

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

May 17, 1977

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, May 17, 1977 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 244, Mendenhall Student Center. The following members were absent: Gulati, Haritun, Shank, Banks, Read, Hoots. The following alternates were present: Bernard Kane for Smith, Carlton Benz for Ray, Betty Levey for Mills, G. Lynis Dohm for J. G. Jones. The following ex-officio members were absent: Jenkins, Holt, Monroe, Howell, M. Moore, Williams.

The minutes of April 19, 1977 were corrected by Daugherty: page 3, B., third line should read "Daugherty made a motion to change 'Personnel Committee' from capital letters to lowercase as a clarification." The minutes were approved as corrected.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

A. Adler gave a summary of the past academic year insofar as progress towards the goals he had set himself as Faculty Chairman. He said that he found the relation between the Senate and the University administrators to have improved somewhat, in the sense that the administration was generally open and receptive to faculty initiatives and interests so long as these remained within the traditional bounds of what the administration considered proper divisions of competencies. However, there remained strong resistance on the administration's part towards a broadening of the faculty's sphere, as demonstrated by the negative reception of the proposed Senate Committee on Educational Planning and Policies. The aura of administrative paternalism still lingers in many areas. Certain Senate committees have demonstrated marked progress in asserting the faculty interest in campus government, notably the University Computer Committee, which has had a particularly difficult task. The Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee appears to be on the threshold of being accepted by the administration as a legitimate and useful adjunct to its own labors. The Faculty Affairs Committee has recently begun to discharge its delicate duties with admirable dispatch and effectiveness. Most of the Senate's committees have developed an effective modus operandi although some weak spots remain to be worked on. Adler suggested a more frequent charging of the various committees by the Senate towards specific topics and goals as one means to improve the Senate-committee relation. The chairman admonished the Senate to be watchful during the coming year in the matter of the selection of a new chancellor, and to establish some sort of contact with the successful candidate as soon as possible, so as to let him know faculty desires and complaints in the early stage of his tenure. Adler pointed out that should the Senate allow itself to be thought of as a passive and compliant body, there would be no lack of candidates to fill the vacuum which would thus ensue in campus government structure. Adler concluded his remarks by thanking the other officers of the Senate, the Senate secretary Mrs. Johnston, and the Mendenhall building overseers for their cooperation and help during the past year.

Ferrell asked to enter a resolution commending Chairman Adler. There were no objections. He moved the resolution. (See attachment.) Reep seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

B. Ferrell presented a report from the Faculty Assembly delegation. (See attachment.)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Student Recruitment Committee. Louise Haigwood, chairperson, reported on the

activities of the committee. Two major topics were: (1) a campus visitation program to give 2,000 to 3,000 prospective students a chance to find out first hand about the University and (2) the development of a questionnaire given to entering students to develop a profile of them and determine their expectations in college. The committee is also concerned with the recruitment of the "older student." Adler asked if the committee knows why the recruitment of older students has been slow. Haigwood replied it is the committee's feeling that actively recruiting older students without a plan would create a problem. Such a plan would have to be initiated by the Admissions Committee which is currently working on one. Adler noted this is becoming the only area of college enrollment expansion for the foreseeable future.

B. University Curriculum Committee. Edward Ryan, chairperson, presented the Medieval and Renaissance Studies Minor and noted that GEOG 2123 should be listed as a requirement for the B. S. Degree for Teaching Earth Science. (See University Curriculum Committee Minutes for May 5, 1977.) South seconded, and the degree requirements passed.

C. Ad Hoc Screening Committee. Loren Campion, chairperson, presented the Code of the Department of Chemistry. He made the following editorial changes: (1) page 6, d., third indented paragraph, change "and" to "or" and (2) page 8, F., sentence should read "All actions of elected committees, with the exception of those specified in the case of the Executive Committee," Everett moved to accept the code. Sehgal seconded, and the motion passed. It was noted that about one-third of the codes have not yet been approved by the Senate.

D. Committee on Committees. Henry Ferrell, chairperson, presented the by-law change. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for May 17, 1977.) The Career Education Committee is trying to coordinate all committees at ECU which deal with career education. The recently created ad hoc committee is the background for this amendment. Ferrell commented that this change is for the Senate's notice and will be voted on at the Senate meeting in September. He noted the Guidance and Counseling Center is now called the University Counseling Center.

E. Faculty Governance Committee. Robert Woodside, chairperson, presented a report on a study of the relationship of the Faculty Senate to the academic components of ECU. (See attachment.) Ferrell commented that the report reflects several implicit conflicts between the Constitution of the General Faculty and statements from the Faculty Manual. The letter from Chancellor Jenkins authorizes the Graduate Council "to exercise 'final jurisdiction over procedural matters and over most policy matters.'" He asked how far could the Faculty Senate go in dealing with graduate programs. The Senate only wishes input on the Medical School to ascertain if appointment, tenure, etc. are comparable to other schools and departments since the Medical School should operate under the same policies. Ferrell moved the Faculty Senate accept this report only for information and that the committee pursue this in greater detail next fall. Saieed seconded. Woodside noted that this is only an informational report. Ferrell asked if the senator from the Medical School had any comments on this. There were no comments. Yarbrough said there is nothing to deny faculty in the Medical School tenure, etc. under the Code. Woodside said there is no evidence that the Faculty Senate has any connection with the Graduate School and that this would probably continue as long as Dr. Jenkins is chancellor. The question was called on the Ferrell motion and passed. Adler noted that each new committee member for 1977-78 should have copies of that committee's minutes for the previous year and this will be the chairman's (of each committee) obligation. Annual Reports are furnished to new members by the Faculty Senate office.

F. Faculty Welfare Committee. Committee member Atkeson presented the resolution on salary equalization for Robert Brown, chairperson. (See attachment.) Atkeson made some editorial changes and moved approval of the resolution. Sparrow seconded.

Atkeson noted this resolution was drawn up by Tennala Gross and himself. They obtained considerable statistical information on salaries but could not get an adequate base for proposing concrete formulae. President Friday commented last October that funds may become available for equalization of salaries and this is the purpose of the resolution. It was felt that he meant an internal equalization. Yarbrough asked if the salary of people in the same rank should be equal. Atkeson said the committee is trying to achieve a particular figure that constitutes a reasonable figure in each rank based on the three factors in the resolution. Yarbrough noted the resolution does not deal with this. Atkeson replied that some people will get a larger salary since the resolution does not take into consideration publishing, etc. Kane moved to amend the third paragraph to read: Be it therefore recommended that these funds be utilized by establishing a schedule of minimum annual and academic year salaries for each rank. This schedule shall include recommended increases for experience at each rank." Potter seconded. Reep noted that the purpose is to establish a minimum base salary for each rank and a Ph.D. is not the only terminal degree. Other university service should be included as criterion. Yarbrough moved to recommit the proposal to the committee and Reep seconded. Adler noted the Faculty Welfare Committee had data going back for six years and only four of these (1972-75) were in the normal range of administrative decision. Sehgal said the difference in the two resolutions revolves around average salary. Hursey commented that it would be best to set rank minimum salaries. He noted the minimums we should set are hard to determine without figures. A schedule of salaries does not exist. Equal funds does not necessarily mean equalization. Does equalization mean to equalize ranks or to use affirmative action to compensate underpaid females? Garrison asked why the figures don't show what the committee wants them to show. Atkeson remarked that the figures over the last six years are skewed. The committee tried to find a concrete guideline but information for more years is needed. Castellon suggested waiting for the information before any action is taken. Atkeson objected, saying the administration does not care about equalization, and when the money comes, it will be put where the administration wants it. Reep said if the administration doesn't care now, they won't care later. Since this will be a small amount of money, it would be used up before it could be distributed to all of those found eligible. We could determine a just salary schedule but this is not that urgent now. Atkeson commented that if \$1300 was given to the most deserving cases, only 100 people would receive any money. Satterfield spoke against recommitment and noted something has to be done this year. Ferrell commented that we are dealing with three things at once: (1) cost of living adjustment, (2) competency raise, and (3) merit. It has all been jammed together. The institutions are divided into three categories. Ph.D. granting institutions rank higher than ECU. These funds are designed to pull us up. The difficult problem and basic thing here is the cost of living raise. Hursey said if this resolution is defeated then the administration could set rank minimum salaries which would be lower than are currently paid. Brown spoke against recommitment. Either we do it or the administration does it. The question was called to recommit. Hand count vote was 15 for recommitment and 25 against recommitment. Kane moved to amend the third paragraph to read: "Be it therefore recommended that these funds in the academic year 1977-78 will be utilized by having the administration establish a schedule of rank minima for each year of service in rank. This schedule shall include recommended increases for experience at each rank." Saieed seconded. Hursey moved to amend paragraph four to drop "equalization standard" and insert "rank minimum." E. Ryan noted it can go up to a certain floor figure. Yarbrough noted the administration could also decrease salaries. Reep said if you take this money to establish minima, it will be clearly in their minds that this will be the pay schedule and each salary level will have to be reduced. This will not pull us up to the B level of Class II institutions on the AAUP scale. Atkeson moved to add at the end of the third paragraph after rank: "and shall be for the academic year 1977-78 only." Garton seconded. Potter called the question on the Atkeson amendment, and it passed. Potter called the question on the Hursey and Kane amendments. Hand count vote was 15 for and 18 against. The question was called on the main resolution. Hand count vote was 14 for and 19 against. The resolution failed.

Atkeson presented and moved the resolution on the Chancellor Search Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for May 17, 1977.) Castellow seconded. The question was called and the resolution passed.

Sehgal reported that Mrs. Gross and he met with Mr. A. C. Dawson and Mr. Lloyd Issacs of the NCAE in Raleigh. Mr. Issacs is extremely knowledgeable about TSERS and he answered all the questions raised. In the last week of April, Mr. Harlan Boyles, State Treasurer, also in a letter to Sehgal, answered most of the questions about TSERS. In summary Sehgal said:

1. The State Retirement System is financially extremely sound.
2. In the future, the retirement benefits may be liberalized. The money for increasing such benefits is there.
3. Mr. Boyles refused to compare TSERS and TIAA-CREF. The two systems are different in their philosophies. The problems encountered in trying to compare the two under a standard set of assumptions are hard but can be handled by Faculty Welfare Committee.
4. He and some of his colleagues would be meeting with Mr. Boyles in Raleigh on May 23, 1977. He asked for questions that need to be raised.

Sehgal passed a table illustrating retirement benefits under TSERS. (See attachment.) His major conclusion was that if salary raises are at about 3.5% per annum, the AFC and the retirement benefits are fair. Anyone getting less than 3.5% per annum raise in salary may not be fairly treated in retirement benefits in later years.

Hursey distributed another table. (See attachment.) He noted the TIAA does well with the money sent them to invest. E. Ryan moved the following resolution: "The Faculty Senate supports Professor Prem Sehgal's efforts to clarify the status of faculty retirement benefits and is grateful to him for his efforts." Adler seconded. The question was called, and the motion passed.

G. General College Committee. Eugene Ryan presented the report from the General College Committee for Edward Leahy, chairperson. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for May 17, 1977.) He noted that Ferrell was the chairman of the subcommittee that drew up this report. E. Ryan moved to approve the report. J. A. Jones seconded. Ferrell moved to amend line 9 to read "consultation with the General College Committee and the chairperson of the appropriate academic unit." Potter seconded. Yarbrough asked if some units could have a high number of advisees. The answer was yes. Yarbrough expressed concern over giving \$2500 to certain faculty for performing a service which is a function of the past. The question was called on the Ferrell amendment and it passed. Garrison asked where this money will come from. Adler answered that it is hoped the administration would support this and help get the money. There is no secure source for this now. Ferrell noted this \$62,500 is for the benefit of the students. The General College is in a mess. The money would not be a gift; it would be well earned. He added that Chapel Hill has had this procedure for twenty years. The major point here is what happens to the freshmen coming in. The last paragraph of the report is the important one. Yadav remarked that the advising in the General College needs improvement but just because Chapel Hill approves this procedure does not mean that ECU has to do it. Everett noted the trouble is in the departments and not in the General College itself. The job of advising is looked down upon by some chairmen. A solution would be to let the chairman select senior faculty members for advisors instead of new faculty members. Ferrell noted we won't get this money if we don't ask for it. Sparrow asked if this money would come from that already appropriated for salaries. Ferrell replied this would not diminish any salary money already appropriated. Sparrow and Lao expressed support for the report. Lao commented that if faculty were paid to

advise, they might do a better job. Woodside remarked that there is no guarantee of getting good people just by paying them. Collins said he has seen some poor advising because the job is looked down on. If this report is passed, there will be good results. Gantt spoke against the report. It is unfair to pay some faculty for advising here when faculty may have to advise within their own department without being paid. Brown asked why Dean Bailey doesn't hold a workshop for advisors. E. Ryan replied because no one would attend. Yarbrough mentioned there is sloppy work in advising because chairmen in the units do not tell the advisors that this affects their pay raises. Woodside said there is a double standard here for those who advise within their units and those in General College. Reep suggested raising the standard and take advising more seriously because this is beneficial to the students and that's why we are here in the first place. The question was called on the amended proposal and passed.

H. Calendar Committee. R. B. Keusch, chairperson, presented the report from the Calendar Committee. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for May 17, 1977.) Keusch moved to reconsider the 1978-79 calendar and Tadlock seconded. Sparrow said at the April 27, 1976 Faculty Senate meeting it was moved and approved that the Senate accept as information only the three added years (1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81) and instruct the Calendar Committee to make a careful survey of the 1977-78 experience. The calendar for 1978-79 could be submitted in December since the problem lay with the fall calendar and not with the spring. He spoke in opposition to reconsider now. Keusch said there is not enough time to get this decided before it is needed by the administration and others for planning. South suggested waiting until after we experienced the fall semester since there will be adequate time to make adjustments. Keusch said we need to consider the end rather than the beginning of the semester calendar. There is no way we can have the complete experience. J. A. Jones commented that some experience is better than none. The question was called on the motion to reconsider. Hand count vote was 19 for and 10 against reconsideration. Keusch distributed a handout. (See attachment.) He noted there will be a rotating exam schedule and after nine semesters, it will return to the beginning. Keusch moved to approve the summer calendar for 1978, and Everett seconded. The question was called, and the summer calendar passed. South distributed a copy of pages 3 and 4 from the Faculty Senate Agenda of April 27, 1976 which compares the 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80, and 1980-81 calendars. He wished to discuss the concepts which had apparently shaped the fall semesters for 1978-79, 1979-80, and 1980-81. He wanted to call attention to the number of instructional days in these semesters. It appears that the primary force that shaped the fall semesters was an aim to retain half of what we have on the quarter system. We now have 150 instructional days. In the last three semester calendars, there are 75 instructional days in the fall. A second force in shaping the fall semesters also seemed to be at work. This was a desire to get an even number of instructional days (M-F), so that there will be the same number of days for labs. Although the aim to have the same number of days for labs is to be commended, such an aim can lead to a distorted fall semester. The Calendar Committee used a certain Monday in August as the starting date. In the calendars for 1978-79, 1979-80, and 1980-81, this starting date moves toward the beginning of the month: August 21, August 20 and August 18. There is a great deal in the fall semester: three beginning days, 75 instructional days, a reading day and an examination period of approximately six days. It is difficult to squeeze all of this in without a fairly early starting date in August. We should also remember that most people prefer to get out at least four or five days before Christmas. Adler ruled the vote now would only be on the 1978-79 calendar. Bassman asked why we have more days than Chapel Hill. Keusch replied they are stuck. Castellow asked what will prevent us from becoming stuck with 75 days. Keusch answered that we do not need to adhere to a certain thing. Garrison asked why we have this great number of days. Keusch replied that some departments need more contact days. Sparrow noted that the semester system was supported by many faculty because it would reduce contact days. Woodside said we should accept this calendar in order to get used to the teaching time under the semester system. South commented that you don't achieve

that much in more teaching days. E. Ryan moved that the 1978-79 calendar be recommitted until the fall and that the Calendar Committee draw up a new calendar with a maximum of 71 days and a later starting date. Sparrow seconded. Hodgins suggested that if the motion passed, an amendment might be added to consider a way to avoid common exams before the end of classes. Everett spoke against the motion. If the number of days is reduced, this will throw off the lab experiments. The question was called for recommitment. Hand count vote was 18 for and 15 against recommitment.

I. Instructional Survey Committee. Marie Farr, chairperson, presented a report from the committee. The survey (of faculty, administrators, and students) for outstanding teachers has been held. The concept of administrator was redefined to include the chairperson of each unit. The computer program includes course level as a variable this year. The important difference is that the voting took place by ballot boxes instead of preregistration. There was a good response from the administration with 20 votes. There were 212 faculty returns and no final count has been made on the student returns at this time with only about 1000 returns now. The committee will probably return to the preregistration method next year. The committee will meet on Thursday to see if a recommendation can be made to the Alumni Association. A report will be made to the Senate in the fall before any further action is taken by the committee on this survey. The committee hopes to develop an evaluation instrument to be used next year. A distribution of the method used this year will be sent to all faculty later. E. Ryan moved the Senate go on record that it supports any nomination made by the committee for the awards. Ferrell seconded. The question was called on the Ryan motion, and it passed.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Atkeson presented the Resolution Concerning Leave for Professional Development. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for May 17, 1977.) He moved approval and Sehgal seconded. Yadav noted this will be a problem in the small departments that have only a few faculty members. Atkeson replied that the departments can decide whether or not to do this. The question was called and the resolution passed.

Sparrow moved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Joseph Calder, Director of Security, is talking of raising parking fees to a level of \$10 to \$25 next year,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Chairman of the Faculty write a letter to the East Carolina administration and to Director Calder expressing the Senate's and Faculty's opposition to an increase in faculty parking fees.

Sehgal seconded. The question was called and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Conner Atkeson
Secretary

Sharon Johnston
Faculty Senate Office Secretary

RESOLUTION COMMENDING CHAIRMAN ADLER

WHEREAS, Professor Philip Adler was called under exceptional circumstances to serve as Chairman of the Faculty during the present Academic year, and

WHEREAS, he has contributed to the advancement of academic progress as Chairman of the Faculty during the present Academic year, and

WHEREAS, he has been an efficient and valuable spokesman for general and particular faculty interests and concerns,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University expresses its appreciation for the services rendered by Chairman Adler and values his presence as a colleague and faculty leader at the University.

Enabling amendment: Forward this resolution to Chancellor Jenkins/
Chairperson Herbert Paschal, History Department

RESOLUTION ON SALARY EQUALIZATION

WHEREAS, President Friday in his visit to ECU in the Fall of 1976 said that funds would be sought for the improvement of ECU salary schedule for 1977-78 Academic year, thereby recognizing that inequalities exist in faculty salaries, and

WHEREAS, the ECU Faculty Senate believes that these funds should be distributed according to criteria,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that funds for the improvement of the ECU salary schedule made available for 1977-78 be utilized for faculty members within each rank on a university-wide basis, taking into consideration (1) the ECU average salary within that rank, (2) the highest degree earned by the faculty member, and (3) the number of years served at ECU. This criteria should be applied separately to those with 9 months and 12 months contracts. This increase should be in addition to such salary increase as the faculty member shall receive from the funds made available for annual increases.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ECU Faculty Senate requests that the Administration publish the equalization standard for the information of the Faculty.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY REPORT

The Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina met in Chapel Hill on April 29. East Carolina University Delegates Daugherty, Ferrell and Woodside were in attendance. Alternate James McDaniel served in the place of Delegate Williams, owing to departmental conflicts with the latter's schedule. President William C. Friday noted that it was an unusually busy season. The General Assembly had required considerable information from the General Administration. The Faculty Assembly request that the Board of Governors be authorized by the Legislature to extend the privilege of tuition-free enrollment to any full-time University staff member or full-time faculty member of the rank of instructor or above to be exercised at any of the constituent institutions is before the General Assembly as amendment to G. S. 116-143 (Tuition Waiver). Attention was given by President Friday to the continual difficulties the University has encountered with various federal authorities over desegregation plans. The problem of improving institutions will be solved by time and money. No word on salaries was available, but the present prospect is 6.5% for the first year of the biennium, none for the second. An additional increment of approximately 2.5% equal to State Personnel Act employees fringe benefits has been requested. An additional fund of one million dollars has been requested for upgrading salaries at certain institutions, including East Carolina University. The President expressed concern over faculty support for these proposals and urged any concerns the faculties held be expressed to their representatives.

Vice President Felix Joyner noted that \$50 million is expected for capital improvements. Vice President Raymond Dawson informed the Assembly of a proposed resolution by Representative John Gamble that would study faculty "work loads" and assess the true cost of tuition in the State University systems. The proposition is apparently designed to eliminate the tuition differential between public and private schools in higher education. Vice President John Saunders commented upon a proposed "open meetings" bill that would open faculty meetings of all institutions to the public as well as other government agencies. The ECU delegation raised the question as to how it is that administrators throughout the system have minimum salary scales, whereas none exist for faculty.

In elections for 1977-78 academic year, Professor Roy Carroll of Appalachian State University was elected Chairman. Professor Daugherty was elected Chairperson of the University Community Committee. Professor Ferrell was elected Chairperson of Faculty Development. Professor Woodside was elected Chairperson of the Committee on Committees. No formal resolutions were forthcoming, but in committee reports and discussions the results of the Teacher Education survey by the General Administration are beginning to appear. One institution reported that a guideline has been issued by the General Administration that a teacher education program with five graduates annually or less is nonproductive. This guideline has been applied to fifteen institutions. At present the initiation of dropping Teacher Education degree programs still resides at the local campus. Some institutions reported growing interest in faculty governance at local institutions. The delegation at UNC-CH noted that considerable unrest exists there, owing to an outmoded governance instrument.

Respectfully submitted,

ECU Faculty Assembly Delegation

In compliance with the resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 15, 1977, the Faculty Governance Committee has undertaken a study of the relationship of the Faculty Senate to the academic components of East Carolina University and has made the following preliminary findings:

- I. Several passages in the Faculty Manual are instructive. First, at page 7 it is provided: "The Faculty Senate is the legislative and advisory body which represents the General Faculty and provides the means by which the faculty is enabled to fulfill its function with respect to faculty welfare and academic and educational policies exclusive of graduate programs." In Appendix A, Constitution of the Faculty Senate, East Carolina University, V. Organization of the Faculty Senate (pages 110-111), it is further provided:

All faculty members of East Carolina University are eligible to vote for representatives to or serve in the Faculty Senate who have the rank of instructor or above and who are tenured or are under yearly contracts with East Carolina University as full-time faculty members. The membership of the Faculty Senate shall consist of elected representatives and of ex-officio members.

. . . Electoral units for the purposes of this constitution shall be the various schools (including the Division of Continuing Education, the Division of Library Services, and the Counseling Center) and the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Thus the relationship to the academic components appears to be somewhat indirect in that the Senate represents the General Faculty the members of which are appointed to academic units or components. These units coincide with the electoral units specified by the Constitution of the Faculty Senate.

- II. The Graduate School is an administrative, not an academic component. The Faculty Senate has no jurisdiction over the policies and programs of the Graduate School. This conclusion is based primarily on the passage from the Faculty Manual cited above and the following further evidence:

- A. The Faculty Manual, at page 16, provides: "The Graduate Council, as the representative body of the Graduate Faculty, sends its recommendations directly to the Chancellor."

- B. In a letter to the Chairman of the Faculty, dated February 24, 1977, Chancellor Jenkins made a response to the Faculty Senate's creation of a Committee on Educational Policies and Planning. The Chancellor's letter included the following pertinent passage:

I will not approve the charge of a Faculty Senate Committee which includes jurisdiction over any graduate programs. The Graduate Faculty has been established to exercise 'the authority within the University for the development of general policies and procedures for the graduate courses and programs.' The Graduate Council has been authorized to exercise 'final jurisdiction over procedural matters and over most policy matters.' This establishment of the Graduate Faculty and Graduate Council removed all graduate matters from the purview of the Faculty Senate. I do not wish to change this arrangement.

In view of the University's clear policy on the issue, the Governance Committee did not consider it necessary to examine the possible effects of Faculty Senate jurisdiction over graduate policies and programs on their status with accreditation agencies.

III. Except to the extent that it has advisory capacities concerning the General Faculty of East Carolina University and its welfare, the Faculty Senate has no jurisdiction over the present academic policies and programs of the Medical School. The Faculty Senate has been given no specific jurisdiction over Medical School academic policies and programs. Moreover, the Medical Doctor (M.D. Degree, a first professional degree) and courses to be offered by the Medical School differ markedly from those under Faculty Senate jurisdiction: The professional degree is not a baccalaureate degree and courses to be offered by the Medical School, unlike those under Faculty Senate jurisdiction, clearly are not normally open to enrollment by students seeking baccalaureate degrees. Finally, any graduate degree program initiated by the Medical School would be under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council, not the Faculty Senate. These considerations, combined with accreditation difficulties which would appear likely to arise if the Faculty Senate attempted to assume jurisdiction over Medical School policies and programs, have prompted the Committee to conclude that the Faculty Senate neither possesses, nor should attempt to assume, jurisdiction over Medical School academic policies and programs.

As indicated, Faculty of the Medical School should continue to enjoy representation in the Faculty Senate, just as do all members of the General Faculty of East Carolina University. The Faculty Senate has authority to advise in matters of concern to the General Faculty; and all East Carolina University faculty are thus entitled to be represented in Senate decision-making.

Some Illustrative Examples of Benefits Under TSERS

Case	Salary Increment	Years of Service	Age Group	Personal Contribution @ 6%	State's Contribution @ 9.12%	Investment Results (Rate)	\$ @ age 65 Personal Contributions	\$ @ age 65 State's Contributions	\$ @ age 65 Total Contributions (10)=(8)+(9)	Average Final Compensation (AFC) (11)	Formula-based retirement per year (12)	Amount of annuity per year (@ 5% 20 years) (13)	Retirement as percent of annuity (14)= $\frac{(12)}{(13)} \times 100$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)=(8)+(9)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)= $\frac{(12)}{(13)} \times 100$
A	3%	30	25-55	\$28,547	\$ 43,391	5%	80,178	121,669	201,847	22,555	\$10,150	\$16,196	62.67%
B	3%	30	35-65	\$38,362	\$ 58,310	5%	97,188	147,725	244,913	30,312	13,640	19,652	69.41%
C	3%	40	25-65	\$45,241	\$ 68,766	5%	118,974	180,785	299,759	30,312	18,187	24,717	73.58%
D	4%	40	25-65	\$49,828	\$ 75,739	4%	115,224	175,140	290,364	43,566	26,140	23,300	112.13%
E	5%	40	25-65	\$72,479	\$132,454	5%	168,936	256,782	425,718	62,408	37,445	34,161	109.6 %
F	0	40	26-65	\$24,000	\$ 36,480	5%	72,480	110,169	182,649	10,000	6,000	14,656	40.9%

Assumptions in the above calculations:

1. Starting salary @ age 25=\$10,000. It grows or does not grow at a certain rate.
2. Individual contribution/year=6% of salary.
3. State's contribution/year=9.12% of salary
4. Retirement Income/year=Average final compensation (AFC) for 4 consecutive best years X years of service X 0.015.
5. Features not considered in above calculations
 - a) Disability and death benefits
 - b) Cost of living increases at retirement
 - c) Inequities in salary increases

Some conclusions:

1. It appears that under the present formula anyone getting a salary increment of 3% or below will get less than 100% of the annuity value at retirement (Cases A,B,C).
2. If the factor in formula for calculating retirement benefits is changed to 0.02 from its present value of 0.015, retirement benefits are more equitable (cases A,B, and C).
3. If cost of living increases are assumed @ 3% after retirement, the benefits at retirement are the same as if the formula had a factor of 0.02.
4. If both changes in formula and cost of living increases in retirement benefits are assumed, everyone is more than fairly treated as judged by percent of annuity value.
5. For salary increases of 4% and investment returns at 4% or alternatively salary increases of 5% and investment returns of 5%, everyone gets more than annuity value figures.
6. The last example (F) illustrates no increment in salary. The benefits at retirement are very poor. Such a person would be better off depositing money in a savings account or being a member of TIAA-CREF. The same will hold true if percent increases in salary in the next 5-10 years are less than 4% or if they are frozen for any length of time.

13 CASE	ANNUAL SALARY INCREMENT	AGE GROUP	AFC	RETIREMENT IN TSERS (NO SS INCLUDED)	RETIREMENT IN TSERS (1 SS per yr., \$1700, included)	RETIREMENT IN TIAA (NO SS INCLUDED)	RETIREMENT IN TIAA (1 SS per yr., \$1700, included)
A	3%	25 - 65	\$30,312	\$18,185 (60% AFC)	\$19,205 (63% AFC)	\$25,608 (85% AFC)	\$28,464 (95% AFC)
B	3%	30 - 65	\$26,141	\$15,685 (52.5% AFC)	\$16,705 (64% AFC)	\$17,900 (69% AFC)	\$19,975 (77% AFC)
C	3%	35 - 65	\$22,550	\$10,148 (45% AFC)	\$11,168 (50% AFC)	\$12,288 (55% AFC)	\$13,775 (62% AFC)
D	0%	30 - 65	\$10,000	\$5,250 (52.5% AFC)	\$6,270 (63% AFC)	\$12,204 (122% AFC)	\$14,280 (143% AFC)

In all above examples, a beginning salary of \$10,000 per annum is assumed. For TIAA calculations, it is assumed that all payments are made to TIAA (none to CREF), that a single life annuity with 10 year guarantee is selected, and that 1973 TIAA annuity rates and dividends (excluding extra dividends) prevail during the working years. Had 1975 TIAA annuity rates and dividends been assumed, retirement figures for TIAA would have been 8 - 12% higher.

(a) SS - Summer School

(b) AFC - Average Final Compensation - average of four highest consecutive years salary.

HANDOUT FROM KEUSCH

ANALYSIS OF SEMESTER CALENDARS -- 1977-78

FALL SEMESTER

	ECU	UNC-CH	U. Texas
Registration	T Aug 23	MTW Aug 22-24	MTW Aug 22-24
Drop Add	W Aug 24	(Incl in reg'n)	F Aug 26
Classes Begin	Th Aug 25	Th Aug 25	M Aug 29
Labor Day	M Sep 5	M Sep 5	M Sep 5
Thanksgiving	ThFS Nov 24-26	ThFS Nov 24-26	ThFS Nov 24-26
Classes End	F Dec 9	T Dec 6	F Dec 9
Reading Day	M Dec 12	W Dec 7	M Dec 12
Exams Begin	T Dec 13	Th Dec 8	T Dec 13
Exams End	T Dec 20	S Dec 17	T Dec 20
Graduation Day	---	---	Sa Dec 24

Comparison of:

1. Total Class days M-F:	74	71	72
2. Class Days on MWF:	44	42	43
3. Class Days on TTh:	30	29	29
4. Examination days:	6	9	6
5. Common Examination Days:	2	None Spec.	None Spec.
6. Total class and exam days:	82	80	78
7. Total "work" days from Registration to End of Exams	85	84	83

SPRING SEMESTER

	ECU	UNC-CH	U. Texas
Registration	M Jan 9	MT Jan 9-10	MTW Jan 9-11
Drop Add	T Jan 10	(Incl in reg'n)	F Jan 13
Classes Begin	W Jan 11	W Jan 11	M Jan 16
Spring Recess	Su-Su Mar 5-12	Mar 6-10	Mar 20-25
State Holiday	M Mar 27	M Mar 27	
Classes End	F Apr 28	Th Apr 27	F May 5
Reading Day	M May 1	F Apr 28	M May 8
Exams Begin	T May 2	M May 1	T May 9
Exams End	T May 9	W May 10	T May 16
Commencement	Su May 14	Su May 14	Sa May 20

Comparison of:

1. Total class days M-F:	72	71	75
2. Class days on MWF:	43	42	45
3. Class days on TTh:	29	29	30
4. Examination Days:	6	9	6
5. Common Examination Days:	2	None Spec.	None Spec.
6. Total class and exam days:	80	80	81
7. Total "work" days from Registration to End of Exams	83	83	86

HANDOUT FROM KEUSCH

ANALYSIS OF CALENDARS -- 1978-79

FALL SEMESTER

	ECU	UNC--Chapel Hill
Registration	T Aug 22	MTW Aug 21-23
Drop Add	W Aug 23	(Incl. in reg'n days)
Classes Begin	Th Aug 24	Th Aug 24
Labor Day Holiday	M Sep 4	M Sep 4
Thanksgiving Holiday	ThFS Nov 23-25	ThFS Nov 23-25
Classes End	M Dec 11	T Dec 5
Reading Day	T Dec 12	W Dec 6
Exams Begin	W Dec 13	Th Dec 7
Exams End	W Dec 20	S Dec 16

Comparison of:

1. Total class days M-F:	75	71
2. Class Days on MWF:	45	42
3. Class Days on TTh:	30	29
4. Examination Days:	6	9
5. Common Examination Days:	1	None Spec.
6. Total class and exam Days:	82	80
7. Total "Work" days from Registration to End of Exams:	85	84

SPRING SEMESTER

	ECU	UNC--Chapel Hill
Registration	M Jan 8	MT Jan 8-9
Drop Add	T Jan 9	(Incl. in reg'n days)
Classes Begin	W Jan 10	W Jan 10
Spring Recess	Su-Su Mar 4-11	M-F Mar 5-9
State Holiday	M Apr 16	M Apr 16
Classes End	M Apr 30	Th Apr 26
Reading Day	T May 1	F Apr 27
Exams Begin	W May 2	M Apr 30
Exams End	W May 9	W May 9
Commencement	Su May 13	Su May 13

Comparison of:

1. Total class days M-F:	73	71
2. Class days on MWF:	44	42
3. Class days on TTh:	29	29
4. Examination Days:	6	9
5. Common Exam Days:	1	None Spec.
6. Total class and exam Days:	80	80
7. Total "Work" days from Registration to End of Exams:	83	83