

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

January 18, 1977

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 18, 1977 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 244, Mendenhall Student Center. The following members were absent: Gulati, Shank, Hoots. The following alternates were present: Joseph Fernandez for Bassman, Lynis G. Dohm for J. G. Jones, Belinda Lee for Banks. The following ex-officio members were absent: Jenkins, Holt, Howell, Monroe.

Ferrell said that he would like to clarify his statement that the University system would lose 10 million dollars annually on conversions. He has not been able to verify this figure but is in the process of doing so. The minutes of December 14, 1976 were approved.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

A. The chair reported that he had written to the Chancellor concerning moving pending codes out of departments. In Appendix D there is a virtual command that new faculty be appointed by a committee under an approved code. Appendix D was implemented last summer and doubtless some people have been appointed by a department without a personnel committee. The Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Chairman of the Faculty feel this is going to lead to complication. The Board of Trustees' resolution established the enabling code three years ago. Surely the Board is not too happy with this delay on the part of about half of the units. The reasons are manifold: the unit cannot agree within itself; the Senate has not agreed with the unit; and on some, the administration has not agreed. The process should be speeded up. All units have submitted at least one draft, but nothing further has been done in many.

B. Adler noted that the Senate resolution on State funding of private colleges/universities has been sent to the General Assembly representatives. He hopes it will bring comments, for there is a distinct danger to public universities in a diversion of funds.

C. The chair announced the following appointments to committees: Charles H. Moore, Psychology, to replace Loren Campion on the Faculty Affairs Committee; and Jean Lowry, Geology to replace Charles H. Moore as alternate on the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The chair introduced Vincent Foote of N. C. State University, Chairman of the UNC Faculty Assembly. Foote said he had attended the Board of Governors' meeting last Friday. The resolution on funding from ECU was before it and the Board went into executive session. Foote was thus unable to be present during discussion. The Board did pass the Ethics Code supported by Governor Hunt. This means chancellors and possibly as far down as department heads will be required to disclose all sources of income. Certainly chancellors, assistants, provosts, and academic deans will be required to do this.

Foote commented that he was aware of the impending retirement of the ECU Chancellor and he knew that President Friday had talked to the ECU Senate. At N. C. State, the faculty were encouraged to submit names to the Senate for membership on the Search Committee. It is important that faculty views be placed before the candidate before selection. The UNC Faculty Assembly had pushed this at State.

Sehgal asked if the teachers retirement system would be considered by the Assembly. He sees a lot of problems here. He believes the TIAA has a better arrangement. Foote responded that Ferrell has brought the issue to the Council and the General Administration. Foote said he will work on this problem and would report back. Ferrell asked if Foote would give his estimate of the nature of the Board of Governors as he sees it this year. Foote commented the makeup of the Board will change shortly.

The new members will appear in May. It is time to make faculty views known to those legislators who select the members. The Board has approved capital funding and it supports the 10 percent raise, though Governor Hunt says it looks like a 6.5 percent raise. The NCEA and the AAUP are being contacted for support on the 10 percent raise. The Board has advisory powers on State aid to students in private institutions. New members could change some decisions. Johnson asked why there is a big turnover. Foote said there are ten positions which are open. This could turn the balance on the Board, as most controversial issues are close to 50-50. State institutions should make their views known. Adler said that it is the impression of the ECU delegates to the Faculty Assembly that the Assembly is moving towards being an initiator of policy review. Foote responded that some campuses are not capable of taking issue with the administration. There has been some intimidation of delegates, although President Friday and the Board of Governors have said that there will be faculty governing bodies on each campus.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Committee on Committees. Henry Ferrell, chairperson, presented two by-law amendments for information. (See attachments.) These will be voted on at the February Senate meeting.

B. University Curriculum Committee. Ed Ryan, chairperson, presented a change to increase the hours from 2 s.h. to 3 s.h. for PTHE 3121 which would increase the total number of hours for the degree to 130 s.h. and a change in the cognate requirements. (See University Curriculum Committee Minutes for January 6, 1977.) Read seconded the motion to approve and the changes were approved.

C. Ad Hoc Screening Committee. Adler reported for Loren Campion that the Mathematics Code, Library Science Code, and School of Business Code have been submitted and approved by the Ad Hoc Screening Committee and will be forwarded to the Senate. The Library Services Code is on the agenda of the Ad Hoc Screening Committee. There are approximately 15 codes out of 27 units that are now in operation. The Chancellor has reported he has no codes awaiting his approval as of November.

D. Faculty Governance Committee. Robert Woodside, chairperson, presented the recommendation of the Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for January 18, 1977.) He noted that the recommendation was not submitted earlier because of time. He added a third statement. (See attachment.) He commented that the Governance Committee had written a letter to the History Department in December, 1976 but has no answer as yet. Woodside moved the recommendation and Hursey seconded. Atkeson said that the History Department had received the letter from the Governance Committee on December 5. The letter was read to the departmental faculty meeting on December 6 by the Chairman who then referred the matter to the Departmental Executive Committee. The Executive Committee met on January 10 and appointed a subcommittee of Price and Ferrell to confer with the Governance Committee. Any resultant amendment to the History Code would be considered by the Senate. Atkeson moved to table the motion. J. A. Jones seconded. The motion to table passed.

The chairman said that if there were no objections he would recognize T. Williams who wished to speak in reference to Pitt Technical Institute becoming a community college. Williams commented that technical institutes have an important job which they have done with some success. Some are distant from a university and their progress to community college status is justified. With a college available such progress is not justified. Many students at East Carolina (10 percent from Pitt County) would take some courses at a community college. He was not impressed with

what he had seen in his field with transferability of work from a technical institute or community college. The work is not as thorough and not as much material is covered. A community college in Greenville would be needless duplication. Total college age population will begin to fall off rapidly in the next ten years. The county commissioners have met once and are deadlocked. Keusch said a vote by Pitt County voters rejected this several years ago. Williams added if the county commissioners approve it, no referendum would be required now. General discussion ensued, in which several senators expressed their opposition to the elevation of Pitt Technical Institute to college status and urged their colleagues to write to the Pitt County commissioners in protest against the intended move.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Instructional Survey Committee. Marie Farr, chairperson, presented the committee resolution. The objective had been to identify teachers whom students thought to be outstanding. The Alumni Association suggested the peer and administrative evaluation. This was not an objective of the committee. The effort on the part of the committee was to say something positive about a teacher. The students did their part and are entitled to some feedback. Previously, the committee went to Chancellor Jenkins with names. Chancellor Jenkins said that the desire of the committee to send congratulatory letters was understandable but that confidentiality precluded his doing this. He said he always furnished courtesy copies to deans and chairpersons. He suggested that the committee might wish to reconsider the policy. If wider dissemination were permitted, he would be willing to send letters. Farr noted that the previous resolution stressed maximum confidentiality. She believed that the previous vote of the Senate was the result of misunderstanding rather than real opposition. She hoped to clarify some of the points by explaining the instructional survey again: It was a student survey alone, with four variables allowing comparability. No one was removed from the survey because of incomparability on only one variable. People in Music and Art had expressed concern because of their frequent one to one basis. They were afraid that many of them had been eliminated. This was not true. Size of class was but one of the four variables. Other variables are the number of different classes taught, number of different students taught, and average grade. Farr stressed that there is no potential for possible abuse. This evaluation does not measure any negatives. There is no scale of "how good." The committee wants to publicize only the 49 top names. No other information is to be released except to individual faculty members who request their own standing in writing to the committee. She asked for reconsideration of the resolution as amended. The resolutions were moved by Sehgal and seconded by Garton.

Daugherty asked how many names were eliminated from the survey. Farr said that there were 660 names in survey. Hursey noted that there were 926 names in the faculty list and that this included graduate assistants. 124 faculty members taught no undergraduate courses and were therefore excluded. Yarbrough asked if a faculty member can get his or her ranking from the committee and then use the material as the member sees fit. Hursey said this was true. Yarbrough then said that he could see no problem. Reep argued that without full revelation of scores the affair was puerile. He pointed out that at another university he was once named outstanding educator and was quite happy about it until he discovered he had been named along with the worst teacher on the campus. Hursey commented that publishing the total list would be bad. The survey was designed to accentuate the positive. The committee did this, but a complete list would be misinterpreted. Gantt said that he had heard that an organized effort was made in his department to insure recognition of a member. This could have happened in other departments. He himself administered classes containing 400 odd students, but did not personally teach them. How could they rate him? Hursey said that the committee knew this but believed that Gantt's case was special. Williams believed that there are many problems. One real problem is: Are we doing justice to the top 49 by publishing their names? This could open them to malice. He learned long ago that good teaching never led to success on this campus. He feels it a disservice to higher education to publish names. Ray commented

that any attempt at a future student evaluation would be useless without publication. The Senate might as well cancel future efforts.

Adler said that this appeared to be the appropriate moment to read a letter from Tim McLeod, SGA Secretary of Academic Affairs, strongly urging publication of faculty names. Hursey said that he feared initially the result would be a popularity contest, but this had not proved out. There was no strong correlation between good grades and high ranking. Sehgal observed that this was the third survey on campus and looked to be the best of the group. He said that he supports the resolution. One of the two top-rated persons is in his department, and he is considered best and toughest by the department. Hursey commented that two people were recognized by the Alumni awards: one from a "hard" science, and other from Business Education. These were totally different disciplines and the grade bias was virtually negligible. Reep said that he thought the context of his statement was misunderstood. He asked why should grown people need this survey? Tadlock was concerned about the freedom of information act. Adler said there appears to be no violation. Ferrell believed the second part of the offered resolution invaded his vote which he had thought to be confidential. Farr read the letter sent to faculty originally. She saw no evidence of implication of confidentiality. Reep asked if addresses were on sheet. Farr responded no. E. Ryan wanted to know when the committee decided to exclude faculty responses from the evaluation. Farr said that Hursey had reported the committee's intended method last spring. The decision was made before the data came in. The data from the faculty was not used in drawing up list. Ferrell said he would not have voted if he had known data would be published. The publication of top 49 was not mentioned last year. Hursey noted that the student survey was a nominating device. The faculty and administration was a correlative device. Johnson saw one area of concern. He was most interested in establishing a survey that will work year after year. If the committee releases names in rank order it might destroy the continuing evaluation. Suppose #3 drops to #48. This would be a serious question. If in alphabetical order this element would not be a problem.

Adler noted that it was getting late and asked for a vote in ten minutes. Saieed said she believed the committee did a good job and favored publication of some of the material. She was concerned with the confidentiality charge. Could the Senate vote on this without changing the charge through the formal process? E. Ryan reminded the Senate that his department opposed publication. Another department had voted no, also. The list is exclusively the result of a student vote, and he found no indication in the minutes of last spring that only students would be used. Lao supported the resolution. She felt the students were entitled to the results. She agreed with Ferrell that there should be an exact definition of "best teacher" so there would be no question of meaning or distortion. Sparrow supported the resolution saying he could see no bad consequences. Woodside supported publication. He believed the committee had done a good job and it would be a disservice if not published. Keusch argued that there may be nothing wrong with publishing 7 percent of faculty names but what about 100 percent? Before too long, there would be pressure for having 100 percent published. McLeod was granted floor privileges and told the Senate that it could be voting on nothing next year. He believed that the students would not participate next year without publication and he urged support for the resolution. Snyder reported that Geology supported this unanimously. Adler gave chair to the vice-chairman and spoke in support of committee's work and publication of results. He was satisfied that fairness was achieved by committee. He agreed with Tim McLeod that students will withdraw if not given the results.

Ferrell moved to amend the resolution by striking the second paragraph. Keusch seconded. The question was called and the amendment failed. Lao moved to amend the first paragraph so it would read: Be it hereby resolved that the Instructional Survey Committee shall arrange for the release and publication of the names of the forty-nine full-time faculty members "believed by the students to be the most

outstanding instructors in the student survey" for their undergraduate teaching from Fall, 1975 through Spring, 1976. Haigwood seconded. The amendment passed. Ferrell moved to add in the first paragraph after "members" and whose primary charge involved teaching undergraduates. Keusch seconded. Farr noted that it is possible that some persons who taught primarily graduates may have been included. Ferrell's motion was withdrawn. Sparrow felt that attempts at clarification are counter-productive. Johnson moved to add in alphabetical order after "names" in the first paragraph. Woodside seconded. J. A. Jones asked whether the committee had intended to rank. Hursey replied yes, because that is what students were asked. Garrison noted that it was evident that there was a weakness in the survey. He believed that specificity introduces problem. Johnson's amendment passed. The question was called on the main motion and it passed. (See attachment.) Persons desiring to know his/her rank may request this in writing from Marie Farr, chairperson, Instructional Survey Committee, c/o Department of English, Austin Building.

Ferrell moved a letter from the Senate be sent to Mrs. Leo Jenkins for the death of her father and a letter also to be sent to Worth Baker's family. The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Conner Atkeson
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES PROPOSED BY-LAW AMENDMENTS

- (1) At its January 11, 1977 meeting, the Committee on Committees considered the following by-law change (referred by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1976) of the Agenda, Committee on Committees, and Faculty Governance Committees to insert: "most immediate past Chairman of the Faculty in residence" for the phrase "immediate past Chairman of the Faculty."

The Committee on Committees voted to amend the by-law by the deletion of the word "most" and the addition of "who shall not serve in the event of the reelection of the present chairperson."

The Committee on Committees recommends a change in the by-laws of the Agenda, Committee on Committees, and Faculty Governance Committees to insert "immediate past Chairman of the Faculty in residence who shall not serve in the event of the reelection of the present chairperson" for the phrase "immediate past Chairman of the Faculty."

- (2) Educational Planning and Policies Committee - Three (3) elected faculty members plus ex-officio: Chairpersons of the University Curriculum Committee, Teacher Education Committee, Library Committee, Admissions Committee, General College Committee, Continuing Education Committee, Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee, Graduate School Policies Committee and Graduate School Curriculum Committee, and President of the Student Government Association.

Quorum: Three (3) members exclusive of ex-officio.

The Educational Planning and Policies Committee shall advise and recommend to the Chancellor action to be taken in the event that the institution will experience financial exigency or when it is considering a major curtailment of a teaching, research, or public service program (Appendix D., "Tenure Policies and Regulations," Section VI. A. 2.) The Committee shall review the educational policies, goals, standards and procedures, and resources of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Division of Health Affairs, the various professional schools,

and the Graduate School. The Committee shall be concerned with adequacy and balance of the University's overall graduate and undergraduate programs. It shall propose whatever recommendations it considers advisable in these areas to the proper committees, administrative officers, or boards. The Committee shall be advised of all proposals for new curricula, programs, and policies or of changes in existing ones and may comment on these matters to the proper authorities. The Committee shall annually review with the Chancellor, or his appointed representative, the proposed budget of the Institution prior to its submission to the General Administration and may comment to the proper authorities on this subject. The Committee shall report its recommendations and concerns to the Faculty Senate at least on an annual basis.

The Committee shall meet once monthly from the beginning of the autumn term until spring commencement. It may delegate part or all of its work to subcommittees which may be drawn wholly or in part from outside its membership. The chairperson of the Committee shall be elected from the elected faculty members. Initially upon election, the three faculty members shall be elected in order to provide for staggered three-year terms.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Governance Committee recommended the following action:

- (1) The Governance Committee finds that the History Department Code is ambiguous on page 4, Section IV, paragraph 2, sentence 2, and on page 7, paragraph 2, item 2, and on page 7, Section V, sentence 2.

The sentence on page four indicates that all standing committee action shall be subject to approval by the History Department, or by faculty so specified. This is clear in and of itself, but the question arises regarding the item on page 7: Does the action of recommending criteria for permanent tenure, reappointment, and promotion (in the case of this appeal, promotion only) fall under approval by the department or under approval by some more specific body? The second sentence of Section V on page 7 indicates that recommendations concerning promotions shall be approved by a meeting of faculty members holding professorial rank senior to that of the faculty member under consideration. The specific question now becomes: Do those recommendations include the criteria as well as the candidates? Or were recommendations concerning criteria for promotion (and for recommending for permanent tenure and for reappointment) meant to be approved by the entire department?

The ambiguity here is further evidenced in sentences 3 and 4 under Section V of page 7, where recommendations concerning tenure seem to leave out altogether the idea that criteria are to be approved by the same body that approves of recommendations for granting permanent tenure, viz., the body of permanently tenured faculty.

- (2) The Governance Committee recommends to the Senate that the History Department clarify these passages in its code by amending and inserting in all appropriate places whether the department, specific individuals, or some committee is responsible for considering committee recommendations.
 - (3) The Governance Committee understands the Department of History is reconsidering under recently clarified procedures the action on which the appeal was based.
-

AMENDED RESOLUTION

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE

JANUARY 18, 1977

Be it hereby resolved that the Instructional Survey Committee shall arrange for the release and publication of the names in alphabetical order of the forty-nine full-time faculty members believed by the students to be the most outstanding instructors in the student survey for their undergraduate teaching from Fall, 1975 through Spring, 1976.

Be it also resolved that the Instructional Survey Committee be allowed to designate those of the forty-nine selected faculty members who also ranked in the top ten-percent of their school or departmental faculty survey.

Be it also resolved that the above 49 faculty members receive letters from Chancellor Jenkins recognizing their teaching excellence during the academic year 1975-76.

Be it also resolved that each full-time faculty member who taught undergraduate courses during the academic year 1975-76 be given, upon his/her written request to the Instructional Survey Committee, information on the five-percentile rank in which he/she placed in the student survey.

Be it further resolved that each Graduate Teaching Assistant who ranked in the top 15% of the student survey be sent a letter of commendation by the Instructional Survey Committee, with a carbon copy to his/her departmental chairman.