

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 27, 1976

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 27, 1976, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 101, Nursing Building. The following members were absent: Henderson, Gulati, Williams, Snyder, Adler, Collins, Shank, Read. The following alternates were present: Bernard Kane for Davis, Tom Johnson for Martinez, Beth Moore for Saieed, Joe Davis for Hodgin. The following ex-officio members were absent: Jenkins, Holt, Monroe.

The minutes of March 23, 1976 were approved as presented.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

A. Lloyd Benjamin thanked Mrs. S. Daugherty for acting as chairperson at the previous meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Benjamin reported on a meeting of the Board of Trustees which met earlier this month. He said that there was little to report inasmuch as the meeting was concerned chiefly with athletics and the new stadium addition. He suggested that it would be very much to the advantage of the faculty if the Chairman of the Senate was made a voting member of the Board of Trustees by next fall. He urged the Board of Trustees to establish a precedent in the state by being the first to do this.

Mr. Benjamin read a letter which he had addressed to Chancellor Jenkins on three issues:

1. The Chancellor's letter to Carl Adler regarding the Employee Benefits Committee. Mr. Benjamin asked why is it not possible for the faculty representation on that committee to be members drawn from the Faculty Welfare Committee.

2. Mr. Benjamin's letter of January 22, 1976 on the issue of the two-track system for unit recommendations and Chancellor Jenkins' reply to this. Several units have had codes returned requesting a single-track system which violate the new Appendix D approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The two-track system has been approved in some codes.

3. The Chancellor's memo written in response to the action of the Faculty Senate of December 16, 1975 requesting that in each unit criteria for promotion, merit raises and the granting of permanent tenure be made public. The Faculty Manual provides on page 133 that "objective criteria upon which evaluations are undertaken will be publicized." "Will," according to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, is used to express a command. Mr. Benjamin believes that the faculty responsible for that page in the Manual did indeed intend this as an obligatory requirement. There has been no answer to this letter to date.

Mr. Benjamin has received a letter from the Chancellor outlining the status of the codes. A copy has been sent to Don Sexauer to give to Loren Campion in order to check their records and see if they agree with the Chancellor's.

Mr. Benjamin will send notices to committee chairpersons within the next week requesting they make a personal report to the Senate at the next meeting. These will be short oral reports based on the annual reports.

Mr. Benjamin received a call early in April from Phil McKinney at UNC-Charlotte about a conference being held there on the American Federation of Teachers. East Carolina was invited. Mr. Benjamin said that he was unable to attend and was unable to get someone from ECU to attend because of short notice and the spring vacation. UNC-C called on ECU to join with them in promoting AFT. Mr. Benjamin urged the Faculty Welfare Committee to establish and maintain communications with UNC-Charlotte about this.

B. Henry Ferrell presented the report on the UNC Faculty Assembly. The 17th meeting was held April 23 and 24, 1976. The elected representatives from ECU attended. The agenda was of a nature to require evening meetings. Mr. Ferrell said that he wished to note that no extra pay accrued to those who gave up part of their vacation to attend the Assembly meeting. Mr. Woodside was unable to get an alternate to attend in his place. New officers were elected. The new chairman was the vice chairman, Vincent Foote of N. C. State; the new vice chairman is from N. C. A & T, Ralph Wooden; the new secretary is Roy Carroll of Appalachian. These people take office effective July 1, 1976. There were several fruitful resolutions. The Ad Hoc Resolution Committee reported on resolutions over the past four years and action taken. Persons interested in reading this may see Mr. Ferrell. Resolutions passed in this meeting included the following: A Resolution on Faculty Political Action, setting October 9, 1976 for the Faculty Assembly to hear candidates from State office. A resolution on salary asking the President and Chancellors to extend an effort for salary increase equal to that extended by them for the bond issue. A resolution supporting the NCAE rally scheduled for May 1 in Raleigh to demonstrate for the 16 percent pay increase. A resolution on research which called upon each campus to have a research committee to develop policies and seek funds for research. There was a resolution by the Assembly endorsing the leadership of Mr. Ferrell over the past two years. A committee of Chancellors discussed their problems with the Assembly and considered what faced them in the coming years. There was resolution supporting a faculty newsletter. President Friday told Mr. Ferrell that there had been some progress in relating performance to salary. Mr. Ferrell said that there was some evidence that merit was a relative issue and that the Chancellors are the main supporters of the merit position. President Friday said that he was interested in the faculty and he hopes to visit ECU in the fall as he has visited other campuses. Mr. Ferrell said that he would like to have President Friday meet the Senate. Mr. Bassman offered a resolution endorsing the Assembly resolutions and encouraging the faculty to attend the rally on May 1. Mr. Sparrow seconded the motion. The question was called and the motion passed. Mr. Ferrell said that he has a copy of the long-range plan for 1976-1981. There is an additional copy in Provost Howell's office. There is nothing concerning faculty development in it. The General Administration is aware of this, and it will probably be taken care of in the annual review process.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Calendar Committee. The Calendar Committee report was presented by Mr. Hooks (see Faculty Senate Agenda for April 27, 1976). There were two items for consideration. The calendar was presented through 1980-81 for provisional approval. The Summer 1978 Calendar shows the true picture of the summer school under the semester system. It will permit an early semester in the next academic year. It was moved by Hooks to accept this calendar, and seconded by Mr. Woodside. Mr. Castellow asked whether the resolution under new business on the agenda would affect this calendar. Mr. Benjamin said that it would. Mr. Hooks said that it would not affect the summer calendar. Mr. South said that the resolution from the English Department would not affect the summer calendar. Ms. Koldjeski asked, as a point of information, why there would be 54 days in the summer as compared to 88 in the fall. Mr. Hooks said that summer classes are longer than fifty minutes. The question was called and the Summer Calendar was accepted. Mr. Hooks said that the second part of the proposal was the calendars for 1977-1981. Mr. South asked whether it was necessary to have a specific number of instructional days Monday through Friday. Mr. Hooks said that the intent was to develop a calendar with similar number of days and that the Senate had made this point before. Mr. South noted that there was an increase of days in 1979-1981 Fall calendars. He asked why this was so as he thought that there ought to be a decrease rather than an increase in the instructional days. Mr. Hooks said that the committee found it impossible to arrange the decline because of drop-add

days and State holidays. These caused the loss of one Tuesday and two Mondays. The Committee tried to have the same number of instructional week days in each semester. The increase was based on the assumption of fifteen instructional weeks. Mr. South said that he still saw 75 days in the fall and then 73 in the spring and that the even number is not really met. He suggested that different dates for faculty meetings and other events might be useful. He did not like August 18 as a starting date and said that he could see no pattern in the calendar. Mr. Hooks said that Monday was used as a starting base and that this causes the date to move around. The real question is when the date is to be moved forward and not backward. There is a four or five day cycle in this. This in turn affects the Christmas vacation. Mr. South said that this was not significant since difference of ending is only four days. Mr. Benjamin said that the discussion now involved the subject of the resolution under New Business on the Agenda. Mr. Sparrow said that he had talked with the admissions office at another university. They average 70 Monday through Friday instructional days. The question is can ECU do this rather than have a longer period. Mr. Woodside said that the two institutions which have most recently moved to the semester system have opted for the fifteen week semester. He opposed simply following UNC-CH. ECU has averaged 150 class days per year and switching to a fifteen week semester system would keep this number. He said that ECU was already losing five class hours and suggested that an advancement of the date would cause the loss of an additional three hours. We should keep what we have now. Mr. Benjamin added that he was notified by a member of the ECU SGA that they are opposed to a mid-August beginning date because the dorms are not air-conditioned. Mr. South asked what the figures were for Appalachian and suggested they do not have a fixed exam period and, therefore, might not be a good model for ECU. Mr. Hooks said that he had a copy of the calendar and that their exams appeared to be fixed. The President of the SGA, Tim Sullivan, asked for floor privileges. There being no objection, he said that the SGA had passed a resolution the previous night opposing an early date. He said that any group of students would oppose this date. They favor an early out with exams before Christmas. Air conditioning had already been mentioned but jobs were a definite factor in the problem inasmuch as many students had jobs in agriculture and resorts and both continued into late August. He said that the semester system would help student quite a bit but that trimming was necessary to meet objections. He has set up a committee of students to help revise the calendar. He said that he believes that the faculty cares what the students think and should consider these problems in their vote. He asked for postponement to give students a chance for input. Mr. Benjamin said that the Calendar Committee had a student representative. Mr. Hooks said that the Calendar Committee was charged by the Senate for an early semester and for that it is necessary to start in August. It is difficult to get around these facts. He handed out an analysis of the semester system as compared to UNC-CH (see attachment). He said that the calendars are very similar and the ECU calendar was as close to the UNC-CH calendar and still take care of all the things required by custom and past activities. There are only one or two days difference between the calendars. Mr. Ferrell said that the Senate has already adopted the 1977-78 calendar. He asked the purpose of submitting the additional years now. Mr. Hooks said that it was necessary for advance planning purposes and the Senate had requested it be done. Mr. Ferrell said that in effect we are adopting the semester system through 1981. Mr. Hooks said that it was provisional and that some adjustment might be necessary as experience develops. Mr. Ferrell moved that the Senate accept as information only the three added years (not 1977-78 which has already been adopted) and instruct the Calendar Committee to make a careful survey of the 1977-78 experience. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoots. Mr. Ferrell said that we don't want to be locked into this calendar because we may want to change it and the administration might say that you cannot change it because it has been adopted. Mr. Garrison said that he noted that the 1977-78 calendar has fewer days than the following years. Is there a similar difference in the other years? Mr. Hooks said that he did not know because he had not analyzed the 1978 calendars, but he could give sample dates. Mr. South said that the Senators from the English Department had been instructed to present the resolution. They had used only the 1977-78 calendar. He discussed the differences between the figures in the resolution (see page 5 of the Agenda) and those presented

by Mr. Hooks. He noted that UNC-CH starts later than ECU and gets out earlier. UNC-CH uses its time differently. The whole calendar is influenced by use of larger figures than those of UNC-CH. Since UNC-CH has used the semester system for a long time, their calendar should be fairly effective. It is not necessary to imitate Chapel Hill, but some thought should be given to their experience. He said that the semester covered a long time and that the last few days might well be non-productive for the students. Chapel Hill has a longer exam period to use these days. It is possible that we might not like this calendar in three or four years. Mr. Benjamin said that the motion was to include these for information. He asked Mr. South if he wanted to make an amendment requesting the Calendar Committee study and develop provisional calendars with fewer instructional days. Mr. South said that he supported the resolution. The Committee should not be inflexible, but that the number of days should be 70-71. Mr. Ferrell said that the 1977-78 calendar is the latest calendar being proposed, and he urged support for his motion. Mr. Howell said that he had been working with a group from all units to work out the conversion. One of the problems has been to divide the semester for student teachers. One concern was that if the semester was not maintained at the proposed length that practice teaching might be too short. He believed that this should be held in mind. He noted that the strongest support for this came from the English Department representatives. Mr. Sparrow said those must be the three who voted against the resolution. Mr. Kane spoke in favor of Mr. Ferrell's motion and supported the student comments. He said that economic consideration was serious factor for the students in the face of today's educational costs. The climate is a valid point. He said that the faculty was here to serve the students. He also noted that the local public school calendar was a factor inasmuch as many of the faculty had spouses teaching in these schools. Mr. Keusch asked whether the Ferrell motion included acceptance of the committee report. Mr. Benjamin said that it would accept a provisional calendar. Mr. Howell asked whether the committee could consider 1977-78 experience in time for the 1978-79 calendar. Mr. Ferrell said that there was no problem because the calendar can be submitted in December. The problem lay with the Fall calendar and not with the Spring. The question was called on the Ferrell motion and passed.

B. Ad Hoc Screening Committee. The Ad Hoc Screening Committee report was presented by Mr. Champion. The Committee recommended approval of the Biology Code and the Counseling Center Code. Mrs. S. Daugherty moved the acceptance, seconded by Mrs. I. Ryan. The question was called and the motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Mr. Woodside moved the approval of the graduation list. (List available in the Faculty Senate Office). Mr. Richards seconded. The question was called and the motion passed.

B. Mr. Benjamin noted that this item had been considered under the Calendar Committee report. It would now require a two-thirds vote of the Senate to reconsider the item. Mr. Sparrow moved to reconsider. Mr. Ferrell noted that Mr. Sparrow had voted against the previous motion and was thus ineligible to move this. Mr. Garrison said that he did not believe that this resolution had been considered with the other. Mr. Benjamin said that in his opinion the Senate had. Ms. Lao moved to reconsider. Mr. Hoots seconded. The question was called and the vote was 14 for and 15 against. The motion failed for lack of a two-thirds majority.

C. Mr. Yarbrough moved the acceptance of the Political Science Code. Mr. Howell seconded. Mr. Ferrell asked floor privilege for Mr. Sexauer who is chairman of the subcommittee that has been dealing with this code. Mr. Ferrell believed that it was a good idea to get the point of view of the subcommittee. Mr. Ferrell said that he did not recommend the code and that Mr. Sexauer would speak if there were no objections. There being no objections, Mr. Sexauer took the floor. Mr. Sexauer said that the Code does not conform with item 6 in the guidelines adopted by the Faculty Senate and that the Subcommittee agrees on this point. He said that the

detailed statement of organization that is required by the guideline is not in the Political Science Code. The Senate has approved at least twenty codes which have met the guideline points. Reference by the Political Science Code to details contained in a manual permits change without any serious amendment process. If the Political Science Code is passed then other units should be allowed the same privilege. Mr. E. Ryan asked if it was Sexauer's view that this went against the ECU Code as well as against the guidelines. Mr. Sexauer said no and that the ECU Code is open to interpretation which he chooses not to make. His concern is that the Senate approved guidelines to use on all codes. Mr. Garrison asked what important decision-making points are missing. Mr. Sexauer said that a unit shall describe in detail its procedures and organization. This is not done in the Political Science Code but that there is only reference to a manual prepared and maintained by the Chairman of the Political Science Department. The manual is not part of the code and is not seen by the Chancellor unless it is sought out. Mr. Garrison said that in his department code some details are left out, that only those requested are in the code. He asked what was lacking, was tenure, etc. left out. Mr. Sexauer said that there was nothing in the code telling of committee structure. It cannot be said from reading the Code how the department operates which can be done in other unit codes. The delegation of responsibility is not spelled out. There is no provision for tenure of office or elections. Mr. Campion asked and received floor privileges. He said that the Math Department had already had its code rejected because the duties of the chairman were not spelled out. He said this should also apply to the Political Science Department. Possibly this is provided for in the manual but the committee has not seen the manual. Reference to the manual for procedures leaves much room for maneuvering. It is vague who has final say-so over preparation of the manual. Mr. Brinn asked for a response by the Political Science Department. Mr. Benjamin gave floor privileges to Mr. Sugg who was the chairman of the committee of the whole which had prepared the code in the department. Mr. Sugg agreed that Mr. Sexauer's comments were accurate. He then gave a short history of the development of the code. The Political Science Department Faculty approved unanimously its first draft of the Code of Operations on September 26, 1974, and forwarded it to the Ad Hoc Screening Committee. The Committee returned the draft with recommendations on November 6, 1974. A second draft, unanimously approved by the Political Science Faculty on March 20, 1975, was forwarded to the Committee. The Committee returned the second draft on November 17, 1975, stating that "the Political Science Code does not conform to the guideline adopted September 24, 1974, by the Faculty Senate. . ." The Political Science Faculty has considered the Committee's Memorandum of November 17, 1975, and has made the following revisions: (a) The Preamble prescribed by the Chancellor has been added; and (b) The word "permanent" has been placed in front of the word "tenure" wherever appearing. The Political Science Faculty considers that the draft Code conforms both to the letter and to the spirit of the ECU Code in that it: (a) provides "for the conduct of unit affairs according to Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised;" and (b) establishes "procedures which will allow the Faculty to participate by making recommendations concerning all decisions affecting promotions, the granting of (permanent) tenure and dismissal." The present draft of the Political Science Departmental Code, with the Preamble added, has been democratically developed, and was approved by secret ballot by a vote of 9 to 1, with one abstention, on February 19, 1976, all members of the voting faculty of the Political Science Department voting. Mr. Sugg then argued that the Code had been developed democratically and that the manual referred to had been in successful operation for ten years and that the unit chairman had not in one single instance failed to act in accord with the majority of the unit even when he did not agree with the vote. He said that the best constitutions are brief and general, that too much detail leads to inflexibility and inability to change. The size of a committee is not important to the Chancellor or the Senate. He said that a complete range of the description of responsibilities is in the Code and that the details of the function of a committee do not insure that the committee functions. He argued that of all the departments on campus, certainly the Political Science was best qualified to make the judgment of what was proper for a constitutional system. Mr. Reep asked whether the Political Science department felt any uneasiness in being alone in holding out. He asked whether it was possible that some danger

might exist in being too brief. He suggested that the manual referred to might simply have its pertinent points included in the code. Mr. Sugg said that the basic proposition of the codes was to provide for participation by the faculty. The Political Science Department felt that the system which had been developed and proven effective over ten years should be acceptable. Mr. Reep asked whether it was possible that what Political Science considers democratic might appear not so to others. Mr. Sugg said that of all departments at ECU the Political Science Department would be most likely to be democratic. Ms. Koldjeski called the question. The vote was 15 in favor and 17 against. The motion to accept failed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Conner Atkeson
Secretary

ANALYSIS OF SEMESTER CALENDARS

FALL SEMESTEREast Carolina University (1977-78)

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Registration | August 23 (Tuesday) |
| Drop Add | August 24 (Wednesday) |
| Classes Begin | August 25 (Thursday) |
| Labor Day Holiday | September 5 (Monday) |
| Thanksgiving | November 23-28 |
| Holiday | (Thursday and Friday) |
| Thanksgiving | November 23 (10:00 p.m.) - |
| Holiday | November 28 (8:00 a.m.) |
| Classes End | December 9 (Friday) |
| Reading Day | December 12 (Monday) |
| Exams Begin | December 13 (Tuesday) |
| Exams End | December 20 (Tuesday) |

UNC - Chapel Hill (1977-78)

| |
|---------------------------------|
| August 22-24 (Monday-Wednesday) |
| No single day designation |
| August 25 (Thursday) |
| September 5 (Monday) |
| November 23 (1:00 p.m.) - |
| November 28 (8:00 a.m.) |
| December 6 (Tuesday) |
| December 7 (Wednesday) |
| December 8 (Thursday) |
| December 17 (Saturday) |

A comparison of the two calendars indicates the following:

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------|
| 1. Total class days M-F: | ECU - 74 | UNC-Ch - 71 |
| 2. Class Days on MWF: | ECU - 44 | UNC-Ch - 42 |
| 3. Class Days on TTh: | ECU - 30 | UNC-Ch - 29 |
| 4. Examination Days: | ECU - 6 | UNC-Ch - 9 |
| 5. Common Examination Days: | ECU - 2 | UNC-Ch - None specified |
| 6. Total class and examination Days: | ECU - 82 | UNC-Ch - 80 |
| 7. Total "Work" days from Registration to End of Exams: | ECU - 85 | UNC-Ch - 84 |

SPRING SEMESTEREast Carolina University (1977-78)

| | |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| Registration | January 9 (Monday) |
| Drop Add | January 10 (Tuesday) |
| Classes Begin | January 11 (Wednesday) |
| Spring Recess | March 5-12 (Sunday-Sunday) |
| State Holiday | March 27 (Monday) |
| Classes End | April 28 (Friday) |
| Reading Day | May 1 (Monday) |
| Exams Begin | May 2 (Tuesday) |
| Exams End | May 9 (Tuesday) |

UNC - Chapel Hill (1977-78)

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Registration | January 9-10 (Monday-Tuesday) |
| Drop Add | Included in registration schedule |
| Classes Begin | January 11 (Wednesday) |
| Spring Recess | March 6-10 (Monday-Friday) |
| State Holiday | March 27 (Monday) |
| Classes End | April 27 (Thursday) |
| Reading Day | April 28 (Friday) |
| Exams Begin | May 1 (Monday) |
| Exams End | May 10 (Wednesday) |

A comparison of the two calendars indicates the following:

| | | |
|---|----------|-------------------------|
| 1. Total class days M-F: | ECU - 72 | UNC-Ch - 71 |
| 2. Class days on MWF: | ECU - 43 | UNC-Ch - 42 |
| 3. Class days on TTh: | ECU - 29 | UNC-Ch - 29 |
| 4. Examination Days: | ECU - 6 | UNC-Ch - 9 |
| 5. Common Examination Days: | ECU - 2 | UNC-Ch - none specified |
| 6. Total class and examination days: | ECU - 80 | UNC-Ch - 80 |
| 7. Total "work" days from registration to end of exams: | ECU - 83 | UNC-Ch - 83 |