

FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1979/80 will be held on Tuesday, October 23, 1979, at 2:10 p.m. in Room 221, Mendenhall Student Center.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes
3. Special Order of the Day
 - A. Announcements
 - B. Report from the Faculty Assembly (Professor Patricia Daugherty)
4. Unfinished Business
5. Report of Committees
 - A. Committee on Committees (Professor E. Ryan) (See Faculty Senate Agenda of September 25, 1979, Agenda Item 5B Attachment)
 - B. Curriculum Committee (Professor W. Grossnickle)
 1. Change in BS Degree in Medical Technology
 2. Change in BS Degree in Nursing
 3. Change in BSBA Degree (Accounting Options)

(See Curriculum Committee Minutes for September 20, and October 4, 1979)
 - C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee (Professor Patricia Daugherty) (See Attachment)
 - D. General College Committee (Professor Henry Ferrell) (See Attachment)
 - E. Student Scholarships, Fellowships & Financial Aid Committee (Professor Robert Hause) (See Attachment)
6. New Business
 - A. Parking
 1. Resolution (Professor Wilson Luquire) (See Attachment)
 2. Question Concerning Towing Policy

Agenda Item 5C: (Please see page 4)

Agenda Item 5D: General College Committee - Attachment

REPORT ON GENERAL COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADVISING

The proposed resolution enables development of an advisor cadre that has demonstrated provision of successful academic counseling to students. It promotes counseling by faculty with sustaining interest in advising, and provides mechanisms that assist their informed judgments concerning programs, procedures and requirements. It insures accessibility of advisors to students during two, twenty-minute intervals each academic year. It provides continuity throughout the two-year General College experience. It encourages investigation of specific disciplines, while it supports student development of functional, generic skills (e.g. proficiency in reception and expression of ideas both verbally and mathematically; application of understanding of scientific method, by acquiring and analyzing information which leads to scientific conclusions, and appraisal of those conclusions).

We believe that the proposed resolution enables faculty accountability for academic counseling and rewards both faculty and departments for active participation. Further, it will enhance direct communication between the General College administration and its advisors.

The proposed resolution was ranked by the Committee as requiring intermediate levels of financial support. Costs will accrue through: purchase, installation, and operation of data base management computer software; changes in policies governing current General College advising; and costs associated with production and maintenance of the midsemester reporting protocol.

Release time accorded General College advisors (i.e. teaching loads reduced by three hours each semester or similar compensation) and statement of an East Carolina University policy which demonstrates commitment to academic counseling, and rewards faculty advisors through promotion and tenure considerations, must also be considered costs of the proposed resolution.

We wish to acknowledge the General College administration's diligence for preventing chaos in an advising system constrained by woefully inadequate student data management systems and insufficient advising protocols. As "new students" (with increasingly differential educational and experiential capabilities) put pressure upon existing advising systems, a revised, comprehensive advising system will be critical to counsel students in fulfilling program requirements and achieving academic excellence.

Respectfully submitted,

General College Committee

Resolution on General College Academic Advising

Solicit and evaluate applications from which to select a cadre of advisors, each assigned approximately 43 advisees. Advisors will serve those students for both years of the General College experience. Advisor teaching loads will be reduced by 3 hours each semester (or similar compensation). Freshmen advising in summer should be continued as under current procedures.

Agenda Item 5E: Student Scholarships, Fellowships and Financial Aid Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Academic Units
FROM: Student Scholarships, Fellowships and Financial Aid Committee
SUBJECT: Requests to the Committee to Approve or to Award Scholarships

In the past the SSF and FA Committee has been asked by academic units to assist in the awarding of departmental scholarships in two ways:

- (1) approval of recipients selected by the department
- (2) selection of a recipient from a number of candidates

In the future we ask that the enclosed guidelines be followed in these instances for the following reasons:

- (1) procedures need to be uniform for all requests.
- (2) one of our functions is to hear appeals in all matters related to financial aid. This can be done only with pertinent data on file.

We ask for your cooperation and help through the use of the guidelines.

Guidelines for Awarding Undergraduate
School, College, or Department Scholarships

Before requesting the Student Scholarships, Fellowships and Financial Aid Committee to approve an award, please follow the procedures below.

1. A unit committee of at least three persons should oversee the announcement and selection procedures.
2. The scholarship and its criteria should be publicly announced at least 30 days before the application deadline in such places as the "East Carolinian," departmental bulletin boards, club newsletters, etc., as appropriate.
3. In order for the committee to have an over-all view, at the time of submission for approval of an award, the SSF and FA Committee must receive copies of the announcement and the criteria along with the names of the candidates. Criteria should place emphasis on Grade Point Average, Academic Awards, professional activity and similar objectives considerations.
4. The unit committee may recommend the recipient(s) or submit a list of nominees (no more than 3 per award) in priority order from which the SSF and FA Committee may choose. The list of recommended recipients should be accompanied by a list of all candidates considered for each award.
5. The attached recommended application form, obtainable from the Financial Aid office, ~~must be forwarded~~ to the committee for each candidate considered for the scholarship.
6. One completed departmental Nominee/Recipient Form (attached) must accompany all material submitted as outlined above.

7. Definition of Terms:

- a. Recipient: an individual recommended for a scholarship by a unit committee
- b. Nominees: two or three persons recommended by a unit committee to the SSF and FA Committee for consideration for a scholarship.
- c. Candidates: all individuals who apply for a departmental (unit) scholarship.

Agenda Item 6A.1: Resolution Submitted by Professor Wilson Luquire

WHEREAS, Many parking spaces on the mid-campus area (between Fifth and Tenth Streets) are assigned to Residence Hall Student parking, and

WHEREAS, Residence Hall students who are in the central campus area (Clement, White, Fletcher, Garrett, Greene, Jarvis, Cotten, Fleming, etc.) do not need a car to get to the university daily, and

WHEREAS, Remote parking lots are particularly inconvenient for day students, faculty and staff who must always commute to campus, and

WHEREAS, Faculty and staff have professional and university business which take them to and from the campus frequently, and

WHEREAS, The parking lots in the J. Y. Joyner Library and Mendenhall Student Center area are unavailable until at least mid-December;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That as a reasonable temporary solution all Residence Hall parking (sometimes called Dorm spaces) be converted to day student, faculty, and staff parking until the parking lot construction is complete, that central campus Residence Hall students be provided flexible shuttle service to and from the more distant lots near the College Hill area, the Ficklen Stadium area, Belk Building area, and the Willis Building area.

Agenda Item 5C: Committee on Educational Policies and Planning

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: The Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (Pat Daugherty)

It has been proposed that class bells be turned off in all academic buildings. The Committee refers this matter to the Senate without recommendation.

Minutes
Faculty Senate of East Carolina University
2nd Regular Session of 1979/80 Academic Year
23 October 1979

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 23 October 1979, at 2:10 p.m. in Mendenhall Student Center, Room 221. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Thomas Johnson. Upon the calling of the roll, the following members were absent: Rasch (Art), Davis (Allied Health), Haskins (Drama and Speech), Baker (Geography), Cheng (Health Affairs Library), Haigwood (Nursing), Fulghum (Medicine), Tadlock (Aerospace). The following alternates were present: Kares for Luquire (Library Services), Dewar for Tester (Technology). The following members later joined the session: Rose for Haigwood, Tadlock, Baker, Fulghum, Cheng. The following were present by invitation: Bell (Director of Purchasing), Meyer (Vice Chancellor for Student Life).

The minutes of the September 25, 1979 session of the Faculty Senate were amended as follows: Page 6, 7th paragraph, first line, to read: "C. Adler asked for a definition of freshman. Ferrell said no more than 31 semester hours (Ferrell)." Page 7, paragraph 4, line 4 should read: "Sayetta said that it could be done, but that a comparison of the scores from different disciplines would not be very meaningful (Nischan)." Page 8, line 10 should read ". . .Grossnickle said that if a survey were to be done this fall there would be no protection against photo copying (Grossnickle)." Page 8, paragraph 2, last sentence should read "The committee recommended that Affirmative Action be included in the planning process (P. Daugherty)." The minutes were approved as amended.

The Chair proposed the following changes to the published agenda: That Agenda Item 3, Special Order of the Day, be changed to add as Item A., Report on Parking Study by John Bell, thereby making Announcements Item B, and Report from the Faculty Assembly, Item C. Also that Agenda Item 5.E become Agenda Item 5.A.1, and 5.A become Agenda Item 5.A.2. He proposed adding a Faculty Affairs Committee report on Appendix D as Agenda Item 5.E.

C. Adler raised an objection to the changing of the order of the agenda. After discussion, Woodside moved that the proposed agenda changes be approved. Bolt seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Agenda Item 3.A: Report on Parking Study (Mr. John Bell). Mr. Bell, at the request of Chancellor Brewer, gave the Senate a brief history of the parking study. The Board of Trustees commissioned the study in the spring of 1979 and in August the contract was awarded to Kimley-Horn and Associates, based in Atlanta and Raleigh. The scope of the contract was outlined: the consultants will determine university parking needs and develop a master parking program for the university; they will evaluate access and circulation of parking on the university campus proper and develop a traffic flow plan. Representatives of the firm have been on campus several times for an overview of the situation and meetings with the Security and Traffic office, obtaining base mapping, information on current construction projects, etc. The firm may do a survey of students, faculty and staff, on a random, sample basis. (Fulghum joined the session) After additional information is acquired, the firm would like to present the data and solicit comments and suggestions before making further recommendations to the university. This would probably be in November. In about two weeks the consultants will have individuals on campus to do accumulation and usage studies. The total number of cars on campus will be counted to determine parking demand. Turnover, car movement, and vacant spaces will be determined.

Professor Nischan asked two questions: How much is the parking study going to cost, and why did the university go to an outside firm when there is a competent Geography Department right here? Mr. Bell said the study is going to cost approximately \$36,000. The original estimate was \$70,000, but through negotiation the estimate was revised downward. He did not know why an outside firm was contracted, only that the Board of Trustees told the Chancellor to request outside consulting help. Mr. Bell said the consulting firm comes very highly recommended and has had similar experience at other universities along the eastern seaboard, including Vanderbilt University, the University of Virginia, and North Carolina State University. Brewer mentioned that a Senate resolution passed last year called for outside consultant help. (See Resolutions Passed 79-1.)

C. Adler asked if the consulting firm had been given any guidelines from which to operate, such as where student parking should be. Mr. Bell said that at this point they have not been given any specific guidelines but have only been making themselves aware of the current parking situation, parking regulations, etc. His impression is they want to solicit this information at a later date after they have gathered the raw data. (Cheng joined the session.)

Agenda Item 3.B: Announcements. The Chair made the following remarks and announcements.

1. The following Resolutions were acted upon by the Chancellor on October 5, 1979: Resolution 79-35, Summer School Calendar was approved; Resolution 79-36, Midsemester Grades, was deferred for further study; Resolution 79-37, Faculty Salaries, was referred to President Friday with Chancellor Brewer's letter attached. The chair read Chancellor Brewer's letter (see attachment).

2. The Chair read a copy of a memorandum to Dr. Ronald Thiele, Dean of the School of Allied Health and Social Professions, advising him that he had been elected by the Administrative Council as their representative to the Senate. The Chair welcomed Dr. Thiele to the Senate.

3. Chancellor Brewer has appointed an ad hoc committee to draw up a charge for a new campus facilities committee. This committee will include faculty, staff, and students, and will advise the Chancellor on matters of facilities planning. Dr. Charles Moore will convene the group which will report to the Chancellor. The membership of the ad hoc committee is: Charles Moore, William Byrd, Paul Breitman, and Jim Lowry.

4. On October 9, 1979, Vice Chancellor Maier established an ad hoc Building Program Committee for the Remodeling of Wright Auditorium with Dean Everett Pittman the Chair. Other members are Rudolph Alexander, George Bissinger, Susan McDaniel, Charles Moore, Edgar Loessin, Gil Moore, and Carl Tadlock. The charge of the committee is as follows:

1. To develop an appropriate description of contemplated program activities for Wright Auditorium;
2. To interpret and recommend the future program activities to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the architect for his/her consideration;
3. To bring to the attention of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs any space requests resulting from the above program description and not being accommodated by the proposed remodeling which must be considered to be assigned in other campus facilities.

5. The Board of Trustees will meet on Saturday, November 10, 1979.
6. The membership list of academic committees and their officers will be distributed following the senate meeting with the appropriate changes in ex officio membership, with or without student membership.
7. The second meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Thursday, October 25, 1979, at 2:10 p.m. in this room.
8. The Chair read a letter from Vice President Dawson to the members of Faculty Assembly Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Committee on Governance, and the Faculty Chairmen of the Constituent Institutions, calling a meeting on Tuesday, October 30, to discuss a new revised draft of the Policy Statement on External Professional Activities.
9. The Chair appointed Professor Bernard Kane of Allied Health to fill the unexpired term of Professor Ben Spangler on the Credits Committee. The term expires in 1980.
10. The fourth draft of the revised ECU Code has been prepared by the Faculty Governance Committee. It is still under consideration.
11. The Committee for Teaching Effectiveness will have a second open hearing on the student opinion survey on Wednesday, October 24, at 4:00 p.m. in Mendenhall. All interested faculty are urged to attend.
12. A letter from Sharon Johnston was read expressing her appreciation for the plaque given her at the September 25th session for her years of service to the faculty.
13. The Chair introduced Pat Woolard, the new Faculty Senate Office Secretary.
14. The Woman's Club Annual Dinner for International Faculty and Students will be on Friday, November 2, at 6:30 p.m. in the Woman's Club Building. Anyone wishing to attend should call Dean Fulghum before Monday, October 29. Anyone of international origin, even though American citizens, may attend.

Agenda Item 3.C: The report of the Faculty Assembly was presented by Professor Patricia Daugherty (see attachment).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Agenda Item 4. There was no unfinished business.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Agenda Item 5.A.1: The report of the Student Scholarships, Fellowships, and Financial Aid Committee was presented by Professor Robert Hause, the Chair. Hause referred the Senate to the Agenda which contains a memorandum and guidelines and asked for Senate approval so they may be sent to all academic units. The committee hopes to obtain some assistance from departments which request the committee to award scholarships to students recommended by their departments.

Grossnickle asked if this material is to be used only for those honor societies which ask the committee to make a selection and is it in no way an attempt to take that prerogative from honor societies? Professor Hause said that is exactly right. Last semester the committee participated in awarding approximately 13 scholarships and this is an effort to achieve some uniformity of procedure. Maier questioned item number 4 of the guidelines for information purposes. He asked if when a unit

submits to the committee a list of recommended recipients by priority order if there is flexibility to the extent that the committee may not follow the priority order. If that happens does the committee communicate with the department or negotiate as to why the order was not followed? Hause said that it is implied that the committee may not take recommendations in priority order; he is certain that in that case the committee could communicate with the department and ask if this is all right and explain why the committee did not use their priority. Dough said that units may establish their own priorities by asking for approval of single requests. Hause said that if there were more than one individual recommended, then the unit is recommending without priority. There being no further discussion, the Chair called for a vote on the proposal presented by the committee. On a voice vote the proposal was approved. (See Resolutions Passed 79-38).

Agenda Item 5.A.2: The report of the Committee on Committees was presented by its Chair, Professor Eugene Ryan. Ryan referred the Senate to pages 4 and 5 of the Agenda for the session of September 25, 1979. The Senate Constitution requires the committee to present by-law changes first for information purposes, and then for vote. The changes, with one exception, all concern ex officio membership on various committees. The proposal from the Committee on Committees to revise membership on a number of academic committees was approved by voice vote. (See Resolutions Passed 79-39).

Agenda Item 5.B: The report of the University Curriculum Committee was presented by its Chair, Professor William Grossnickle. Curriculum changes as shown on the Agenda were presented for approval: (1) Change in BS Degree in Medical Technology; (2) Change in BS Degree in Nursing; and (3) Change in BSBA Degree (Accounting Options). On a voice vote the Senate approved the changes. (See Resolutions Passed 79-40).

Agenda Item 5.C: The report of the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning was presented by its Chair, Professor Patricia Daugherty. Daugherty said that a proposal that class bells be discontinued in all academic buildings came to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee. The committee is referring the proposal to the Senate without recommendation.

Allen moved that class bells be continued and, in those situations where no class bells are operable, that the bells be made operable. Ayers seconded. Allen gave his reasons for the motion, among which were watch inaccuracy, size of the campus, difficulty of students getting from one class to another within a 10 minute break, synchronizing class endings with the student transportation systems, and the advantage of having a precise time for students and faculty to begin and end class. Hough noted that no two clocks on the campus agree.

Brewer spoke against the motion. He said the bells are not synchronized anyway. His experience at universities twice the size of East Carolina demonstrates they are not needed. He noted that he had not heard class bells since he left high school. Woodside moved an amendment, that the administration fix the clocks. Grossnickle seconded. C. Adler said the Senate could vote all they pleased, but the clocks will never agree. Daugherty said the clocks should be synchronized at a university this size, otherwise there isn't much hope for us. Maier said that many faculty people have come to him about the issue of the bells. He had polled the deans and felt the bell issue should be addressed. Maier said discontinuation of the bells should be given a trial period. The Chair clarified that the amendment before the Senate related to clocks and at the moment the Senate should address the clocks issue. Kane asked if the bells were in some way synchronized with the clocks? Ferrell, asked if he could answer that question, said that he had no idea, but if the administration issued all the faculty a watch it would probably be a Mickey Mouse watch. Jones moved the previous question. On a voice vote, the Woodside amendment was adopted.

The Chair called for discussion on the main motion, as amended. C. Adler said that even if the Senate passed the motion to fix the bells, he hopes they don't fix them in his building. They were extremely loud before they mysteriously stopped working. He can still hear the bells in the next building. There being no further discussion, the Chair read the motion as amended: that the ringing of the bells be continued and that the administration repair the clocks that are not working. On a voice vote the motion failed.

Baker moved that the administration be asked to repair or remove the clocks that are not working. Woodside seconded. On a voice vote the motion was adopted. (See Resolutions Passed 79-41). Brewer asked if Allen would lend the administration his watch. C. Adler moved that the use of the bells be discontinued for a period of one year. Bolt seconded. On a voice vote the motion carried. (See Resolutions Passed 79-42.)

Agenda Item 5.D: The report of the General College Committee was presented by its Chair, Professor Henry Ferrell. Ferrell corrected the resolution at the bottom of page 2 of the Agenda. The resolution should begin "The Dean of the General College shall solicit ... " Ferrell said the Senate had before it the report of the General College Committee concerning academic advising within that academic division; the resolution at the bottom of page 2 of the Agenda is for the Senate's consideration. Since Senators have had the opportunity to read the various points of view of the General College Committee, he would not add anything, but would answer questions.

C. Adler said there are faculty members who advise in the General College who already have reduced time for one reason or another and could end up teaching very little. He asked if that had been considered. Ferrell said that was an administrative problem. The particular problem here is not so much that the advisor is also tied into any particular academic unit, but that the General College is in need of people who are experts in advising. At the same time since freshmen are somewhat unorganized and disoriented, to be identified with a particular professor and a particular advisor who is concerned and knowledgeable would be a boon to incoming freshmen during their freshman year. He said that the term "or similar compensation" would provide alternatives in that case. C. Adler said that his concern was that the resolution might exclude some who would want to advise. He had one person in mind who might enjoy advising but might not be able to if that went into effect. Ferrell said that perhaps the phrase "or similar compensation" would take care of that. Nischan said that he is very negative about the whole thing. He doesn't like the report. The committee is implementing a policy that is still being discussed. He noted that on October 3rd the committee sent out a memo soliciting suggestions for the philosophy of the General College and that, it seemed to him, ought to be the emphasis right now. Last month midterm grades were proposed which he supported, this month the committee is suggesting that a pool of advisors be created. He feels that the committee is putting the cart before the horse. He questioned the meaning of the terms "midsemester reporting protocol," and "functional generic skills."

Ledbetter, speaking for the motion, said that if it is good for the General College it would also be good for the University. Any faculty member in the University who advises 43 or more students should be given reduced time. If it is not good for the University, then it is not good for the General College. Ryan asked where the figure 43 was obtained. (Tadlock joined the session) Ferrell said that at that time the figure resulted from a division of the enrollment in the General College. At the present time there are some 3000 persons enrolled in the General College. Ryan asked if that would mean 75 advisors. Ferrell said it would fluctuate because at the end of the first semester of the sophomore year considerable numbers of

students move out, they determine their major and make a decision about their academic program. An average probably would not be that many. Ryan said that in essence then the committee is asking for about 20 full-time positions to advise in the General College, if there were roughly 60 or 70 people advising and each one had a 3-hour reduction. Ryan asked if the committee had considered if that expenditure of time, which is quite substantial, is really worth while.

Ferrell said that he is at a disadvantage since he wasn't on the committee last year, but the subcommittee gave this as an evaluation last April and it was carried over to this time. He suggested that if the number 43 presents a problem the Senate might substitute an appropriate number for the term 43 and let the Dean of the General College determine the appropriateness of the number. South said that he favors the idea but does see some difficulties. For example, if a person now has 25 or 30 advisees and does not choose to become a part of this particular program that person is disadvantaged. He said also that the source of this released time needs to be made clear. Ferrell said first that the committee is dealing only with students of the General College. Secondly, the number of persons advising in each academic unit is academic unit policy and has nothing to do with university policy. For example, some departments assign one or two persons to advise all majors; in other departments advising is spread all over the map, everybody has 5 or 10, or whatever. Ferrell said he could not speak on something that the General College Committee had not addressed. The committee is concerned about the particular problems of meeting students when they arrive for orientation in the summer, registration procedures, and carrying them through the first year. Ferrell said furthermore that the statement of philosophy referred to by Nischan was passed by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor two years ago. Nischan replied that he had no objection to the philosophy, but that he was confused by the language in the October 3rd memo.

The Chair, Tom Johnson, clarified that the October 3rd memo from the General College Committee was a questionnaire distributed to all the faculty. He said that if Senators had remarks to make about that memo, such remarks should be addressed to the committee directly. Mikkelsen asked if this policy would be applied university-wide. He was specifically interested in released time for advisors, for those in the School of Education have 70 to 75 advisees and if the General College receives released time he doesn't think it's fair for others not to receive the same. Ferrell said he understood, but that as policy this was an internal problem within the School of Education. The other problem the General College has in regard to making these kinds of adjustments is that at the present time they ask for volunteers who are assigned by the particular unit. Advisors come in without the General College knowing from month to month who is staying and who is leaving. This resolution is an attempt to give some structure to advising procedures so the same persons advise year after year with a high level of competence. That is the essential intention of this resolution--as the university faces coming years with declining enrollment, persons enrolled in the freshman class must be retained, all things being appropriately academic. Grossnickle said that with this resolution the Senate would endorse the importance of advising for people in the General College but not for those outside the General College. It is not enough to say that released time is up to the unit chairperson. Woodside agreed that it is not fair to say that other departments should leave released time up to their unit chairpersons.

Hough said the General College has no faculty. It has at any given time approximately one-fourth of the total student body which constitutes the pool of undecided students who go to the departments to be advised by their faculty as their majors. Ferrell's point is that retention is vital to this group since they are the ones we have to work the hardest to advise, to get them to the departments, so that they will then be departmental advisees and know what program they want. There are 3657

students in the General College as of two weeks ago. Most of them don't know where they are going or why they are here. These are the ones who are most difficult to advise. Financially, the released time issue perhaps is moot since it would be the equivalent of maybe \$2500 on a moonlighting basis. He supported the idea in principle.

Ledbetter pointed out that 3 hours of released time at an average salary of \$20,000 would cost the university \$150 an hour for consultation with students and on that basis the university could have a medical doctor, a psychiatrist, a nurse, and a stenographer to take down all the information rather than have faculty spend that much time in their unassuming, advising way. Daugherty said that she supports the motion and thinks that the students in the General College really need consistent advising. She has asked students who their advisor is and they say they don't have one. They need someone they can go and talk to, who can give them help. Nischan said that it is bad enough to have specialist teachers, specialist campus politicians and now we are going to create a group of special advisors. In his opinion advising is a responsibility of the faculty just like teaching and research. To further subdivide the faculty is self-defeating. Pories moved to table the resolution. Nischan seconded. On a voice vote the report of the General College Committee was tabled. Ferrell asked the Chair if the committee was discharged. Johnson replied no. Ferrell said that it would have helped if the Senate had given them specific instructions, but seeing none, they would continue to bring in varieties of advising procedures and make use of the wisdom of the Senate. The Chair said the Senate would be open to further reports by the General College Committee.

Agenda Item 5.E: The report of the Faculty Affairs Committee was presented by Professor Gregory Ross. He brought before the Senate the change in Appendix D, Section 5, passed last January 30 by the Board of Governors, Retirement of Faculty Beyond the Normal Retirement Date. The changes were submitted to the Senate by David Stevens to bring Appendix D into accordance with state law.

The Chair said that the changes are before the Senate with a copy on everyone's desk. He called for debate. Daugherty asked why this was brought to the Senate this month and not left to go on the agenda for next month's meeting. The Chair replied that it was necessary so that the proposal might come before the Board of Trustees on November 10th. Price called attention to the date of July 1, even though he thought the committee did not have jurisdiction, he felt it should grasp the issue even though it might require changing the law. The date should be changed to June 30, otherwise those who retire on July 1 lose all of the increase in pay for inflation for a whole year. He thinks that is something the committee should look at very carefully. The Chair said he believed July 1 is consistent with the way the law reads. Price said that his point is that if it takes a change of law, then a proposal should be made to change the law. The Chair said that the Faculty Assembly passed a resolution at its last meeting requesting that the administration seek a change in the law.

Muzzarelli asked how the addition of the words "without notice" would bring Appendix D into compliance with the law. Ross said that the phrase "without notice" means "automatically" but he supposed they wanted to make that point unusually clear.

The Chair asked for a vote on the motion. There was no vote for or against. The Chair said he preferred to continue debate in order to determine the will of the Senate. Pories said all of the Senators were reluctant to vote on an amendment which they were told would cost a lot of individuals some money when they reach age 65. He moved to refer it back to the Faculty Affairs Committee so the committee could bring it back next month with additional information. Hursey seconded the motion.

Brewer said that the way he reads it, when they say "on July 1," it really in effect gives somebody another year if their birthday is on July 1. If their birthday is on June 30 they retire. June 30 is the last pay period. Brewer said he doesn't really understand the issue and asked for clarification. Price said there was an inflationary provision that provides that when you retire during the year you don't get any inflationary increase until the next July 1, because the law says that you must retire on the first of the month. Therefore, you have a choice if you retire on June 1, or July 1: either you give up one month's work or you give up forever the inflation increase for the year in which you retire. Hursey said that this is something that is granted by the legislature to those who have already retired. The issue is not faculty members' salaries, but increases granted by the legislature to retirees. He said that Price's point is well taken. If one retires June 1 one would be eligible for the increase, but if one retired July 1, one would not. Brewer said that quite frankly the change is dictated by the General Administration. They have given us precise wording for our policy. We can debate it, but it has been dictated that we will put this exact wording in to bring Appendix D in line with the Board of Governors' decision.

To further clarify, the Chair read the letter from David Stevens to him concerning the changes. He said the changes had been referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee and after they considered it they sent it to the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Welfare Committee sent the changes back to the Faculty Affairs Committee indicating that they did not agree with the law but would accept the wording. Faculty Affairs considered the proposal and said they also did not agree with the law but would send the resolution to the Senate for action. Pories said that in view of the additional information he would like to withdraw his motion since there is no alternative but to vote yes on the issue. Price moved to reconsider. The parliamentarian said the most appropriate action would be a new motion. Price moved that the resolution be adopted. Pories seconded. On a voice vote the motion passed. (See Resolutions Passed 79-43.) Brewer said that he would investigate the possibility of changing the law.

Agenda Item 6.A: Resolution submitted by Wilson Luquire. The Chair called for debate on the resolution. Meyer read a resolution passed by the Student Legislature requesting that residence hall parking areas remain dorm student parking areas. Meyer stated that everyone, students and faculty, have the same parking problems and in view of the parking study which is supposed to be completed in December, the resolution would cause difficulty. He said he was happy to have someone coming in from outside the university to try to straighten things out. Any change in configuration would make it that much more difficult for the consultants to do their job. Also, it would be costly to institute the shuttle transportation system, perhaps on a 24-hour basis, due to safety and security considerations. The consultants' study is to be completed by December. The lots are being used now when the contractors are not there. The contractor and the Director of Security communicate so that at least some times, when the lots are open, people are not ticketed for parking there.

Briley said that on the first day of school the lots were dug up; on the second day there were "No Parking" signs erected. The lots became "Tow Away Zones" about two weeks later. This is the first time she has heard that it is all right to park there. Faulkner asked when faculty would be ticketed and when not. What is the current status of ticketing in the dug-up lots behind Mendenhall and the Library? Meyer said he could not give a precise answer, but he has told Security to take it easy because it is a difficult time. The Security Department has been trying to accommodate everybody. The ticketing policy is the same as in the past--when somebody parks in an improper place, a ticket is given. Faulkner said that some firm policy should be made about when it is all right to park in those areas when no other space is available, and when it is not all right. Ledbetter, speaking against

the resolution, said he liked the "Whereas's" but not the "Therefore." He didn't think it fair to take the resident students parking privileges away.

Woodside spoke of the towing policy related to student vehicles with staff stickers parking in staff parking areas, and asked if the policy had been altered. He asked if towing is enforced, or not. Meyer said that there was an article in Pieces of Eight that towing would be enforced, particularly in the Brewster areas. There was a two-week period when towing was not in effect, but the towing policy is in effect now. However, Security is trying to call people first. Meyer said he does not believe in wholesale towing. The previous question was moved. The Chair called for a vote on the resolution as stated in the Agenda. On a voice vote the resolution failed.

Agenda Item 6.A.2: Woodside said that he was satisfied with Agenda Item 6.A.2 Towing Policy. He mentioned that he had talked to Mr. Calder some time ago about students driving cars with staff stickers on them. Apparently, little could be done about it since no action had been taken. He asked about the current policy on student cars with staff stickers. Meyer said that he had no objection to taking action against students who drive cars with staff stickers.

There being no further business, the second session of the Faculty Senate in its 15th year adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Rodney Schmidt
Secretary of the Faculty

Patsey Woolard
Faculty Senate Office Secretary

RESOLUTIONS PASSED - October 23, 1979

- (79-38) The Faculty Senate approved the Guidelines for Awarding Undergraduate School, College, or Departmental Scholarships. Note: Agenda 10-23-79
- (79-39) The Faculty Senate approved the changes in ex officio membership on academic committees. Note: Agenda 9-25-79
- (79-40) The Faculty Senate approved the following curriculum changes (see University Curriculum Committee Minutes for September 20, and October 4, 1979):

1. Change in BS Degree in Medical Technology
2. Change in BS Degree in Nursing
3. Change in BSBA Degree (Accounting Option).

- (79-41) The Faculty Senate approved a resolution that the administration be asked to repair or remove the clocks that do not work.
- (79-42) The Faculty Senate approved a resolution that the use of the bells be discontinued for a period of one year.
- (79-43) The Faculty Senate approved the following revisions in Appendix D of the East Carolina University Faculty Manual (Section III,c.):

"5. Reappointment of Faculty Beyond Normal Retirement Date

a. Retirement Policy for Members of the Faculty

Each member of the faculty who has permanent tenure shall automatically be retired, without notice, on July 1 coincident with or next following his or her sixty-fifth birthday, except as provided in subsection b(1), below.

Agenda Item 3.B.1 Attachment:

C O P Y

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor

September 27, 1979

President William C. Friday
The University of North Carolina
P. O. Box 2688
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Dear President Friday:

Enclosed is Resolution 79-37 of the East Carolina University Faculty Senate, which was passed September 25. I have discussed the problem of salary discrepancies with Dr. Dawson twice in the last week and urge that the General Administration give this matter the highest priority.

I would like to discuss this great concern when we next meet.

Sincerely,

/s/ Thomas B. Brewer

Thomas B. Brewer

TBB/ra
enclosure

Agenda Item 3.C Attachment:

FACULTY ASSEMBLY REPORT

The thirtieth meeting of the UNC Faculty Assembly was held September 28, 1979 at the General Administration Building in Chapel Hill. East Carolina University delegates Thomas Johnson, Patricia Daugherty, Robert Hursey and Eugene Ryan attended.

President William Friday reviewed prospects for salary increases for the second year of the biennium. \$1.7 million dollars has been requested. Richard Robbins of the staff discussed the current status of litigation between the University and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Vice President Donald Stedman reported that a review has been initiated of extension and public service activities of the constituent institutions of the University. Vice President Roy Carroll stated that results of the study and recommendations arising from it will be included in the next long-range plan. Vice President A. K. King reviewed topics discussed at a meeting of a liaison committee of representatives of the General Administration, private colleges and universities and community colleges.

President Friday explained the reasons for the need for a policy statement on external professional activity for pay. Vice President Raymond Dawson met with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Governance Committee for a discussion of a second draft of the policy statement. (A third draft is in preparation now.) Vice President Felix Joyner met with the Budget Committee of the Assembly.

The Governance Committee has prepared a Faculty Opinion Survey questionnaire which it is considering sending to all faculty. A copy of the Survey will be placed in the Reserve Room of Joyner Library. The Professional Development Committee is gathering information concerning resources available for faculty development at the 16 constituent institutions.

The Assembly approved four resolutions, one the resolution forwarded from East Carolina University requesting funds to increase salaries at comprehensive and baccalaureate institutions to bring them in line with national differentials. A second resolution endorsed the concept of reciprocal agreements among states waiving non-resident tuition. A third resolution requested a study of state contract purchasing systems to provide a basis for increasing the flexibility of the North Carolina system. A resolution from the Faculty Welfare Committee recommends repeal of the current law mandating retirement at age 65. The law applies only to individuals born between 1914 and 1917.

Minutes of the meeting will be placed in the Reserve Room at Joyner Library.

East Carolina University Delegation
Faculty Assembly