

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 23, 1976

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 23, 1976, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Benjamin, Jones, Henderson, Brown. Alternates present were: Bernard Kane for Davis, Tom Johnson for Grimsley, William Grossnickle for Lao. Ex-officio members absent were: Jenkins, Holt, Monroe.

The minutes of February 17 were corrected as follows: P. Daugherty was present. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Mrs. Stella Daugherty, Vice Chairman, acted as chairman. Mr. Benjamin was absent delivering a paper.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

A. For the election of two delegates to the University of North Carolina Faculty Assembly, the Vice Chairman asked for nominations from the list of eligible candidates attached to the agenda. The following were nominated for delegates: Henry Ferrell, Lloyd Benjamin, Robert Woodside, Grover Everett, Anne Briley, Brame Resnik, Fred Ragan, Ennis Chestang, and Jean Lowry. Mr. Williams moved nominations be closed. Mr. Johnson seconded. Henry Ferrell was elected on the first ballot. On the fourth ballot, Lloyd Benjamin was elected as the second delegate. Mr. C. Adler and Dean Capwell acted as tellers.

The floor was opened for nominations for one alternate to the U. N. C. Faculty Assembly. The following were nominated: Robert Woodside, Phil Adler, Brame Resnik, Alfred S. Wang, Charles Price, and Jean Lowry. It was moved that nominations be closed. Mr. Johnson seconded. There was no majority on the first ballot. On the second ballot, Robert Woodside was elected as an alternate. Mr. C. Adler and Dean Capwell acted as tellers.

B. The AAUP and Faculty Senate Banquet will be Friday, April 9, at the Riverside Restaurant at 6:30. The speaker will be Kathy Sebo, a political scientist at Guilford College.

The Annual Reports of the committees are due May 10.

Committee preference sheets are due in the Senate Office by April 16.

April is election month for Faculty Senators. The method of election is on pages 4-5 of the Faculty Constitution.

There was no objection from the Senate for referring to the Faculty Governance Committee the charge of drafting an amendment to Section IX of the Senate Constitution, which indicates the number of meetings to be held each quarter by the Senate. The section will have to be revised for the semester system.

The Vice Chairman read to the Senate a letter from President Friday. The Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure had met and considered the E. C. U. Senate Resolution of December 18, 1975. It did not concur in the allegation that the proposed regulations or Chapter Six in any way negated the contractual obligation of E. C. U. to any faculty member at E. C. U. The Committee unanimously agreed that all faculty contracts have been subject to termination on the basis of financial exigency or the major curtailment or elimination of a program as now described in Section 605 of The Code.

There will be a meeting of the Board of Trustees in Mendenhall 244 on April 6 at 2:00 p.m.

The traditional procedure for transmitting codes to the Chancellor has been to send them through the Senate Office. Send seven copies of the final draft to the Senate

2

Office and indicate that these copies are intended for the Chancellor. The Senate Office will keep a copy of the approved code on file. All units which have not submitted a final copy of their code to the Senate Office are urged to do so. Please date the codes.

Mr. Benjamin met with Chancellor Jenkins as requested by the Senate to discuss the memorandum issued by the Chancellor stating that promotion criteria need not be published or made public as the Senate requested. The Chancellor said that he would respond in writing shortly.

The Vice Chairman said that Mr. Benjamin wished to thank those persons who volunteered for the Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee.

Mr. Benjamin has received a copy of a resolution sent to Troy Pate by Ricky Price, SGA Legislature Speaker. It is entitled "Alternate to the Foreign Language Requirement." This resolution requests that the appropriate committee consider an alternate of some worthwhile requirement to foreign language (computer science, math, etc.). A copy of this resolution is in the Senate Office.

C. The Vice Chairman asked for nominations to the Nominating Committee, noting that those nominated must be Senators. The following were nominated: Stella Daugherty, Grover Everett, Thomas Williams, Ray Martinez, and Tinsley Yarbrough. Mr. Keusch moved that the nominations be closed. Mrs. Saieed seconded. It was moved and seconded that the slate be accepted by acclamation. The motion passed. Mrs. S. Daugherty appointed Mr. Martinez as chairman of the committee.

D. Mr. Woodside presented the report of the U. N. C. Faculty Assembly. (See attachment).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Credits Committee. Mr. John East presented the report of the Credits Committee. (See attachment to the Faculty Senate Agenda for March 23, 1976). The committee had two items. First was proposed new procedure for the medical drop. The form which the Credits Committee developed, because some faculty wanted to be involved in the medical drop process, had been devised with the advice and approval of the Counseling Center and the Infirmary. The Counseling Center and the Infirmary would state their opinion regarding a drop and then the instructor could respond. Mr. Lewis asked if the medical drop form would always be from the Counseling Center or Infirmary to the instructor. Mr. East said that this was a good point. The Counseling Center or the Infirmary would normally initiate the form if they felt that the situation warranted a drop. Mr. Ferrell wanted to know what the legal implications of putting his name to the paper might be. The faculty might become involved in legal problems as a result of making judgments which it could not professionally defend. Mr. East said that a potential legal problem existed in everything, but he believed the problem insignificant. The ultimate decision would rest with the Provost or some appropriate authority and the decision would not lie with the faculty. If a conflict existed, a further evaluation would have to be made. The form does not suggest that the faculty has the ultimate decision power but merely represents what the faculty member feels. Mr. Williams said that the form is so vague as to be meaningless and thus would be dangerous or meaningless to sign. He believed that a notification might be made to the faculty concerned giving them the option of input to the Provost. There should be a way to look into this but not by the use of this exact form. Mr. Keusch moved that a third alternative should be available: "I am unable to comment definitively on this matter." Mr. Collins seconded. Ms. Potter said that she had the signatures of every member of the Accounting Department opposing this form. She said that they

could not make an assessment of a student's mental or physical health. Mr. E. Ryan said that ninety percent of the faculty of the Philosophy Department felt this way. He questioned whether the faculty had the right to inquire into the health of a student. Mr. East said that it was a good idea from this standpoint: that one or two percent of the medical drops are a problem. This form offers an individual professor an opportunity to know that a student proposes a medical drop. Nine out of ten professors will yield to the judgment of the Infirmary or Counseling Center. Where the professor feels that all is not well he can check nothing or comment. This gives the faculty a slight tool to control the medical drop problem. Mr. Johnson asked about the destination of the form. Would they go back to the Infirmary, the Counseling Center, or be sent to the Registrar's Office? Mr. Williams called a point of order. The discussion had strayed to the main motion. He called the question. Mr. Johnson apologized for being out of order but repeated the question about the ultimate destination. Mrs. I. Ryan said that it would go to the Assistant Provost and stay there. The Assistant Provost would make the decision in the event of controversy. The form can also be used by the faculty to initiate a drop for the student who could then go to the Provost. Mrs. S. Daugherty said that the form seemed to indicate otherwise, that it would have to start with the Infirmary or the Counseling Center. Mr. East said that the forms would end up in the Provost Office, Dean of Nursing, Allied Health, or Continuing Education. Mr. Johnson said that he believed that it was inappropriate for the forms to end in these locations. Ms. Koldjeski opposed the form. She said that the entire problem of the transmission of medical information is only now being studied among the professions. This form may be illegal. A legal release form must be signed by the person, not the physician. Secondly, she questioned the overriding of medical or counseling opinion by the faculty. Could the administration override the Infirmary or Counseling Center? Mr. East said no. Ultimately, the Provost would rely on medical opinion. This form is just to inform the faculty. Mr. Grossnickle called the question. Ms. Potter asked what the voting would be on. Mrs. S. Daugherty said that a division would be made in first item and second item and a separate vote would be made. Mr. Everett said that the problem had been here a long time. The administration would side with the Infirmary and so the procedure would be useless. It would be better if the Infirmary or Counseling Center would call up the professor and not have this in writing. Mr. East said that this was too time consuming. The Infirmary and Counseling Center would rather have the form than take the time to call each professor. Only one percent of student's dropping would be questionable, anyway. Mr. E. Ryan said that the form seems to imply that the faculty has the right to find out the health status of the student. Mr. East said that the form does not grant that right. It simply informs the faculty before the fact and gives the option of being involved. The question was called to accept the forms as amended. The vote was nay-27, aye-11. The motion failed. Mr. East said that he presumed that the Senate was saying that there was no problem. Mr. Williams said the Senate agreed only that this was no solution. Mr. East asked if there were other instructions to his committee. Mr. P. Adler suggested that a form from the Infirmary or Counseling Center saying simply that a student had requested a medical drop and offering the faculty a chance to comment would be sufficient. Mr. East said that the committee had tried to do this with this form. This group does not want to be a part of this and he believed that further effort by his committee would be wasted. Mr. Kane said that the professor could simply indicate awareness that the process had been initiated. Mr. Johnson believed that an appropriate form could be drafted and that the faculty might wish to participate. The proposed form could be read by the University Attorney. Ms. Potter said that Mr. East was right, the problem was too small to bother with. Mr. Reep said that it was a tempest in a teapot. He saw no particular problem. He would only be offering his teaching part to the information being gathered. This information would be used to help the medical people make a decision. The form could be phrased in a different way. Mr. Everett complimented the committee and said that he believed it had done a good job. He believed that another item might be placed upon the form saying that the faculty would like to consult with the Infirmary or Counseling Center in conference.

The second item concerns the recommendation on page five of the agenda which calls

for the elimination of the twenty-five percent limitation on the number of credits which may be earned by special examination. It is believed that 25% is an undue limitation. It is not a problem at present but may become one in the future. Mr. Richards moved to amend it to read "25% of the total hours to graduate." Mrs. S. Daugherty said that the complete sentence would be removed and that there was no problem. Ms. Potter said that the Accounting Department disagreed with this item. How could one recommend students when there had been no contact with them? Mr. Garrison spoke in favor of the motion. It would have to be an industrious student to get that many hours by exams. He said that he had gone to an unaccredited school and had transferred to ECU and got credit by examination. Ms. Potter asked Mr. Garrison if a student should get a diploma if the entire 190 hours had been passed by special exam. Mr. Garrison said yes. Mr. Howell said that this could involve exams given at other schools. Mrs. S. Daugherty said that exams given off campus at the college level such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) are accepted now. Mr. Williams spoke against the recommendation. He said that there was a place for credit for examination. He said that Garrison's experience was unusual. While Mr. Garrison had done classroom work at another school and had gotten credit by exam here, the procedure was open to considerable abuse. It is necessary to keep control on credit by examinations. There is a big difference between work in class and credit by examination. Mr. Williams does not believe that the knowledge would be equal. There is too much opportunity for off campus professors to award improper credit. Mrs. Koldjeski asked whether a school or department could set aside a class and say that it was not open to challenge. Mr. Howell said no, that any course was now open to challenge under the twenty-five percent rule. Mr. Castellow opposed the recommendation. He said that many of his colleagues agreed with him that the exam was of little value as it was usually only two hours in duration and consisted mostly of multiple choice. Mr. Garrison asked for more information as to how the examination program worked. The individual asks the Registrar for exam on any course with the possible exception of a lab course, gets permission from the department or school involved, pays the money and goes to the professor and takes the exam. A two-week advance notice is required and the individual is limited by the twenty-five percent statement. Mr. Garrison asked if CLEP offered this much credit. Mr. Howell said that CLEP offered up to fifty hours if you picked the right courses. Mr. P. Adler inquired as to the origin of the issue. Mr. East said that there were some exceptional cases in which hardships were worked by the 25 percent limit. There has been an effort to get people into college who have greater experience in life and who could possibly pass these tests. There is no expectation of there being any great mass of these people applying or of even being able to pass all of the special examinations. There is no intent to grant permissiveness. The idea is to permit ECU to deal with unique cases. Mr. Ferrell said that this appeared to be a classic example of the tail wagging the dog. There is an appeals procedure to deal with these situations. Exceptions could be made but there is no need to abandon the regulations for 11,000 students to meet the needs of three. The Credits Committee operated on the assumption that the exams would be of real substance. Mr. Bassman said that he believed that participation was important, particularly in a seminar class. The question was called, seconded by Mr. Keusch. The motion to approve the removal of the 25 percent limitation failed.

B. Faculty Welfare Committee. The report of the Faculty Welfare Committee was presented by Mrs. S. Daugherty in the absence of Mr. Brown who was unable to be present. The results of the straw vote of the faculty concerning collective bargaining were presented. Approximately 700 survey forms were sent out and 375 or approximately 54% were returned. Of the 375 the results were: Yes-245 or 65%; no-130 or 35%. Of the 245 yes votes the results were: North Carolina Association of Educators-37 or 15%; American Association of University Professors-90 or 36%; American Federation of Teachers-103 or 42%; undecided or other-15 or 7%.

C. Committee on Committees. Mr. C. Adler presented the report. He had two items. The first was on page five of the Faculty Senate Agenda for March 23, 1976. He presented this as a motion. Ms. Hodgin asked if there was a clear definition of what constituted a closed meeting. Mr. C. Adler said yes, that personnel and financial

matters were the areas which could be closed by executive session and these are covered by state statutes and university regulations. Mr. Reep said that a legal representative briefed the committee on these points. Mr. C. Adler said that when there are any questions the university legal advisor should be consulted. Ms. Hodgins said that she was concerned about the chairpersons of the committees knowing this. Mr. P. Adler asked about the Administrative Procedures Act. Mr. C. Adler said that this did not affect the universities. There could be cases where things are not clear but certainly the majority of meetings will be open. Mr. Everett asked about the problem of the Senate calendar for committee meetings. Would it be possible to set one up? Mr. C. Adler said that a committee chairperson could call the Senate Office and the record of the meeting would be there. Mr. Everett said that if you do not know what is being discussed you don't know if you want to go to the meeting. Mr. Ferrell said that one of the intentions is to let faculty with particular concerns find out when committees meet. Mr. C. Adler said that complaints had occurred about closed meetings. Mrs. J. Shea called the question. Mr. P. Adler seconded it. The motion presented by the Committee on Committees passed. The second item concerned volunteers for the Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee. The individuals nominated were Walter Calhoun, 1978; Bruce Wardrep, 1978; Wes Hankins, 1979; Vernie W. Saieed, 1977; and Mel Stanforth, 1979. Mr. Williams moved that the slate be accepted. Mr. Bassman seconded. The motion passed.

D. Ad Hoc Screening Committee. The Ad Hoc Screening Committee report was presented by Mr. Champion. The Allied Health Code was presented for final approval. Its acceptance was moved and seconded and passed unanimously. The Philosophy Department Code was recommended for approval with the note that the code had an unusual feature. Students participated in the development of the code draft. This was not covered by any guidelines on the code. The motion to accept was made and seconded and the code passed the Senate. The Mathematics Code was presented to the Senate for the first time. It did not specify the functions of the unit head and conflicts with Senate guideline number eight. Ms. Hodgins moved acceptance. The motion was seconded. Mr. Johnson asked restatement of differences. Mr. Champion complied. Ms. Hodgins said that the unit felt that the code was specific enough on the chairman without relisting the functions on page 2. Mr. Johnson asked whether the criteria were sufficient to permit an evaluation every four years. Ms. Kares said that this point was not discussed by the full Mathematics faculty. Mr. Williams advocated backing the Screening Committee's request. Mr. Ferrell said that the small details must be sustained. The question was called. The vote of the Mathematics Code failed. Mr. Champion said that there were no more codes to be offered at this time. Mr. Coulter asked as to the status of the codes with the Chancellor. Mr. Champion said that he had no idea. Interested units should contact the Chancellor's Office.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Mr. P. Adler moved the approval of the Senate Calendar for the next year. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for March 23, 1976). The motion, seconded, passed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Conner Atkeson
Secretary

FACULTY ASSEMBLY REPORT

The sixteenth meeting of the Faculty Assembly occurred on February 20, 21, 1976. East Carolina delegates, Robert Woodside, Patricia Daugherty, Thomas Williams, and Henry Ferrell were in attendance. In response to the Board of Governors acceptance of an earlier resolution treating the declining literacy of incoming students, the Assembly instructed the Chairman to convey to the Board the Assembly's continuing interest in the questionnaires of entering student's literacy. In addition, formal action on a resolution on waiver of tuition for faculty members was postponed indefinitely in view of President Friday's avowed active pursuit of the matter made before the Assembly.

A resolution on higher education capital improvement bonds reflected the awareness that the Assembly has concerning the needs of the various campuses to meet present enrollment necessities. A resolution opposing tenure quotas, magnified by the presence of Chapter Six of the University's Code, in the constituent institutions was adopted. A careful reading of the resolution illustrates the undercurrent of concern felt by younger faculty persons particularly in the application of Chapter Six and the institutional policies that may be adopted to avoid Chapter Six's implications. It serves also to underline the unrest that Chapter Six has produced. An additional resolution, encouraging faculty opinion in the extension of post-sixty five employment, reflected a concern over the FTE ratios.

Several general questions treating the directions of the Assembly and its effectiveness were raised. The procedure of using the formal resolution to forward advice to President Friday's office was questioned. A general study of salaries was promised by the General Administration in time for the next Assembly meeting in April. The Budget Committee of the Assembly is making an institutional budget study for comparisons within the University as well.

Each institution was asked to conduct a poll concerning collective bargaining and possible bargaining agent.