

## Minutes

Faculty Senate of East Carolina University  
3rd Regular Session of 1979/80 Academic Year  
20 November 1979

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 20 November 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: Tadlock (Aerospace), Ward (Continuing Education), Levey (Education), Pories (Medicine), Fulghum (Medicine). The following alternates were present: Rees for Haskins (Drama and Speech), Smith for Davis (Allied Health), Buck for Bolt (Foreign Languages), Hankins for Baker (Geography), Dennison for Cheng (Health Affairs Library), Lauffer for Hancock (HPERS). The following members later joined the session: Tadlock, Pories, Fulghum, Davis. The following ex officio members were absent: Brewer (Chancellor), Maier (Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs). The following were present by invitation: Donald L. Lemish (Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement and Planning; Elmer Meyer, Vice Chancellor for Student Life.

The Chair presented a request from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee to add an item to the agenda under New Business, Agenda Item 6. Each senator was sent a copy of a resolution from this committee. There being no objection, the resolution was added as Agenda Item 6, New Business. (Pories and Fulghum joined the session.)

The minutes of the October 23, 1979 session were amended as follows: Page 1, paragraph 1, delete Haigwood from those absent. Delete Rose from those present. Page 1, paragraph 1, add Davis to those who later joined the session (Kane). Page 4, after first paragraph under Agenda Item 5.C, add (Davis joined the session) (Kane). Page 6, first paragraph, last sentence, change to read: "Nischan replied that he had no objection to the philosophy, but that he was confused by the language in the General College Committee report and its relationship to the October 3rd memo." The minutes were approved as amended. (Tadlock joined the session)

### SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

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

1. A new seating arrangement is in effect. There were a number of suggestions. Some were complied with, some were not. Additional suggestions are welcome. Adjustments will continue, to make seating as satisfactory as possible in this location.
2. If there are any additions or corrections to the Academic Committee List which was distributed to the entire faculty, they should be given to the Chair or the Faculty Senate Office.
3. The following resolutions were acted upon by the Chancellor on November 15, 1979: Resolution 79-38, Guidelines for Awarding Undergraduate School, College, or Departmental Scholarships. Action deferred pending further discussions with the Scholarship Committee. Resolution 79-39, changes in ex officio membership on academic committees was approved; Resolution 79-40, curriculum changes, was approved; Resolution 79-41, on repairing or removing the clocks, was referred to Mr. Moore; Resolution 79-42, that the use of the bells be discontinued for a period of one year, was approved; Resolution 79-43, revisions in Appendix D, was approved.

4. The Chair read a letter he had written to the Chancellor concerning Resolution 79-43, "Retirement Policy for Members of the Faculty." The letter outlined recommendations from the Faculty Welfare and Faculty Affairs Committees. The Chair has spoken with the Chancellor about this resolution and understood that the Chancellor will pursue the matter further.

5. In a letter dated November 7, 1979, Vice Chancellor Maier did not approve Resolution 79-36, Midsemester Grades for General College Students. At the present time the university does not have the computer availability to accomplish this requested responsibility.

6. A letter was received from Vice Chancellor Maier allocating additional funds in the amount of \$799 for office supplies for the Faculty Senate Office and an additional half-time graduate assistantship to be assigned to the Chair of the Faculty.

7. The Chair attended the Board of Trustees meeting on November 10, 1979. Prior to the meeting of the Board of Trustees the Chair also attended the meeting of the Educational Planning and Faculty Affairs Committee. The Chair of that committee is Dr. John Bridgers, who invited the Chair of the Faculty back to all subsequent meetings of this particular committee. It was felt that the exchange of ideas among the committee, Dr. Maier, and the Chair of the Faculty, was very helpful. Items discussed at the last meeting included the process and procedures involved in the changes of Appendix C and the ECU Code.

8. On October 30th, the Chair and Professor Daugherty attended a special called meeting at the General Administration Office with Vice President Dawson on the External Consulting for Pay document. Two of the draft proposals have been mailed to the entire faculty. Yesterday, the Chair received a copy of the final document approved by the Board of Governors on November 9. A number of changes have been made from the first draft of the document. Although all of the desires of the faculty representatives from the various institutions have not been met, a number of important changes have been made.

9. Two additional hearings on ECU Code Revisions are scheduled. The Chair urged Senators to attend. The next hearing is scheduled for 1:00 p.m., November 27, in the Brewster Building, Room B-102. The final hearing is at 4:00 p.m., December 11, in the Allied Health Building, Room 101.

10. The Chair has received a memorandum from Vice Chancellor Robert Maier indicating his willingness to cooperate with the faculty in developing catered breakfasts or luncheons during the spring semester for a fee. The Chair has referred the matter to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Both Vice Chancellor Elmer Meyer and Vice Chancellor Robert Maier are cooperating with the faculty on this.

11. The Chair noted that membership selection on unit task forces for the Planning Commission is in progress. Criteria have been established and mailed to the head of each unit. One-half the membership of the task force will be elected by majority ballot of the full time faculty in the unit. The Chair of the task force will be nominated from the elected membership and approved by the Chancellor. The unit head will serve as an ex officio member; there will be one student and one alternate elected by majority ballot of all full time faculty in the unit from among those enrolled in a major program in the unit. The Chair explained that the Unit Task Force is the grass roots level for the planning process. The remaining membership will be nominated by the Chair of the subcommission in consultation with the Coordinator of Planning, and approved by the Chancellor.

12. Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting of August 29 have been received and are available in the Faculty Senate Office. The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on January 23, 1980. The minutes of the Board of Governors of October 12 and the minutes of the Faculty Assembly of September 28 have been received and are available in the Faculty Senate Office. The next meeting of the Faculty Assembly will be on December 1, 1979.

13. The Chair, in consultation with the other officers of the faculty, has concluded that three additional members should be added to the Ad Hoc Committee on Appendix C to ensure equal representation from the entire university. Trenton Davis, Robert Hursey, and Donald Sexauer have been appointed. The other members of the committee are Eugene Ryan, Michael Bassman (Chair), Henry Ferrell, Sandra Wurth-Hough, Rodney Schmidt, Artemis Kares, and Tom Johnson.

14. The News Bureau is interested in receiving articles from the faculty for publication in Pieces of Eight which is distributed to the entire faculty and staff of the university. Items for this publication can be sent to the Faculty Senate Office or directly to the News Bureau.

15. Minutes of the Appalachian State University Senate Meetings of September 10, and October 8 are available in the Faculty Senate Office. Also the October 3rd minutes of the Academic Cabinet of UNC-G have been received.

Agenda Item 3.B: Remarks by Vice Chancellor Donald L. Lemish. Vice Chancellor Lemish said that rather than covering all of the areas relating to Institutional Advancement and Planning, he has chosen to talk about two areas. First, some information concerning the Computing Center and second, the Alumni Development Program. Lemish circulated some material which he said was the end result of response received from many faculty members, department heads, and deans. He had asked everyone to help identify needs, from the faculty viewpoint, which could be incorporated into a case statement. The response to that request filled a large notebook. He is able to use it now when dealing with an individual prospect who has an interest in a specific area. He spoke of the Order of Wright Circle, which is a major donor recognition organization.

Lemish said that he knows there are a number of concerns both from the academic and administrative sides concerning university computing and the Computing Center itself. Last February the Chancellor commissioned a task force to make some recommendations to him by April 1 to help plan the future operation of the center. He has tried to implement some of the recommendations from that task force. He has tried to proceed with what they referred to as Phase 2 planning in relation to the Computing Center. The first week in December he will announce the organization of a new computer committee which will be the major policy, priority, and decision-making committee for the Computing Center. The committee will be named the Information Systems Advisory Committee (ISAC). Its membership will include the four Vice Chancellors, the Dean of the School of Medicine, the Chairperson of the University Computer Committee, and the Chairperson of a new committee which will be named the Administrative Computer Users Committee (that committee will replace the former administrative appointed committee called CUAC, Computer Users Advisory Committee). At a later date there is the possibility of an appointment to ISAC from another committee which will be the Health Affairs Computing Committee. The task force made a recommendation dealing with reorganization of the Computing Center: the appointment of a director of computing activities reporting directly to the Chancellor and establishing offices of academic computing, administrative computing, and health affairs computing. Some internal reorganization has been

made. He has upgraded the visibility of the center and the reporting system. Hopefully, this will bring about more attention to the problems of the center and better consideration of their needs.

A management study will be done. Lemish is negotiating with recommended consultants on computing center management. He anticipates that the two consultants will be from education. He does not want consultants from computing businesses, but people who are known across the country for their expertise in this area and from education. The first consultant will be here for a week beginning January 14. This person will be studying the management of the center. He/she will be interviewing many computer users, the employees of the center, and former employees of the center. Lemish hopes to achieve a better understanding of the viewpoint of everyone involved in the center and its management, then he will be able better to make decisions about organization, responsibilities of specific personnel, needs for additional equipment, and needs for additional personnel. In January, a second person will do a similar review. Then he will merge the two reports and make decisions about the future of the center. He has been able to request the acquisition of Data Base Management (DMS 2). He is investigating sharing numerous software packages to enhance programs. He has ordered five additional terminals to enhance academic users availability. The total equipment upgrades come to over \$100,000.

At this point Lemish began to talk about development. He has tried to identify the specific needs of this institution to develop a reasonable budget for money to be raised this year. It is his goal to raise \$126,000 from alumni, a better than 25% increase over what was raised this past year. He also has established a budget of \$61,000 to raise from individuals who are not alumni to support specific projects through the Foundation. That budget includes \$20,000 for research and equipment, \$10,000 for professional faculty growth, \$10,000 for scholarships, \$10,000 for a faculty small grant fund, \$5,000 for faculty excess travel, and \$6,000 for summer faculty grants. In addition to that he is committed to raising enough money to fund 25 new academic merit scholarships for incoming freshmen. This past year 15 were funded from alumni contributions. It is his hope that he will be able to add 25 each year to end up with about 100 in force, so that each year 25 outstanding freshmen can be offered a full tuition scholarship whether they have financial need or not. This is the only way this university will attract quality students who are offered scholarships at other institutions because of their academic merit rather than their need.

Yesterday the university received a \$60,000 gift of cut gems for the Geology Department which will be retained for a minimum of three years for educational purposes. At that time it will be decided whether or not they should be kept for educational purposes or sold and the money used for other purposes. This donor intends to continue this type of gift on a frequent basis. Lemish anticipates that after the first of the year the university will receive another \$40,000 to \$60,000 in gems. The university is about to acquire an alumni center. This is something of which he is personally very proud. Lemish found two alumni who each agreed to a \$50,000 commitment to purchase this house, at the corner of Biltmore and Fifth Street. This house will be the offices of the Alumni and Development staff. The main living room in the house will be maintained and furnished as an alumni lounge with an alumni conference room connected to it. This will do much to enhance alumni programs. The two pledges are spread over time so the house will be financed by a loan to the alumni association.

The university has received \$89,450 from a former school teacher, only about one half of what the total gift will be, because in 1930 this university was kind

enough to give her daughter a scholarship. That gift will be put into an endowment fund from which the interest income will be used for scholarships. Lemish is working with another gentleman who is about to sell 2 million dollars worth of land on the possibility of establishing a trust. This person will avoid capital gains tax and will get an immediate tax deduction based on the actuarial value of his life interest in that property. Lemish has established a parents' fund and is seeking unrestricted gift support from parents for research, equipment, professional growth, scholarships, and faculty small grant funds. It's difficult to raise money from parents of students attending a state university. He started with a direct mail appeal, and is receiving gifts on a daily basis. This will help identify parents who might have additional interest in forming a parents' organization which can benefit the university in public relations and in recruiting other students.

The areas of alumni and development have been reorganized. Lemish introduced the director of that area, Bob Adams, Director of Resource Development. A national search was conducted to find the right person. Adams was with the Medical School as an assistant to the vice chancellor in charge of fund raising. He is now working for the entire university in fund raising. His expertise and background in corporate and foundation areas will bring great rewards to the university in the future. Lemish anticipates reorganization in the Alumni Association. School alumni associations that have an interrelationship with the parent alumni association or the ECU Alumni Association need to be encouraged by constituent groups having representation on the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association. Well planned and coordinated fund raising can benefit individual schools and enhance the total fund raising program. Some by-laws changes in the Alumni Association are necessary. A committee is studying that. The alumni director has communicated with deans and department heads about changing Alumni Day. Right now it is an awards day with the presentation of outstanding alumnus awards and young alumni awards. It is not a highly visible day though it draws a couple of hundred people. Those activities could be tied into Homecoming when more alumni visit the campus than at any other time. Alumni Day could be used to build continuing education programs. For example, the School of Business might have a particular lectureship program on that day and other schools might have activities to conclude the whole affair. He is finding at state universities there is less and less class identification. The number of students who graduate yearly do not become involved with a class identity. They identify with organizations and with their schools and departments; we can capitalize on those identities. Alumni have been involved in a telephone campaign the last seventeen nights. Student volunteers from the Inter Fraternity Council and Panhellenic Council are calling alumni who live in geographical areas without a heavy concentration of alumni. At this time approximately \$35,000 has been pledged with about 60% of this new money. That is encouraging. In late January or early February, 25 regional telephone campaigns will begin. That is the way to reach the goal of \$126,000 and to reach a second goal of at least 30% of alumni giving annually to ECU. If that builds to 30% then this university will be among the top ten state institutions in the country in alumni giving. Lemish can tell a corporation or foundation that the university's alumni are among the best in the country, 30% of them give every year. That makes ears stand up on corporate executives. At every corporate call made in Charlotte to the big bank holding companies and major industrial firms, the first two questions asked are: how well do your alumni support you, and how well do your faculty support you?

In the Order of Wright Circle, the major donor club, there is the possibility that half or more than half of the faculty could be making annual gifts of \$100 or more and become members of the Century Society. The way to encourage this is to be able

to give support money to something that is going to benefit faculty interests. Faculty members can make gifts and designate those gifts for specific departments. This can be set up so that the gift is spent either at the discretion of a committee in a department, the chairman of the department, or any other way a given department might want. Enhancement of the manuscript collection in the library and enhancement of the library itself might interest faculty members in providing annual gift support. A bank draft system is available to pay on an annual commitment. The Order of Wright Circle is a means of recognizing donors for what they do and getting donors to set their sights on higher levels of giving. Giving is a pyramid. It starts with an annual fund and it starts with \$5 or \$10 donors. Then it builds to gift club levels like the Chancellor's Society, which is a \$10,000 commitment payable over 10 years, or the combination of an annual gift and a deferred gift of \$30,000 or \$20,000 through will bequest, unit trust, or insurance. Old Austin will be an annual recognition society for people who give \$500 or more, Associates \$250, and the Century Society for \$100 gifts. There will be organized ways of recognizing donors for the level of gift being given. (Davis joined the session) In another institution, Lemish was very pleased that out of 800 faculty and professional staff, about 600 of them gave \$100 or more annually. They did it because it could go back and help the department in which that person was working. The system here is being established in the same fashion so that within the East Carolina University Foundation there will be 500 to 600 different accounts in a very short period of time. A gift records office has been established, through which all private and philanthropic gifts to the institution will be receipted. The receipting process assures the donor that this money is being allocated as he wished. Lemish asked for questions. There were none.

Agenda Item 4: Unfinished Business. There was no unfinished business.

Agenda Item 5.A: Report of the Committee on Committees (Professor Eugene Ryan) Ryan noted that in the agenda for this session there is a copy of the suggested charge for the Committee on Committees. This is for information purposes and will not be acted upon until next month. The Committee on Committees has been working its way through the charges of all the committees alphabetically and the first one finished is its own. The charge is in three paragraphs: the first, paragraph A, describing the committee's area of concern; the second, paragraph B, indicating to whom the committee reports; the third, paragraph C, indicating how often the committee reports; and the fourth, paragraph D, indicating what independent power the committee has. This is the format that the committee will follow with all charges. There is no paragraph D in the Committee on Committee's charge because it does not have independent powers. Ryan expressed appreciation for the comments of committee members. None of the members of the Committee on Committees is so devoted to their own suggestions that they are not willing and eager to hear comments from others. Committee members will see the changes suggested before they are submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on Committees. The committee hopes by next month to have two or three more revised charges for the agenda.

Agenda Item 5.B: Report of the University Curriculum Committee (Professor William Grossnickle) Grossnickle presented an editorial change in the committee minutes of November 1: under Business Administration Minor, delete BUSA 2002 and add ECON 2283. Without objection, the report of the University Curriculum Committee was adopted. (See the University Curriculum Committee minutes of October 18, 1979 and November 1, 1979.) (See Resolutions Passed 79-44.)

Agenda Item 5.C: Report of the University Research Committee (Professor Lokenath Debnath). On August 27, 1979, the University Research Committee had its organizational meeting at the Mendenhall Student Center. The committee elected Dr. Robert Brown (Education) as Secretary, and Dr. Debnath as Chairman of the committee. Subsequently, Dr. William Still (History) was elected to serve as Vice Chairman of the committee. On May 1, 1979, the committee sent a memo to all ECU Faculty Members inviting applications for grant proposals for the 1979/80 fiscal year, with a deadline of September 10, 1979. On August 20, 1979 a reminder was sent for grant proposals to all unit heads requesting them to make an announcement of the September 10 deadline at the first faculty meeting on Monday, August 27, 1979. During the summer of 1979, a budget was submitted to Dr. John Howell, then Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Indicated in the proposal were funds needed for the various line items. Dr. Howell allocated approximately \$60,000 for research and other creative activities. This year the committee received 94 proposals from the faculty of various departments and schools with a total request of approximately \$150,000. According to its charge, the committee developed a set of criteria for evaluation of proposals and developed an evaluation form to be used by the committee members. The committee discussed its criteria with Dr. Robert Maier, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and incorporated his ideas in the criteria, including Governor Hunt's freeze guidelines. The committee was pleased with Dr. Maier's suggestions and advice. These criteria are recorded in the minutes of the committee which are available in the Faculty Senate Office. Following the established criteria, the committee spent a considerable amount of time and effort in careful evaluation of all grant proposals. The committee recommended 70 proposals for funding with a total dollar figure of \$54,635. The remaining 24 proposals were not recommended for funding. The committee's recommendations were then sent to Dr. Maier for his and the Chancellor's approval. As soon as they are approved by the administration, awards will be announced. The criteria developed by the committee included: (1) Travel expenses for research were funded, but travel expenses for attending meetings with or without papers were not recommended for funding. (2) Limited funds for student or research assistant's wages were a big problem. However, the committee recommended funds for student's or research assistants wages. (3) Funds for research equipment were recommended. (4) Page or publication charges only for accepted research articles by journals were recommended, but page charges for book manuscripts were not funded because text books are non research in nature and royalty income is involved. (5) Most of the requests for supplies and communication were recommended for funding. Due to Governor Hunt's freeze policy, a transfer of funds from one line item to another was a big problem. So the committee could not spend the total of \$60,000 granted by the administration. Debnath expressed pleasure with the active participation and cooperation of all committee members.

Ayers asked Debnath when the committee forwarded their evaluations to the administration for approval. Debnath said that on November 1st he sent the package to Dr. Maier for his approval. Daugherty asked Debnath if he had a breakdown on what percentage of the grants made were for research assistants and equipment. Debnath said the recommended figures were Student Wages \$8000, with \$8000 spent; Travel \$17,965; Supplies \$12,591; Publication \$3877; Communication \$1510; and \$10,692 for Scientific Equipment: a total of \$54,635.

Agenda Item 6: New Business. Resolution from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (Professor Pat Daugherty). (See attachment) Daugherty said that the intention of the resolution was to give the Planning Commission Sub-commissions the benefit of the experience and expertise of committees. In some cases committee charges indicate that they have authority in the subcommission

areas. She asked for questions. Nischan asked if this does not create an insurmountable amount of red tape; is this really what you want to do? Daugherty said she doubted that it would create red tape, though the process would obviously take a little longer. She said that the subcommissions are representatives not only of the faculty but of the staff and students, the Board of Trustees and the alumni, so subcommissions have a broader viewpoint than faculty committees, but faculty committees such as the University Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Committee have a better knowledge of what programs are. The point is that these committees could provide recommendations. Hopefully, this could be done without a lot of red tape. Schmidt moved an amendment to strike the wording of the present resolution from the Educational Policies and Planning Committee and insert new wording (see attachment). Thiele seconded the motion. Schmidt, speaking for his amendment, said that it directs the activity of reading and evaluating task force and subcommission reports to the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning rather than throughout the various academic committees. All of the academic committees are represented by their chairs on the Committee for Educational Policies and Planning. The charge of that committee was established to include the chairs of all academic committees. It is his belief that the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning can institute this review and make recommendations if necessary. The committee may consult with the various committees, which it will be doing anyway since their chairs are on the Committee for Educational Policies and Planning. The Chair called for discussion on the amendment. Ryan said he has no opposition in principle to the proposal, but he would like to move that the matter be postponed until next month in order to give those involved an opportunity to study the question. Lambeth seconded the motion to postpone. The Chair said the motion is debatable and asked the maker of the motion if he wished to debate it. Ryan said that this is the first opportunity he and many members of the Senate have had to see the original proposal and the proposal by Schmidt may have merit, but it is complicated and should be discussed by members of the subcommissions before the Senate votes on it. Grossnickle asked when the subcommission reports are due. Ferrell said the academic ones are due March 19. Dough asked for further clarification on procedures. The Chair said a motion to postpone does not allow for this type of discussion. The Chair was asked if copies of both these proposals could be attached to the agenda for the next meeting. The Chair said it could be included in the agenda. The Chair was asked whether these would be included in the minutes of this meeting. The Chair replied that they would. The Chair said the issue before the Senate is to postpone both the committee report from the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning and the proposed amendment from Schmidt. Kane asked if it was Ryan's intent to allow the Senators more time to comment on this or the various subcommissions and task forces. Ryan said both. By a voice vote the issue was postponed until the next session of the Senate.

There being no further business, the third session of the Faculty Senate in its 15th year adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

Rodney Schmidt  
Secretary of the Faculty

Pat Woolard  
Faculty Senate Office Secretary



RESOLUTIONS PASSED, NOVEMBER 20, 1979

(79-44) The Faculty Senate approved the following curriculum changes (see University Curriculum Committee Minutes for October 18 and November 1, 1979):

1. B.S./B.A. and Business Administration Minor
2. B.S. Major and Minor in DRED
3. B.S. in School and Community Health
4. Changes in Bachelor of Music, B.A. in Music, B.A./B.S. Minors in Music
5. New B.A./B.S. Minor in Public Administration
6. Change in Business Administration Major and Minors.

---

Agenda Item 6: Attachment 1 (Resolution from the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning)

The Committee on Educational Policies and Planning recommends that the General College Committee, the University Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Curriculum Committee, the Library Committee, and such other committees whose charges imply that they should be involved, review and make recommendations concerning all reports from task forces on academic programs before they are submitted to the Subcommittee on Academic Programs; the Committee recommends further that other Faculty Senate Committees, as appropriate, review and make recommendations concerning task force reports of the Subcommittee on Student Service and the Subcommittee on Public Service prior to their submission to the subcommittees. The Committee further recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse this motion.

---

Agenda Item 6: Attachment 2 (Amendment from Professor Schmidt)

WHEREAS, the charge of the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning states that it "shall advise the Chancellor on the educational policies, goals, standards procedures, and resources of East Carolina University," and that it "shall advise the Chancellor concerning long-range planning of academic programs..." and that it "shall participate in the formulation of the university's five-year plan,"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning shall review the reports of the Planning Commission Subcommittee Task Forces prior to their submission to the various Subcommittees. The Committee shall also review the reports of the Subcommittees prior to their submission to the Planning Commission. The Committee shall make whatever recommendations it deems necessary to the appropriate Subcommittee. To this end the Committee may consult with any academic committee whose charge grants it authority in the area of particular Task Force Reports.