

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 17, 1976

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 17, 1976 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Gulati, Robbins, Shank, Hoots. The following alternates were present: Bernard Kane for Smith, Joseph Fernandez for Bassman, Tom Sayetta for Coulter. The following ex-officio members were absent: P. Daugherty, Jenkins, Holt, and Monroe.

The minutes of January 20, 1976 were corrected as follows:

1. Page 1, fourth paragraph, line 17 should read: "(which, it was suggested, amounts to an additional fringe benefit) . . ."
2. Page 4, line 7 under "b," Fall of 1976 should be Fall of 1977.
3. Page 6, line 5 under "D," "letters" should be "communications."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

Mr. Benjamin noted the item inserted in parentheses on page 6. This was the result of a letter from Mr. Martinez suggesting a change in wording. There was no objection from the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

A. Mr. Benjamin announced that he had a memo from Tim McLeod, Chairperson of the Campus Wide Symposia Committee. The purpose of this committee is to help fund symposia for the different departments on the ECU campus. The committee has an unappropriated balance of \$8,359.52 at this time. They would like to have interested departments come before the committee and request funds. A copy of this may be secured from the Faculty Senate Office.

Mr. Benjamin asked for volunteers for the Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee. Members for this are needed and names should be submitted to the Senate Office in time for the March meeting of the Senate.

The Chairman reported that he had received a letter from Vice Chancellor Holt reporting that the Board of Trustees had rejected a motion to permit faculty to enroll in more than one course per quarter. The vote was 6 to 3. Mr. Benjamin appointed Jo Ann Bell and Philip Shea to work out a compromise to resubmit the proposal to the Board of Trustees. He suggested that the committee contact Vice Chancellor Holt so as to ensure that all necessary persons have been contacted. The committee was asked to report back to the Senate at its earliest convenience.

Mr. Benjamin said that there were reports from two units on a poll to sample collective bargaining. In Music, the vote had been: yes, 24; no, 5; with 4 undecided. In English, the vote has been: yes, 29; no, 5; with 4 undecided. Both units expressed a preference for the American Federation of Teachers.

Mr. Benjamin announced that the minutes of the Faculty Senate of Appalachian State University had been received. Referring back to the November minutes, he cited a fifteen point resolution, two points of which he considered important: 1. The Faculty Senate strongly recommended that the ASU budget request for 1976-77 call for a 12 percent cost of living adjustment; and, 2. The ASU budget request contains a proposal for the adoption of an incremental pay schedule similar to that approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly. Mr. Benjamin said that he hoped that the Senators would consider developing a resolution.

A letter has been received from Chancellor Jenkins in which he says that he has approved the tenure statement draft of the subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee and he expressed his appreciation for the cooperation of the Faculty Senate and the subcommittee. Chancellor Jenkins has forwarded to President Friday the resolution of the Senate which had been struck from the draft by the Board of Trustees. President Friday has acknowledged the receipt of the resolution which will be presented to the Board of Governors on February 23, 1976. Mr. Benjamin read a letter which he had sent to Chancellor Jenkins in which he asked for a clarification of the Chancellor's position on the question of whether a one or two-track system for recommendations was to be employed in the codes. The Chancellor said that there had been no decision by the Board of Governors and that he had taken no position on the matter.

Mr. Ferrell has provided the Chairman with a glossary of terms and acronyms handed out at Chapel Hill. It will be on file in the Senate Office.

Mr. Ferrell addressed the Senate. He said that the Board of Governors had met last week and would meet again in a week. Information was developing about budgets. The legislature had passed a two-year budget last year which did not cover salaries for the full period. It would meet this spring to discuss salaries. The status of salaries is uncertain. That this is an election year may be advantageous for us. A cutback in the present operating budget in the next few months might save \$35 million to \$50 million; however, the projection for tax revenues was wrong and there is an anticipated \$70 million deficit. Some reversions (cancellations of authorized expenditures) are expected. Salaries might come from a cutback in other areas. The only certainty is pressure for raises. He believed that 5 percent across the board is a possibility. Still, considering the options open to the legislature, it is possible that Chapter Six might be with us sooner than expected. Secondly, he suggested that the faculty get out and vote on March 23 for the bond issue. The passage of this would take the pressure off the State budget. It would release \$36 million in funds. There would be no benefit for ECU but there would be for your own pocketbook.

Mr. Benjamin said that the Faculty Welfare Committee was studying several important issues: 1. collective bargaining poll to be held by the end of the year; 2. a travel budget; 3. salaries; 4. sabbatical leaves; and 5. a legal aid fund. If anyone has any questions they want considered they should get in touch with the Committee. The Committee should report to the Senate at the next meeting.

B. Mr. Benjamin spoke about a memo received from Chancellor Jenkins concerning the Faculty Senate resolution of December 16. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for February 17, 1976). He asked whether the Senate wished to reconsider the issue at this time. Mr. P. Adler said that he had been the one who had introduced the original resolution and would like to speak to the question. Page 133 in the Faculty Manual is the page referred to in the memo. He believed that the memo from the Chancellor is grammatically correct but questioned the interpretation of the words "shall" and "will." He read the passage from the Manual, noting that there were four procedures for the Evaluation of the Faculty. The question is: Which of these four procedures would be dispensable in a rational bureaucracy in which professionals expect to strive for promotion and recognition? It seems that the ranking of principles for evaluation stated on page 133 of the Faculty Manual indicates that the publication of objective criteria must be number one. He asked Mr. Howell to comment. Mr. Howell questioned why he should respond. Mr. P. Adler said that there was no one else present from the administration. He said that the question baffled him. He noted that some department codes did not specify the publication of criteria. Mr. Howell said that he did not think that the letter said that it could not be done. Mr. P. Adler said that units whose codes do not spell it out are exempt. Mr. Howell said that no one has any objection. Mr. P. Adler asked if Mr. Howell would interpret this as strong encouragement and Mr. Howell replied in the affirmative. Ms. Potter agreed with Mr. Howell and asked why a unit should be forced to do this. Mr. Williams said that the reason was clear.

It is irrational to keep criteria a secret. He believed that the memo might lead to a violation of due process. He suggested that Chancellor Jenkins be asked to reconsider and, failing that, the Senate should then go to President Friday. Mr. P. Adler said that, without published criteria, no one would know where he is going; that we have a race with the location of the finish line known only in the department chairman's head. Mr. Martinez asked if this was routinely required by the Screening Committee. Ms. Kares said that it was not included in the Senate guidelines but many codes have the requirement. Mr. Read asked what the procedure was for this to have been passed and placed in the Faculty Manual in the first place. Mr. Ferrell said that a committee wrote the document which was then approved by the Senate and the Board of Trustees. The whole faculty never voted on it. But, Mr. Ferrell said, it is clear that if one person is told of the criteria, then all must be told. Mr. Read said that it seemed that the Faculty Senate was trying to do something that it had no right to do by itself. Ms. Potter said that the problem could be resolved by each unit placing it in their code but that it was still optional with the unit. Mr. Everett said that it was his impression that the Chancellor was playing on words. His suggestion was that the wording in the Manual be changed. Once this was done, he believed that the Chancellor would go along with it. Mr. E. Ryan said that the amendment procedure, found on page 134 for Appendix C, states that the Senate can amend the Appendix; therefore, he cannot see what the Chancellor is objecting to since the Senate can make changes. Mr. Ferrell said that the Adler resolution was an instruction, not an amendment. Mr. Williams said that it was not necessary to amend. He believed that the resolution reinforced what was implicit in what we now have. He asked Mr. Benjamin if he had talked to the Chancellor about this. Mr. Benjamin said that he had not. Mr. Williams moved that the Chairman make an appointment with the Chancellor and explore the question so as to get at the root of the matter. Mr. Martinez seconded. The question was called and the motion passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Ad Hoc Screening Committee. Mr. Champion presented the report of the Ad Hoc Screening Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for February 17, 1976). He said that the progress report had been included in the Agenda by mistake. The report was for the use of the Committee only. This had occurred as a consequence of sending the wrong document to the Senate. He said that the adverbs and adjectives in the report were placed there for the use of the Committee. The term "democratically" meant with Robert's Rules of Order. The report is divided into several categories: 1. no code ever received--the School of Medicine (presently exempted from submitting a code by the Chancellor); 2. units still working with the Screening Committee on drafts of the code but not yet submitted to the Senate; 3. drafts of codes approved by the Senate and sent to the Chancellor; 4. codes which have gone all the way. Most codes are in the second and third category. Six units have completed their work. The Code Committee is now working actively with all units in the second category. Mr. Champion noted that there was an error in the report--that the School of Music Code was reported as having been forwarded to the Senate; however, it is still being considered by the Screening Committee. Mr. Champion presented the School of Nursing and English Codes. Mr. Woodside moved to accept both. Mrs. S. Daugherty seconded. The question was called and passed. Mr. Champion recommended final approval of the Geography and School of Art Codes. Mr. Woodside moved the approval of the final drafts. Mrs. S. Daugherty seconded. Mr. Martinez noted that the use of the word "director" occurred in the School of Art Code. He understood that this was not allowed. The Physical Education Department had been required to use the term "coordinator." Mr. Benjamin said that the School of Art was never told that it could not use the word. Mr. Thiele said that as a member of the Chancellor's Committee he could say that the question was never considered. Mr. Martinez said that Vice Chancellor Holt had objected in no uncertain manner. Mr. Benjamin said

that in all of the Senate's correspondence regarding codes this had never appeared. The question was called and it passed.

B. University Curriculum Committee. Mr. Ed Ryan presented the report of the University Curriculum Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for February 17, 1976). The report was essentially what had been sent on to the Committee by the General College Committee. The blanks indicated where new courses were to be inserted. He filled in the blanks as ENGL 1100, 1200; LIBS 1000; MATH 1065; SCIE 1250, 1260; and MATH 2127, 2129. The University Curriculum Committee recommended that this be considered. It is a straight conversion. Mr. Williams asked when this would be printed because the Foreign Language Department had been having problems with students misunderstanding the meaning of the phrase "foreign language in translation" and would like to clarify it. Mr. Benjamin said that this could be worked out with Mr. Bezanson who is responsible for the catalogue. Mr. Ryan said that it would be printed in 1977. The question was called and passed.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Mr. Benjamin noted that the Roman numeral IX should be XI in the Ryan resolution. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for February 17, 1976). Mr. Williams seconded. Mr. Ryan noted that the Faculty Constitution restricts who can place items on the agenda. Under these circumstances, it is not a good practice to have anonymity. Mr. Woodside said that some proposals would not be brought if the individuals were named. He said that the individuals should not be deprived of the right to privacy. He knew of six resolutions brought before the Senate while he was Chairman which would not have been brought had anonymity not been preserved. In any event, one senator or another could be the responsible party if they wished. Mr. Benjamin asked Mr. Ryan where the restriction was in the Constitution. Mr. Ryan stated he was making an interpretation. He said that according to the Constitution every faculty member was not given the right to place items on the agenda. Mrs. S. Daugherty said that the term "General Faculty" meant any faculty member. Mr. Ryan said that he thought that the Constitution was inconsistent. Mr. Ferrell said that he supported Mr. Woodside. He said that the term "General Faculty" is a term used to designate the source of the power which was delegated to the Senate. Originally it was held that only a senator could put items on the agenda. But there was a problem of transference through a senator. The restriction has been amended and abridged in many ways. One example of the expansion of the Senate lies in the fact that today the Senate deals with a lot of things that are not academic policy. The question was called and it failed.

B. Resolution to the Calendar Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for February 17, 1976). Mr. Woodside seconded. Mr. Everett spoke on the background of the problem of scheduling so many Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays in a given semester. If there is an imbalance in any of these days then lab courses get shortchanged. This would lead to the omission of certain normally planned experiments. The resolution asks the Committee to make a special effort on this problem. Mr. Knight said that he would like to make the same statement for the School of Music. Mr. Woodside said that while it was no problem in the Mathematics Department, he believed that the Science and Music people should be supported on this. Mr. Sayetta noted that any class which met only twice or three times a week would have the same problem. The question was called and passed.

Mr. Benjamin offered an item of new business which was not on the agenda if there were no objections. There being none, Mr. Martinez moved that the Senate co-sponsor the AAUP dinner in April as they have in the past. Mr. Henderson seconded. Mr. Martinez said that there were two potential speakers: Lt. Gov. Hunt and Kathy Sebo of Guilford College. Mr. Benjamin said that Mr. Ragan will accept suggestions for other speakers. The date will be in early April. The question was called and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Conner Atkeson
Secretary