved with the following changes: On page 2, line 14 from the top change the wording after "and" to "that ECU was supposed to be a pedestrian campus." On page 4 the ninth line under the Geology Code change Ms. Lowry's statement to "Ms. Lowry stated that a year ago they had been led to believe that if the Faculty Senate approved, the administration would not oppose it but this year they had indicated a change of mind."

### SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

The Chairman reported the results of the Semester-Quarter Referendum. The vote was 344 for the semester system, 310 for the quarter system, and 40 unmarked. Therefore, 52% of those voting were for the semester system. Of the total faculty, 49% were for the semester system, 46% for the quarter system, and 5% didn't care. Mr. C. Adler stated that contrary to popular opinion he was not the author of the Byrd memorandum. Mr. Woodside noted that no motions were offered.

The Chairman read the following letter from Carl Adler:

"I am writing this letter to you in the hope that you will read it to the Senate under the Special Order of the Day. It has come to my attention that the Agenda Committee has voted to postpone my motion to rescind the senate action entitled, A Resolution to Chancellor Jenkins, taken at the last meeting. This, of course, effectively kills the action which I wanted to be taken. The restriction on the Agenda Committee that it can only postpone an item of business for one meeting was added so that it could not act as a censor in keeping business from the Senate. In my opinion, the Agenda Committee has in fact violated the spirit, if not the letter of this restriction in its action on the item of business that I suggested.

I think that this is especially deplorable since many people believe that there was a miscount of the votes on the resolution in question. The net result is that the Agenda Committee possibly has allowed a minority to control the action of the Senate."

Mr. C. Adler stated that he wanted a ruling, that as the May meeting was the last meeting of the year there was no way to postpone an item of business for one meeting. It was stated that the Agenda Committee voted 3 to 1 to postpone for one meeting. The Chairman ruled that the Senate is a continuing body and the next regular meeting is in Fall Quarter.

The By-law concerning the seating of alternates brought up for information at the April meeting (see Faculty Senate Agenda for April 22, 1975) was presented for a vote. The By-law was approved.

Mr. Grossnickle presented the report of the Faculty Assembly (see attachment). Mr. Ferrell commented that members of the Faculty Assembly had met a second time with the Personnel and Tenure Committee of the Board of Governors and they seemed to be aware of the problem of lumping financial exigency and program change together. Mr. Ferrell stated that the present draft of Chapter 6 was changed considerably from the original draft in January.

Mr. Ferrell stated that he had received a call in which he had been informed that

faculty in the Piedmont area were making plans to go to Raleigh Thursday or Friday of this week to petition their representatives concerning raises and capital improvements and asking if ECU would like to send a delegation to join them. In March, Appalachian State University sent a delegation to meet with legislators--their effort met with repercussions. Vice President Dawson commented to the Faculty Assembly that he had never seen the General Assembly act like it has this year. Mr. Ferrell felt it might be to the benefit of the faculty for others to go. Mr. P. Adler moved that the proposed delegation be sent with the backing of the Faculty Senate and speak as individuals. Mr. Woodside said that the Faculty Senate would like to see some money set aside for raises as something is better than nothing. No one volunteered to head the delegation or to go to Raleigh. It was decided that each Senator would contact others in their department to see if they might be able to go.

Mr. Woodside announced that the amendment to Chapter 5 of the UNC Code concerning each campus having a Faculty Senate had been approved by the Board of Governors.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Yarbrough stated that he thought the report of the Semester-Quarter Referendum should have been under Unfinished Business instead of being given under Special Order of the Day. Mr. Yarbrough moved to suspend the rules. Ms. Bond seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed with a 2/3 majority. Mr. Yarbrough moved that the Calendar Committee be instructed to commence preparing a semester calendar for the 1976-77 school year with no Saturday classes and with the first semester ending before Christmas. Mr. P. Adler seconded. Mr. Grossnickle pointed out that this would give the faculty only six months to make the change. Also, this definitely should be done so that the catalog could be made to show the change. Ms. P. Daugherty, vice chairman, took the chair to allow Mr. Woodside to enter the debate. Mr. Yarbrough changed the date in his motion to 1977-78. The change was not agreed to by Mr. P. Adler. Mr. T. Williams seconded the revised motion. Mr. C. Adler asked who will re-do the General Education requirements. Mr. Yarbrough replied that it is the jurisdiction of the Calendar Committee to deal with these problems. Mr. Woodside pointed out that it had taken Appalachian State and Western Carolina 2½ years to make the change. Also he pointed out that many departments were still trying to get their codes finished and this would be an added burden. Mr. Grossnickle commented that important factors were being overlooked, such as the issue of hours in general education, hard to change general education requirements, what will be done with the three quarter hour courses, changing them to three semester hour courses will not work, are practice teaching and field placement to comprise 1/8 of the total work. He pointed out that the internal fights must be done and then everything must go through all the appropriate committees. Mr. Ross commented that when a deadline is set, ways can be found to get it done, but if too far in the distance there is a tendency to put it off. Mr. Grossnickle moved to amend the motion to 1978-79 and give 2½ years. Ms. Hampton seconded. Mr. Woodside argued for consideration of the time needed to set up the codes and stated that the committees need to be set up from the codes during the coming year. Mr. Ferrell moved to amend that in the event it is necessary to postpone the date to 1978-79, the Calendar Committee will so request in September 1976. The motion was seconded. Mr. Ferrell said the general education changes would come in the General College Committee. Mr. C. Adler called the question. Mr. Ferrell's amendment passed. Mr. C. Adler stated that the motion was defective that it was not the Calendar Committee's jurisdiction. Mr. Caspar commented that there might need to be additional committees. Mr. Yarbrough's motion as amended passed.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Woodside resumed the chair.

A. Curriculum Committee. Mr. Grossnickle presented the proposed change in the Parks, Recreation and Conservation Major and Minor (see University Curriculum

Committee Minutes for May 1, 1975). The changes were approved. He then presented the revised Bachelor of Music Degree with a major in Voice Performance and the new Bachelor of Music Degree with a major in Voice Pedagogy. The Bachelor of Music Degrees were approved. Also the revised Sociology Major was approved. (See University Curriculum Committee Minutes for May 8, 1975).

B. Committee on Committees. Mr. P. Adler presented the report. (See attachment to Faculty Senate Agenda for May 13, 1975). Item 1 concerning the change in the charge of the Teacher Education Committee had been initiated due to several schools and departments feeling that their input was not asked for or ignored with respect to requirements for courses for budding teachers. The change was approved.

Item 2 was the charge of the Computer Committee which was revised in reply to Chancellor Jenkins' letter. The revised charge was approved.

Item 3, the recommendation that the Student Guidance Committee be dropped, was approved.

Item 4, the recommendation concerning the Instructional Survey Committee, was approved.

C. Library Committee. Mr. James Joyce, Chairman, presented the report of the Library Committee. He distributed the Annual Report of the Library Committee and discussed it and the Report on the Departmental Allocation Formula (see your Senator or go by the Faculty Senate Office if you wish to see a copy). He explained that the allocation formula is not the final answer but that it was something to work from. He explained that the three factors used in the formula were student credit hours, course offerings and foreign publishers. The formula accounted for 90% of the money available. The final 10% was used last year to make up losses in 1973-74. The final 10% is now awarded on the basis of letters from departments documenting their needs.

D. Admissions Committee. Mr. William Durham presented the Admissions Committee report. He passed out the committee's annual report. (See your Senator or go by Faculty Senate Office). Mr. C. Adler commented that he felt the forgiveness policy should be brought to the Senate for interpretation. It was commented that rumor said students with less than 600 SAT were being admitted as regular students. Mr. Ferrell commented that he heard Chancellor Jenkins state on the news that there would be 3000 new students next year. In light of the tight budget, Mr. Ferrell wondered who would teach them. Mr. Ferrell moved that the Admissions Committee look into this and particularly into the low SAT requirement. The motion, seconded by Mr. Rees, passed.

E. Ad Hoc Screening Committee for Unit Codes. Mr. Campion commented that the Screening Committee is leaving it to the units to send their codes to the senators. He reported on the meeting with the Chancellor of the special committee to meet with Chancellor Jenkins. (See attachment). Mr. C. Adler commented that apparently tenure and promotion recommendations could be passed on to the Chancellor as well as to the next higher administrative officer. Mr. Woodside asked if the matter was cleared up so that the codes could be sent on to the Chancellor. Mr. C. Adler moved that the codes passed by the Senate be forwarded to the Chancellor. The motion was seconded by Mr. Keusch and passed.

History Code. Mr. Martinez commented that it was not explicitly stated that the Chairman forwarded his own recommendations. The History Code was approved.

School of Art Code. Mr. Martinez commented that it was excellent as it included student representatives. The Code of the School of Art was approved.

School of Technology Code. Mr. Ferrell moved that the Code of the School of Technology be approved. Ms. S. Daugherty seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Campion stated that the revised code of the Counseling Center still had to be considered by the Ad Hoc Screening Committee. Also, eight codes have not come before the committee for the first time.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Lloyd Benjamin presented the problem of voting concurrently on the evaluation report and the effectiveness of the administrative head. It was pointed out that several units had not voted concurrently possibly due to the evaluation reports not being ready and the feeling that the vote on the administrative head was to be held no later than April 23, 1975. It was also pointed out that the evaluation could effect the vote on the administrative head. Mr. C. Adler moved that the Senate go on record that all future votes be done at the same time. Mr. Castellow seconded. Mr. Ferrell stated that there was an appeals procedure and units could appeal to the Faculty Governance Committee. Mr. Adler's motion failed. Mr. P. Adler moved to instruct the Faculty Governance Committee to examine instances in which there is an apparent violation of the ECU Code with respect to the concurrent vote and take remedial action as they see fit. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez. Mr. Reep stated that if the Senate could not make a ruling, where can you get it. The consensus of the Senate was that there should be another vote. Mr. Adler withdrew his motion. Mr. P. Adler moved that those units which have taken a vote prior to the presentation of the evaluation report be instructed to re-vote upon the completion of the unit evaluation. Mr. Rees seconded. It appeared to be the will of the Senate that when the evaluation report is voted on the unit head shall be voted on "concurrently." The motion passed.

Mr. Ferrell presented the resolutions approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly. (See attachments to the Faculty Senate Agenda for May 13, 1975). It was moved and seconded that they be endorsed by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to Chancellor Jenkins and to President Friday. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Woodside thanked the Senate for the cooperation he has received for the past three years.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella Daugherty

\*\*\*\*\*

REPORT OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina held their Thirteenth Meeting in Chapel Hill, North Carolina on April 25-26, 1975.

Professor Henry C. Ferrell, Jr. was reelected chairman of the Assembly, and Professor Robert Woodside was elected chairman of the Governance Committee.

Chairman Ferrell attended the Board of Governors' meetings on February 28, March 14, and April 11, 1975. Faculty members might wish to see the handout of the remarks of Mr. William B. Rankin, dated February 28, 1975. This handout is available for reading in the Faculty Senate Office.

The Assembly's ad hoc committee on Chapter Six presented the Assembly's twenty-nine paragraphs to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure. Ferrell felt the delegates were well-received. Much of the debate was between the Faculty Assembly delegates and the General Administration representatives and not between the Assembly delegates and the members of the Board of Governors.

In the meeting of April 11, enrollment projections for the next five years were discussed. A larger fifty-page report was also discussed, and copies have been sent to each delegation. A copy is available for reading in the Faculty Senate Office. Chapter Six was also presented, although the final draft was not complete. The final draft will be presented formally in May and acted upon in June. Ferrell noted that the Board reflected the tensions shown in the General Assembly, that the Faculty Assembly comments seemed well-received, and the members of the Board of Governors seemed interested in meeting members of the faculty.

President Friday understands that the Duke faculty is to receive an eight percent salary increase; Wake Forest, better than a six percent increase. He is trying to find out what the Davidson plans are. He feels we must acknowledge that we will do our fair share in terms of total reduction in expenditures; not, however, thirty-eight percent of the reduction when we receive only thirteen percent of the appropriations.

Professor Nerboso, Western Carolina University, introduced the Resolution Re Chapter Six of the Code of the University. Ferrell asked for priority considerations. The resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Assembly has examined the April 22 draft of the Code and considers it an improvement over previous drafts; and that the Chairman of the Assembly should represent the views of the Assembly before the Board of Governors regarding other changes which have been previously suggested by the Assembly.

Nerboso suggested the importance of the separation of financial exigency from program curtailment. Grossnickle emphasized the importance of funds for retraining personnel who have been affected by program curtailment, and Nerboso agreed. Professor Taylor of UNC-CH pointed out that institutions can put in their own codes what is not prohibited in the final form of Chapter Six.

The following two resolutions were included on the Faculty Senate's April 13, 1975, agenda: Resolution on Proposals of the Senate Sub-Committee on Higher Education to Raise Tuition in and Reduce Funding for the University During 1975-77 and Resolution on the Freedom of Faculty Representatives.

Other resolutions passed read as follows:

Resolution for an Addition to Chapter Five of the Code of the University of North Carolina for the Selection of Chancellors

BE IT RESOLVED: That in the event of a vacancy in the Chancellorship, the Board of Trustees shall establish a search committee composed of two or more faculty members elected by procedures previously devised and approved by the general faculty and representatives of the Board of Trustees, the student body, and the alumni.

Resolution on the All University Faculty Welfare Committee

WE THEREFORE RECOMMEND: That President Friday designate one position on the All University Faculty Welfare Committee to be filled by one member of the Faculty Welfare Committee of the Faculty Assembly, and that the Chairman of the Faculty Assembly each year select the member to receive this appointment.

Resolution Concerning the Establishment of a Legal Defense Fund

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Welfare Committee of the University of North Carolina Faculty Assembly study means whereby a university-wide legal defense aid fund may be established and explore steps necessary for the establishment of such a fund.

Resolution on Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions' Objectives and Aims

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Assembly expresses its concern to President Friday over the following:

1. The conflicts between the specific academic aims and objectives of two- and four-year institutions in North Carolina;
2. The overlapping relationships developing between two- and four-year institutions, especially as they relate to the uniqueness and quality of programs, duplication, and coordination (transferability of credits, differentials in tuition rates, etc.);
3. The implications of limited educational and financial resources on the development, growth and relationships between these institutions;
4. The overall ability of existing institutional arrangements to coordinate and plan the delivery of educational opportunities beyond the Secondary level in North Carolina.

Resolution on Merit Salary Increases

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That any chairman, head, dean, or other administrative officer who recommends merit salary increases should make explicit and known the criteria under which he decided such recommendations; and
2. That every faculty member should have the right, upon application, to receive a straightforward and reasonable explanation of the reasons for the merit increase recommended for him, or for his omission from the merit increase list; and
3. That the President is respectfully requested to recognize these principles as administrative policy in all component institutions of the University.

\*\*\*\*\*

REPORT BY MR. CAMPION ON THE MEETING ARRANGED WITH  
MR. LEO JENKINS BY THE SENATE'S AD HOC COMMITTEE  
ON FUTURE ROUTING OF UNIT CODES

The Chancellor talked to us at 10:00 this morning about guidelines for routing the unit codes between his office and the units concerned. Before going into that topic, however, Chancellor Jenkins volunteered some very helpful and generous general remarks about the possibilities contained in the unit code concept, and which remarks deserve to be passed on to the faculty.

For example, the Chancellor touched upon the matter of faculty participation in unit internal affairs. He said he would consider sanctioning anything that was "legal" in the U.N.C. system. Conceivably, this attitude of the Chancellor's offers some hope to those units wishing to elect their unit heads periodically, inasmuch as U.N.C.-Chapel Hill has been doing this for years.

Dr. Jenkins also indicated that he has understanding for the feelings of units which believe that their codes need to contain some kind of unconventional provisions. Units fearing that the Chancellor's screening committee did not understand what they were seeking might therefore address themselves directly to the Chancellor himself, and he would give them friendly consideration. He reminded us that his screening committee is only advisory, just like the Senate's. This is not to imply, however,

that the Chancellor gave us any impression of discounting his screening committee. He would hardly have appointed it if he did not intend to take it seriously. We assume, on the other hand, that he does wish to have input from as many quarters as possible. At the same time, the Chancellor emphasized once more that he would always be bound by what was "legal" for him to permit.

Dr. Jenkins also said that when units start functioning on the basis of their codes faculty committees need not stop at forwarding recommendations to the administrative official next above unit level. Rather, he said, recommendations could be sent also directly to him simultaneously. Presumably the effect of this would be to give him an opportunity to send recommendations "down" the administrative line.

In these general connections, the Chancellor said that he wanted it made known that he maintains what he called an "Open Door Policy" toward faculty individuals, committees, and groups. Thus his screening committee's views did not necessarily have to be the final word.

The Chancellor's conversation also turned to the matter of referendums on the continuance in office of unit heads. He said that the E.C.U. Code would be rigidly enforced in this regard. If a chairman fails to get one needed vote, then he is out; but if he "wins" by one vote, then he stays in. However, Dr. Jenkins also said that the administration would be watchful of unit heads against whom a "substantial minority" had voted. By way of illustration, he used the figure of 10 "no" votes against continuance. Presumably, of course, the actual number of "no" votes would depend upon the size of the unit. Anyway, the gist of these particular observations by the Chancellor was that the administration will expect a unit head unacceptable to a substantial minority of his constituents to make himself more popular within a reasonable space of time.

The Chancellor also indicated that, besides his willingness to give the faculty the widest possible share in making E.C.U. run, there is another side of the coin. He urged all of us to take stock of the good things we have at E.C.U., and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing--including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other campuses in the U.N.C. system--where there are hardly even semblances of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

In fact, although for obvious reasons of tact he did not want to be too crass about bringing it up, Dr. Jenkins gave the impression of feeling that, if he is as benevolently accommodating as he is in enlarging the scope of faculty participation in E.C.U. affairs, then the E.C.U. faculty might perhaps rally to him and his causes somewhat more forcefully. Specifically, he could use more vehement support in defending the chancellor's integrity against encroachments upon it from outside. We are all aware, of course, that for some time Dr. Jenkins has had to fight attempts to muzzle him.

For that matter, he believes--if we understood him correctly--that the E.C.U. faculty might fight harder for its own rights in some areas. He expressed surprise that we have not been more interested in examining the possible advantages of unionization. Dr. Jenkins also believes that we should fight harder at Chapel Hill for salary equalization, and wonders why we have not done it.

Next the Chancellor took up the matter of routing the unit codes. On that he said that he had already commenced a procedure that accorded with what seemed to be Senate preferences. From now on he will merely send objections or reservations about a code back to its unit, and give the unit the opportunity to attempt to accommodate itself to them by the most comfortable means. Here, of course, we are reminded of the Chancellor's earlier indication that a great deal is negotiable as long as it is "legal" in the U.N.C. system.

All in all, our ad hoc committee came away from Chancellor Jenkins most gratified by his friendly cooperativeness. Thank you.

The Chancellor also indicated that he would be willing to give the faculty the widest possible latitude in the selection of the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

In fact, although for obvious reasons of fact he did not want to be too close about bringing it up, he indicated the possibility of looking at the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

The Chancellor also indicated that he would be willing to give the faculty the widest possible latitude in the selection of the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

The Chancellor also indicated that he would be willing to give the faculty the widest possible latitude in the selection of the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

In fact, although for obvious reasons of fact he did not want to be too close about bringing it up, he indicated the possibility of looking at the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

For that matter, he indicated that he would be willing to give the faculty the widest possible latitude in the selection of the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.

For that matter, he indicated that he would be willing to give the faculty the widest possible latitude in the selection of the U.S.U. and of the good things we are even now in the process of developing including faculty participation in some aspects of governance. He indicated a belief that better perspective on such things might be gained by looking at some of the other systems in the U.S. and system where there are faculty representation of faculty organs of participation in governance matters.