

Minutes

Faculty Senate of East Carolina University  
Fifth Regular Session of 1979/80 Academic Year  
29 January 1980

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 29, 1980, 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: Haigwood (Nursing), Haritun (Music), Pories (Medicine), Jones (English), Mikkelsen (Education), Condon (Biology), Satterfield (Art). The following ex officio members were absent: Chancellor Brewer. The following alternates were present: Register for Tschetter (Sociology), Snyder for Steele (Library Science), Atkeson for Nischan (History), Heckrotte for Allen (Biology). The following members later joined the session: Haritun, Pories, Jones, Mikkelsen, Satterfield, and Brewer.

The minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 11, 1979 were approved as distributed.

The Chair proposed the addition of two items to the agenda. Item 6.B: Discussion of the faculty membership to be elected or appointed to the newly established University Facilities Committee; and Item 6.C: Response to the East Carolina University Board of Trustees' request for a change in the meeting date of the Senate for March 1980, to enable the trustees to meet with the Senate. Since there were no objections, the items were added to the agenda. (Haritun, Jones, and Satterfield joined the session)

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

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

1. In a letter dated January 14, 1980, Chancellor Brewer approved all the resolutions passed at the December 11, 1979 meeting.
2. Chancellor Brewer approved the relocation of the Faculty Senate Office to Rawl Annex Rooms 138 and 140 upon the relocation of Vice Chancellor Lemish's office.
3. The Chair attended the meeting of the Board of Trustees on January 23, 1980. He noted that a new member of the board was present, James H. Maynard, filling the unexpired term of Mr. Glenn Jernigan. Vice Chancellor Maier gave a brief summary of the Academic Vice Chancellor's areas of concern with the university, including research grants awarded by the Research Committee, the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness, and the Summer Grants Committee. He reported that this semester there are five faculty members with full-time research appointments. He also reported that he had had successful hearings with Unit Heads concerning the budget for the next biennium; that the University has serious needs for space, including office space for faculty members; and that faculty salaries remain a primary concern at the University. (Mikkelsen joined the session.)
4. The Chair has appointed Professor Wilson Luquire to the Coffee Committee.
5. The General College Committee has issued a last call for contributions designed to improve the General Education Requirements of the University. The deadline is February 4, 1980.
6. The University Research Committee has requested applications for new grants. The deadline is February 18, 1980.

7. The Chair met with the Graduate Council on January 21, 1980 and the council approved an M.A. in Mathematics with an option in Computer Science.

8. Minutes of the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate meeting of December 10, 1979 and minutes of the Academic Council of UNC-Greensboro of December 5 have been received and are available in the Faculty Senate Office.

9. Today and tomorrow from 10:00 until 4:00 the Red Cross Bloodmobile will be on campus. Faculty and staff may donate blood during those hours at Wright Auditorium.

Agenda Item 3.B: The report of the Faculty Assembly was presented by Professor Robert Hursey (see attachment). (Pories and Brewer joined the session.)

Agenda Item 3.C: The report from the Planning Commission was presented by the Coordinator of Planning, Henry C. Ferrell, Jr. Ferrell noted that each senator had before him the membership lists of the three subcommissions now in effect. Handwritten notations reflect the changes and substitutions made recently and were made to keep the lists up to date. All faculty and staff were given a list earlier in the month of the chairpersons of all the task forces with their phone numbers to enable faculty and staff to respond to the proper task force. The three subcommission chairpersons are Eugene Ryan (Academic Programs Task Force), Trenton Davis (Student Service Task Force), and Bill Queen (Public Service Task Force). Presently there are an estimated 57 task forces in operation with about 400 faculty and administrators, 100 students, 19 staff, 17 alumni, 4 trustees, and 3 community persons who coordinate an area of activity in Greenville, such as the Director of Pitt County Memorial Hospital. Significant deadlines to be faced this spring include the Academic Program Task Forces due on March 24; the Student Service Task Forces, due on February 15, with the exception of four which are due April 2: Student Organization and Activities, Student Governance, the Nontraditional Student and Intercollegiate Athletics task forces. April 20 will be the deadline for the Public Service task forces with the exception of two--the Administrative Coordination Task Force and Facilities Task Force, which have a deadline a month later. Ferrell expressed his appreciation for the cooperation and support received from faculty and staff and noted that the office itself would not be able to function without Mrs. Sharon Johnston. The office has the assistance of excellent graduate students who help in collating and running errands on campus.

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

Agenda Item 5.A: The report of the Admissions Committee was presented by its Chair, Professor Peggy Wood. The Chair stated that floor privileges had been granted to Professors Clemens, Bortz, McDaniel, and McGee, for comments on this proposal. Wood said that for some time the Admissions Committee has seen the need to make recommendations for change in scholastic eligibility standards, especially since conversion to the semester system. They have reviewed carefully the current scholastic eligibility standards and, since August, have worked intensively on revising these standards. Presented today are proposed changes for scholastic eligibility standards. Hough asked what data the committee had obtained on the effect this change will have on future enrollment, if any. Wood said they could not predict, but that perhaps there will be a leveling out of enrollment. For example, under the current policy if a student is ruled academically ineligible at the end of spring semester the only way that ineligibility can be removed is through work in summer school. If it is not removed at the end of summer school the student cannot reenroll until the next summer session. Under the proposed new policy, if a student is academically ineligible at the end of fall semester, the student is on

probation during spring semester. If the deficiency is not removed by the end of spring semester, the student will be ineligible to return (except for summer school). If, at the end of summer school, the student is not eligible, the student is suspended for fall semester but can come back in spring semester. The present policy does not allow that. Regarding summer school enrollment a student often hesitates about coming to summer school because of the possibility that he/she will move into the next retention period and be ruled academically ineligible during that time. Under the new policy that would not be the situation; actually, it might encourage attendance during summer school. The last two changes recommended by the committee and passed by the Faculty Senate did not cause any increase in the number of students ruled academically ineligible. Rasch asked why, under the Scholastic Eligibility Standards, there is a minimum grade point average of 2.2 required for admission to the Teacher Education track--are there not catalogue requirements for admission to particular tracks that would also require unique requirements--why is this the only one that is cited? Wood said this particular statement is as it appears currently, and it is her understanding that this was something that the Faculty Senate approved a few years ago. It was recommended by the Teacher Education Committee and approved by the Curriculum Committee. This particular statement refers to a large number of students. Any student going into teaching, whether in History, Art, or English, needs to be aware that admission into the upper division within their department requires a 2.2 G.P.A. Rasch said he was also concerned about readmission appeals, and why certain professional schools require admission by the schools. Why were these schools selected? Wood replied that there are requirements established by these particular schools in addition to the admission requirements to East Carolina. Rasch asked if this was on readmissions? Wood said yes, it states that readmission to the university does not guarantee readmission to one of those programs.

Lambeth said that in answer to Rasch's question, did Wood not say that there would be a change so that students on suspension could come back in the spring? Wood said that in the paragraph which immediately follows those listed as #2, #3, and #4, the statement is made that a student placed on probation must meet scholastic eligibility standards at the end of the next semester in which the student is enrolled or he/she will be declared academically ineligible. If this is based on the fall semester and the necessary grade point average is not attained, the student is on probation in spring semester. He/she is not suspended at that point--the student still has spring semester to bring the grade point average up. Presently G.P.A. aren't checked until the end of spring. The Committee would like to identify the problem student early. Lambeth said he had misunderstood--that back in the quarter system a person who was ineligible could come the last quarter and he thought that was what was meant--that you would reinstitute the former policy. Wood said no, not since we switched over to the semester system.

Ward said that the Division of Continuing Education is concerned because of their structure. He referred the Senate to the amendment distributed by him. They do not work with full time students. Continuing Education is concerned that the proposal for Scholastic Eligibility Standards as presented will affect about 1000 students in their various campus programs. Students at Cherry Point, Camp Lejuene and two other institutions with programs in the evening college program would be victims of the proposed first retention period. Continuing Education would like to propose an adjustment in the first retention period to show the same consideration presently in their catalogue for that adult, full-time working student who takes one course at a time. Normally it takes one semester or two to matriculate into full time study. The division believes that the off-campus student would be unnecessarily encumbered by the 1.35 G.P.A. requirement for academic eligibility in the first 1-31 hours attempted. Therefore, the division would amend the proposal

to show that no grade point average would be required for the first retention period of 1-7 credits. There are many students in off-campus programs who take a one, two, or three semester hour course. Since there are two terms within a semester of eight weeks at military bases and even trimesters at Technical Institutes, this amendment is offered as a necessity for Continuing Education. The Chair said the proposed amendment to the Admissions Committee proposal would include an additional step in the retention period, Step A. Bolt seconded. Davis said he would like to ask Wood or someone on the Admissions Committee about their reaction to the amendment as proposed by Professor Ward. Does the committee perceive the problem the way Continuing Education does? Do they have any data on this? Wood asked Ward if the Division of Continuing Education is aware that a student would not be ruled ineligible at the end of that first semester. Ward said yes. Wood asked how many one-semester-hour classes the division offers? Would a student normally carry only one course? Ward said yes, as a general rule. Wood said that if a student took a course in fall semester and at the end did not have the 1.35 G.P.A., he/she would have spring semester to remove probation as well as summer school. There is the possibility that he/she could have earned nine hours while still working on removing probation. Ward said the problem comes in the definition of semester. The military bases work on terms. They have two 8-week terms of two nights a week, Mondays and Wednesdays, 15 class nights, 45 hours of class in a shorter period of time. If the student came two terms with one course each term, he/she would be ruled ineligible at the end of the fall semester if it were a campus course. Wood said the student would be on probation, not ineligible. Ward said it was his understanding that he/she would be on probation at the end of the first term, so if he/she took a course the second term and didn't do well, the third and fourth term (which is actually spring semester) the student would be ineligible. Wood asked for clarification from Professor Clemens. Clemens asked Ward if he was saying that Continuing Education has two terms for each semester? Ward said that is correct. Clemens questioned whether terms should be equated with semesters for the Committee's evaluation purposes. It is certainly not the intention of the Division of Continuing Education to create semesters of short length and, by calling them terms, allow a student to pile up 5 or 6 "semesters" (terms) in one year. Ward said the need for the terms at military bases is because of missile planning and crises like the Cuban missile crisis of the 60's. An individual student is not tied up for as long a period of time as in the regular semester. This is a different type of student. Wood asked if Continuing Education does not offer classes at night during the summer session. Ward said they do. Wood asked why students do not attend those night sessions during the summer. Ward said they can but scheduling becomes a problem. They schedule a two-year program in three years in a sequential way so that if a student misses one part of the sequence that sequence does not occur again for three or four years. Wood asked Ward if Continuing Education had conducted a study of the probability of success for those students who make a poor grade on their first course. Ward said no, but normally after students are admitted and begin matriculation into the university, their grades at the beginning are not good. Wood said the committee hoped that this additional retention period would not be added because it would be a regression right back to the current situation. Studies have found that the student who got in early academic trouble, that is, below the 1.35 G.P.A., is the student who dropped back to part-time status and drifted along as long as possible. That is one of the reasons for recommending that students be checked even after one course.

Woodside said that the change wasn't that great and moved the question. The vote on the previous question passed. The amendment presented by Ward would add an additional retention period of 1-7 semester hours. On a voice vote the amendment passed. The Chair indicated that the motion as amended was open for discussion.

Jones questioned the last paragraph under Special Readmission. Why the inclusion of the Fall, 1966 date? Clemens said there was a reevaluation in 1966 and all "F's" were dropped at that time and the university went to the 3, 4, system. Ferrell said that if this motion passes, it will take four years to put it into effect. Wood said if the motion passed it should go into effect at the beginning of the fall semester, 1980. Ferrell asked that if the university admitted someone in 1978 under the old procedures, could the university not be held to the old procedures? Wood said can they not select the catalogue under which they want to graduate? Ferrell said that is true, but if they don't want to they don't have to, and he thought it would take four years for this to be in effect. Brewer said he is not certain, but he thinks that when you choose the catalogue you choose the curriculum requirements--he doesn't think you choose the procedures of the university. If the university changes the catalogue procedure on probation and suspension, the changes go into effect that semester. He said he could get a legal opinion on it. Wood said that if it is not out of order and there are no objections, she would request that the proposal be returned to the committee for further study into the ramifications of the amendment. The Chair said there was a motion to recommit the proposal to the committee and asked if there was a second. There was a second. Woodside raised a point of order, that the motion must be moved by a member of the Senate. The Chair agreed and ruled the motion to recommit out-of-order. The previous question was called and passed by the necessary two-thirds majority. On a voice vote, the motion presented by the Admissions Committee, as amended, passed. (See Resolutions Passed 80-1).

Agenda Item 5.B: Report of the Ad Hoc Code Screening Committee (Professor L. Champion). Since Professor Champion was not present, the Senate moved to the next agenda item.

Agenda Item 5.C: The report of the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness was presented by its Chair, Professor Tom Sayetta. Sayetta said that he had not been told the nature of the report desired by the Senate. The Chair stated that at the time the Agenda Committee last met, it requested the chairs of the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness and the University Research Committee to appear before the Senate and respond to questions about the most recent grants recommended by the committees. Professor Sayetta is present to answer questions concerning recommendations for the most recent grants awarded. Ryan asked if the committee had made recommendations for grants for teaching effectiveness. Sayetta replied yes, it had recommended 15 proposals to Dr. Maier. Dr. Maier has approved their recommendations and the recipients have been notified. Ryan moved that the committee supply the Senate the names of people who have been distinguished by receiving awards from the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Ferrell seconded the motion. Schmidt moved an amendment also to provide the nature of the proposal and the amount of the funds. The motion to amend the proposal passed. Snyder said that since she submitted proposals to both committees, it would have been helpful if both committees had established clear guidelines about what is acceptable to Teaching Effectiveness and what is acceptable to the Research Committee. Her proposals were rejected and she doesn't know why. The Chair suggested that Snyder get in touch with the chairs of these committees and ask for a specific explanation. The Chair noted that the motion before the Senate is for a list to be submitted to the Senate of the individuals receiving grants from the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness, including the nature of the proposal and the amount. On a voice vote, the motion was approved. (See Resolutions Passed 80-2.)

Ryan questioned the criteria involved. He assumed that the committee developed criteria in making the decision about which proposals to grant or recommend for funding and which not to grant or recommend. Sayetta said that was correct. Ryan

asked if those criteria had been made known to the faculty. Sayetta replied that there are some guidelines listed on the application form and those are known to the faculty who apply for the grants. Mainly, the committee was looking for proposals that tried to develop new approaches and methods for improving teaching effectiveness where the improved learning experienced by the student could be determined to see if it was better than the previous system. Although all proposals that were funded did not fall into that category, that was the most important criterion. That was what they were looking for, but they accepted other types of proposals. Ryan asked if it would be possible next year in calling for proposals to indicate clearly what criteria would be used in making a decision. It seems unfortunate to have faculty members playing guessing games about whether they are going to meet the criteria or not. Sayetta said that there are new guidelines which they are working on now so that they can request proposals from the faculty within a week. A notice will be sent to make the faculty aware of the request for proposals. Proposals will be due on April 1st for next July. The new guidelines will be more specific for those who want to apply for grants. Baker asked if it is correct that the committee chose as top priority for consideration this year proposals that had some measuring component built into them--pre-effectiveness, post-effectiveness, etc. Sayetta said they may not have put it into those terms, but that is essentially the idea. Baker said he didn't think that came across in what the committee sent out for criteria--in fact, it came to him out of the blue that that was a requirement. Dough said there seems to be some question about material sent out. He can remember receiving several handouts requesting faculty members to submit proposals. Schmidt asked if any workshop attendance was funded. Sayetta said he would have to look through the proposals, but believes the answer is yes. Schmidt said while you are looking, he would like also to know if there were any persons funded who have previously received funds from the committee. Sayetta said he would have to make a correlation between last year's recipients and this year's recipients. He has not done that. Schmidt asked if the committee had made an attempt to ascertain what use had been made of previously granted funds? Sayetta said that proposals for funds request certain items; the committee assumes that the funds have been spent for those items. At the end of the granting period the grantee is supposed to write the committee indicating what has been accomplished and how the funds have been spent. Schmidt moved that the committee respond to his questions in writing prior to the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded. The Chair said the motion before the Senate was that the committee report to the Senate in answer to Professor Schmidt's questions. On a show of hands, the motion failed. Dr. Maier, wishing to respond to the questions raised, recalled that there were a few who were granted funds for workshop attendance, much less than at previous times, and there were some repeaters who were, however, doing different things. The Chair observed that he had been working with the Vice Chancellor and will be working with the chairs of both committees on the question of accountability. Dr. Maier said accountability has already been discussed with the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness. Sayetta is not prepared to discuss it but that accountability is going to come before the committee. They have discussed the problem of how to get the reports in, and it is a significant problem to address--how do you get the previous reports in. Schmidt's question is a good one; we do need to follow up, but he is confident that the three groups--the Summer Grants Committee, the Teaching Effectiveness and Research--will address this issue with results.

Agenda Item 5.D: The report of the Committee on Committees was presented by its chair, Professor Eugene Ryan. Ryan said the Committee on Committees has three new charges for the attention of the Senate, and they are located on pages 4 and 5 of the agenda: new charges for the Faculty Welfare Committee, the University Computer Committee, and the Career Education Committee. The Committee on Committees has

worked these out in cooperation with the committees involved and believes that in no case did they do something counter to the wishes of the people on the committees. These are being presented for the first time and will be voted on as a by-law change next month. Price asked Ryan to explain paragraphs 4.B and 4.D of the charges; they seem to be the same. Ryan said the D. item in each of the charges concerns the power of any specific committee to act independently of the Senate. The Committee on Committees views this as a very important revision of the charges, that is, to spell out in what individual activity the committee should engage. For example, the Faculty Welfare Committee is empowered to make recommendations concerning policy to the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee without coming to the Faculty Senate. If the Senate adopts it, the committee would have that power. The University Computer Committee is empowered to represent the faculty computer interests of the academic community, so there again they would be empowered to do this without coming to the Faculty Senate. Kane asked if salary was under the purview of the Faculty Welfare Committee since it is not specifically mentioned. Ferrell said, in reply to Kane's question, that "all other programs" covered everything else and would include salaries. Atkenson said that the Welfare Committee had pursued the salary question under that phrase. Woodside said that he noted the Career Education Committee had a quorum of 4 faculty members with 5 ex officio members. There was a possibility of ex officio members outnumbering faculty members at a meeting, and he felt this wasn't appropriate on a faculty committee. Ryan said his recollection is that this was not considered, and a proposed amendment might be in order next month. Faulkner said that from three years' experience on the Faculty Welfare Committee, that the ex officio members on this committee frequently lead the discussions and are the main sources of information. Their presence, or their representative's presence, is necessary for conducting the business of that committee. She is in favor of leaving the membership the way it is. Haritun spoke and supported Faulkner. Woodside said that he didn't suggest that they take anybody off--he just called to the Senate's attention that the ex officio members could outnumber the faculty members. Dough said that in the Faculty Welfare Committee charge, paragraph 4.A might conflict with another committee's jurisdiction concerning leaves of absence. Ryan said he thought not. In the Faculty Manual there is a section concerning leaves of absence; no other committee is responsible, and the Faculty Welfare Committee has made recommendations about this issue.

Agenda Item 5.E: The report of the University Curriculum Committee was presented by its chair, Professor William Grossnickle. Grossnickle asked for approval of the degree requirements for Business Education and Office Administration as shown in the committee minutes of December 6, 1979, changing requirements for Vocational Business and Office Education Certificate, Distributive Education Teaching Certificate, Distributive Education and Basic Business Teaching Certificate, Option for Technical Teachers, and Option for Secondary School Teachers. On a voice vote the Senate approved the changes as shown in the committee minutes. (See Resolutions Passed 80-3.)

Agenda Item 5.F: The report of the University Research Committee was presented by its chair, Professor Lokenath Debnath. The Chair said that the Research Committee had presented to the Senate a list showing the applications for research grants that were not funded. Daugherty asked what the letter before the number means on the ones that were not funded. Debnath said this is the committee code number. Ryan asked Debnath about the criteria that were adopted in deciding recommendations. Debnath said they were given in the previous reports: travel expenses for research were funded, travel expense for attending meetings with or without presentation of

of articles were not recommended for funding. Limited funds for student wages and research assistants were recommended. However, the committee had a big problem with the availability of enough funds for this line item. Funds for research equipment were funded. Standard equipment and standard supplies were not recommended for funding. The committee felt these should be provided by the departments or the school. Wages for secretarial help were not funded because funds were not available in the budget. Page or publication charges only for accepted research articles by refereed journals were funded, but publication costs for book manuscripts were not funded because such manuscripts are not research in nature and royalties become involved. These are some of the general criteria used by the committee. Ryan asked if in addition to these there were other criteria adopted by the committee and wondered if the Research Committee could indicate what other criteria the committee had made use of. Would it be possible in connection with the next call for proposals for the committee to let the faculty members know which are the operative criteria? Debnath said those could be mentioned in the next announcement but that they have already announced the call for proposals. Ryan said perhaps it would be easier to append it to the Faculty Senate minutes for this meeting. The Chair asked if it would be acceptable to Ryan for the committee to send out an additional memorandum with this information. Ryan said it would be easier to append it to the Faculty Senate minutes. It seems to him that it should be made clear to the faculty ahead of time what the parameters are so they are not just guessing. Either way is all right with him. Debnath had no objections to mailing the additional information. Adler said he is a member of the committee, and he believes that the criteria are now listed in the new application form, and it would almost mean mailing the application form to everybody. Ryan asked if the criteria that were involved last year, and that will be involved this coming year, are listed on the application form? Debnath said not on the application form but on the guidelines and instructions form. There are two pieces of material, one is the application form and the other is the guidelines and instructions. On that, we list it in general. Ryan said that if that is the case then he would withdraw his request, but it was his understanding that the committee did adopt more specific criteria with regard to funding projects. Are those included on the form? Debnath said yes, in the guidelines and instructions. The Chair clarified that the mailing to the entire faculty did not include all of these criteria. Debnath said that because of the expense involved, they did send the call for proposals to every faculty member, but they did not send the instructions and application form to all faculty members. They sent examples to the departments and schools and indicated in the call for proposals that interested faculty members should either contact their departments or schools or pick it up from the Faculty Senate Office. Ryan said he did not want to belabor the issue, but wanted to get it clear--are all the criteria then shown on the forms? Debnath said he did not know if all the criteria are shown, but most of the criteria the committee has adopted so far are there. He said that other things come up in the committee that they talk about and factors dealing with the amount of research the person had done were involved.

Ryan asked that to the extent that the criteria could be made available ahead of time, then have they been made known? Debnath said yes. Grossnickle asked if normal supplies were not funded? Debnath said no. Grossnickle asked what if they wanted to do a mail survey and then follow up with a telephone survey and the amount of the postage and telephone charges used up the entire departmental budget for those items? Debnath said they evaluated the list of the items requested and what kind of items. If it were a \$5 or \$20 item, or whatever, they felt the departments should carry it. If it is a project which included supplies which were obviously over the budgets of the departments and necessary for completion of the project, they funded this type of proposal. Ironsmith inquired about the committee's wishes



in submitting reports at the end of the funding period. Debnath said that in the instructions and guidelines such a report must be submitted at the end of the fiscal year or when the proposal is completed and when the final report or progress report has been completed. The Chair said that a new progress report form has been prepared by the Research Committee and distributed to those individuals who receive grants so that they might indicate to the committee the progress they are making under the grant. Kane said he was interested in the accountability factor and is wondering what kind of latitude he has in determining his goals and what is he accountable for? Debnath said at this time the committee charge is to evaluate the proposals and recommend funds. They have received a letter from Dr. Maier about evaluating progress reports and after the next meeting of the committee he will be able to tell the committee's position about that, but at this time the committee's charge is to evaluate the proposals and recommend funds. At the next meeting the committee may agree or disagree, but we are committed to getting a one page progress report form and then evaluating them. About the accomplishments, I think there is as wide a latitude as before, you can do whatever you like, but we must evaluate how much accomplishment you made and whether it is satisfactory. Kane wanted to know how the committee evaluated the proposals. Debnath said first of all they used a proposal evaluation form and there are various items on that two page form. Every member of the committee evaluated each proposal, except if a committee member submitted a proposal he could not evaluate his own proposal. After the committee member evaluates each proposal, each subcommittee evaluates the proposal and reports to the full committee. Kane asked if he could receive copies of that evaluation form, not filled out, but blank to see how much weight was put upon the qualifications of the investigator. Debnath said at this time the committee did not want to make public the evaluation form. Kane said that it would be helpful to know how much weight is put upon each area. Debnath said the committee did not use a point system, they had something like weak, strong, very strong, etc., and they also looked at the investigator's credentials, whether he is active, not active, etc., so they could separate the progress and record of the investigator. They tried to look at the project as well as the investigator's record--that does not mean that they did not fund at all if the proposal was good and the investigator's record was not very good--the committee was very sympathetic and funded a lot of marginal proposals in order to promote research and creative activities. Kane said he would like to see the evaluation form and he thinks he would recommend that the committee particularly look for proposals which would stimulate extramural funding outside the university.

Debnath said that concerning the evaluation of committee members' proposals, the committee adopted a very strict rule about evaluation of those proposals. The committee member who submitted proposals was not allowed to participate in the discussion or deliberation about his proposal. He was not allowed to stay in the meeting when his proposal was on the floor. And the committee observed the strict rule that no member could participate on the evaluation of his own proposal.

Dr. Maier said that there were some proposals for secretarial help which were not approved--he reminded everyone that the university cannot designate secretarial positions. The positions have to be generated on a state-wide basis by the general administration. He does not have the authority to create secretarial positions over and above those allotted to the university. Such positions are more difficult to get than faculty positions, and new faculty positions are almost nonexistent for next year. The other thing is that one of the major requests that the Research Committee and the Teaching Effectiveness Committee gets is for student help. These budget categories are set up a year in advance for the university and for academic affairs. It is difficult or impossible to transfer from one budget item to another.

It is impossible to transfer into student wages because this is a salary item-- salary items are set by the general administration. There is no flexibility with student wages other than the amount available at the beginning of the fiscal year. That is why it is necessary to work closely with all three committees to get the recommended budget allotments to fit the allotments of the university. It is difficult from one year to the next to anticipate how they are going to change. The University is always trying to increase student wages but is not successful always in getting those increases.

Adler said he would like to respond to some of the questions raised by Kane because he is chairman of a subcommittee of the Research Committee looking into some of those things. The attitude of the committee is that if you get only 1/3 of the money you asked for, they still expect you to accomplish everything you said you could; if you can't do it, you should turn the money back. That would be the overriding factor and though it has never been voted upon, it has certainly been expressed. In other words, they adopted the policy that they would support as much as they can, and if it's not enough, it's better if you tell the committee then. Along those same lines, there was a difference of opinion in the committee about what they should do. Some people felt that they should pick out the top proposals and give them almost everything they want. Other people felt the money should be spread around by cutting everything to the bare bones. The committee is going to resolve that issue--he would be happy to hear from anyone who has an opinion on which way it should go. They will probably be meeting within the next couple of weeks. It is a very touchy issue. Regarding some of the questions asked earlier, the letters A,B,C, refer to three subcommittees who initially reviewed the proposals. They were not composed of all from English or all from Biology, etc., they were divided up with a scientist on each one, etc. Regarding the evaluation form, there are questions on it and they are answered on a 1-5 scale. There is no way one can average a score by adding them up. The majority of the committee did not believe in that. Ferrell said that several persons have commented that there are some persons who served on the Research Committee who received grants. That was understandable because last year when the Chancellor set up the Research Committee he wanted to make sure there were persons on it who had experience in research. If the best persons available are on the Research Committee, then it is understandable that some of those persons would receive research grants. Kane said there might be an opportunity here for a seminar in the area of research proposal writing. The members of the committee would know specifically where the faculty is weak. It would be nice to consider how they might assist the faculty in this way, both for on-campus and off-campus funds.

Debnath announced the call for proposals for fiscal year 1980/81. On January 15, 1980, the committee sent out a memo to all ECU faculty members inviting applications for grant proposals for fiscal year 1980/81 with a deadline of February 18, 1980. Unit faculty members should submit grant applications using the revised application forms. Revised forms and revised instructions and regulations are available at the Faculty Senate Office or department or school offices. In the revised regulations and instructions, some of the general criteria are listed. The committee has planned to complete its evaluation early and make recommendations to the administration by the end of April, 1980. Early completion of this work will enable the researchers to begin their research projects from July 1, 1980 so they can utilize the whole summer profitably. Also, the committee will be able to tell the administration about the funds required for the various line items of the budget. The committee hopes it will be able to serve the faculty more efficiently in order to promote research and creative activity in the university.

Agenda Item 5.B: The Report of the Ad Hoc Code Screening Committee. The Chair said that in the absence of Professor Loren Campion, the chair of the committee, Professor Ferrell, who is a member of that committee, has agreed to make the report. Ferrell said he thought there was a parliamentary difficulty. The revised code from the English Department was distributed dated December 8, 1979, and in the mail today another set arrived dated January 15, 1980. Ferrell said the second set is the one before the Senate. When a department or academic unit initiates a code, the Ad Hoc Code Screening Committee is the one that deals with it, but once it has been approved by the Chancellor, it then becomes the purview of the Faculty Governance Committee. The Chair noted that the items to be presented to the Senate are indeed amendments, and amendments to codes that have already been approved must go to the Faculty Governance Committee. In the absence of any additional information to the contrary, the Chair ruled the item out of order. Faulkner commented that the Agenda Committee charged her with directing the chairman of the English Department and departmental code committee to compile a list of changes and send them to the Faculty. That's how it got into the hands of the Faculty Senate. The Chair said apparently there had been an error in the route of direction of the proposed amendments to the code of the English Department and this error should be corrected prior to action by the Senate. These changes should be routed to the Faculty Governance Committee. The Faculty Governance Committee will then report to the Faculty Senate. The Senate must receive it from the Faculty Governance Committee.

Agenda Item 6.A: The Report on the Status of Resolution 79-10 was presented by Professor Robert Hursey. He said it was the object of this report to bring the Senate up to date on the disposition of its resolution 79-10 which is reproduced on the back of the agenda. This resolution, adopted by the Faculty Senate January 30, 1979, called for a tax sheltered, tax deferred option in the various state sponsored retirement programs. As early as 1976, it had become evident that a properly structured tax deferred option would be beneficial to both the State and its employees. Acting as sponsor, the North Carolina Federation of Teachers determined that a considerable level of support for a tax deferred option existed and that additional interest was obtainable by explaining to others the advantages of the option. An intensive lobbying effort for the adoption of the option was undertaken in early 1978 and resulted in the establishment of a legislative study commission (co-chaired by Representative Thomas Ellis and Senator Rachel Gray) which began their deliberations in late November of 1978. Testimony by persons from ECU was thrice presented to the legislative committee, the dates of those presentations being 12-14-78, 1-5-79, 2-5-79. On 2-5-79, the Committee voted to continue the study of the tax deferred option into the next legislative session. It is therefore expected that appropriate committees of the General Assembly will soon undertake the continuation of the tax deferred proposal.

On January 12, 1980, the North Carolina Federation of Teachers invited faculty representatives of the University of North Carolina, including AAUP, NCAE, and the Faculty Assembly, to a joint strategy meeting in Winston-Salem. There, the tax deferred option was discussed at length and those present appeared enthusiastic about the proposal. It was agreed that copies of a petition would be provided by the North Carolina Federation of Teachers and sent to those present who had volunteered to collect signatures on their campus. The signed petitions will then be forwarded to legislators, State and University officials. The Faculty Senate of Appalachian State University will formally consider the tax deferred option on 2-11-80, and a phone conference between the Appalachian Senate and Professor Robert Hursey has been arranged on that date. Finally, the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina will consider the proposal at its next meeting on February 15, 1980.

The Chancellor has sent a supportive letter for the proposal to Mr. John A. Williams of the Office of Administration, the State of North Carolina. Hursey said he thought it was time to take the next step in winning this option to our retirement system. Hursey moved the adoption of the resolution which will be identical to 79-10, with the exception of the third paragraph, which will make it appropriate to be directed to the President of the University of North Carolina. Paragraph 3 will be struck and replaced by: "THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the President of the University of North Carolina shall urge the Board of Governors to seek a choice of retirement programs for faculty--one which is tax sheltered, the other not; and". The motion was seconded. On a voice vote the motion passed. (See Resolutions Passed 80-4.)

Agenda Item 6.B: Proposed Faculty Appointments to the University Facilities Committee was presented by Professor Caroline Ayers. The Chair noted that the information before the Senate dealing with the membership of the current committee did not consider how the Senate would fill the four vacancies on the committee allotted by the Chancellor. On the reverse side of the handout, information is given about how persons previously appointed became members, and how the committee was established. Ayers said the Committee on Committees discussed this new committee and the membership (there are supposed to be four faculty members) and made the following recommendations: "The Faculty Senate selects the Chairman of the Faculty while in office as a member of the University Facilities Committee and directs the Campus Planning and Facilities Committee to select three of its members to serve on the University Facilities Committee until August 25, 1981. The Faculty Senate directs the Committee on Committees to evaluate the continuance of the Campus Planning and Facilities Committee." Ayers clarified that the University Facilities Committee is an administrative committee. Ferrell said allowing the Campus Facilities Committee to recommend membership follows the procedures the Senate adopted last year in allowing the Faculty Welfare Committee to select persons to represent itself on the university-wide welfare committee. Hursey asked if the number of faculty persons to be elected still remains four? Ayers said yes, the Chairman of the Faculty will fill one of those positions and three will be selected by the present academic committee. Ayers read the motion again for the Senate. Kane asked, in the event the Campus Facilities Committee is abolished, if the Senate may then elect the four members? Ayers said yes, that if anything happened to the present academic committee, there would have to be other provisions for electing the four faculty members. Kane asked if it is known who is appointed by the Vice Chancellors of various areas? The Chair said there was no information at the present time. If there is a specific need, he can get that information. On a voice vote the proposal from the Committee on Committees was approved. (See Resolutions Passed 80-5.)

Agenda Item 6.C: Change of Senate Meeting Date in March. The Chair said that at the last meeting of the East Carolina University Board of Trustees, a request was made that the Faculty Senate change its March meeting to coincide with the regularly scheduled meeting of the ECU Board of Trustees. They wish to meet for a period of time with the Senate. They also intend to meet for a period of time with the Student Legislature and possibly some of the academic committees--that is still to be determined. Upon receiving the request from the Chancellor, the Chair investigated the possibility of adequate facilities to house the Senate for a change of meeting days and also the question of possible conflict with classes for Senate members. At the present time, it has been determined that the meeting room in Mendenhall, Room 244, would be available on Monday, March 24. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs requested that should there be a particular problem in arranging for a faculty member to take a senator's classes or some difficulty in this

arrangement, contact the Chair and he will in turn communicate this information to the Vice Chancellor who would be glad to assist. The Chair has not been able to contact the Dean of the Medical School but would assume that the same would apply. Woodside moved that the meeting of the Senate in March be shifted from Tuesday, March 18th to Monday, March 24th, in Room 244 of Mendenhall, at the same time, 2:10 p.m. The motion was seconded. On a voice vote, the Senate adopted the change in the March meeting date. (See Resolutions Passed 80-6.)

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

Rodney Schmidt  
Secretary of the Faculty

Patsey Woolard  
Faculty Senate Office Secretary

FSO:pw  
2/14/80

Agenda Item 3.B Attachment:

Report from the Faculty Assembly

The thirty-first meeting of the Faculty Assembly was called to order by Chairman Browning at 1:30 p.m., November 30, 1979 in Chapel Hill at the offices of the General Administration. In attendance from ECU were Professors C. Ayers (for E. Ryan), P. Daugherty, T. Johnson, and R. Hursey.

President Friday spoke briefly and noted his satisfaction with the committee structure of the Assembly. He assured the group that each of its resolutions received the full attention of his staff. He continued by reviewing the disposition of resolutions passed by the Assembly at its previous meeting: Faculties were encouraged to submit information regarding difficulties with the present State purchase plan; the matter of non-resident tuition charges is being studied; the apparent lack of consistency of faculty salary levels among the various State institutions as compared to national category norms is under careful consideration.

With respect to the HEW affair, President Friday reported that charges of improper investigative procedures against HEW had been filed; he assured the Assembly that at no time had the Administration attempted to coerce anyone, as had been alleged by HEW.

Salary increments will be the number one priority of the Administration in the coming short legislative session.

Vice President Dawson reported the adoption by the Board of Governors of the considerably revised external consulting document and thanked the faculties for their recommendations. An additional report to the legislature on the Faculty Workload Study is to be made in January, 1980.

At the evening plenary session, the reports of the various committees were received: in response to an inquiry, the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee concluded that there is no conflict within the UNC Code between the authority of a Chancellor and that of a campus grievance committee--the Chancellor is the final authority of his/her campus; local grievance committees are advisory.

Salaries and the concept of a salary schedule were discussed at length by Vice President Dawson with members of the Budget Committee.

A resolution from the Faculty Welfare Committee calling for improved preventive medical coverage was approved. The Committee also gave notice of their intention to bring before the Assembly at its next meeting a resolution calling for a tax sheltered retirement option.

The Faculty Governance Committee was charged to assess the effectiveness of all Faculty Senates of the University of North Carolina and to report its findings during the current academic year. The Executive Committee is studying the feasibility of rotating the meeting place of the Assembly.

The Assembly adopted a resolution from the Committee on Planning and Programs calling for maximum faculty involvement in long-range planning and budget studies on each campus.

The Professional Development Committee requested details regarding local sources of support for professional development activities in which the faculties are engaged. The committee will again consider the matter of sabbaticals, and comments are welcomed.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED

The Faculty Senate approved the following resolution from the Admissions Committee, as amended:

(80-1) SCHOLASTIC ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS

Retention requirements are based upon attempted hours at East Carolina University and/or transfer hours from another institution.

The minimum scholarship requirements are as follows:

- a. First Retention Period, 1-7 attempted and/or transfer hours, no G.P.A.
- b. Second Retention Period, 8-31 attempted and/or transfer hours, 1.35 G.P.A.
- c. Third Retention Period, 32-63 attempted and/or transfer hours, 1.6 G.P.A.
- d. Fourth Retention Period, 64-95 attempted and/or transfer hours, 1.8 G.P.A.
- e. Fifth Retention Period, 96- attempted and/or transfer hours, 1.9 G.P.A.
- f. Sixth Retention Period; Second undergraduate degree, 2.0 G.P.A.

An overall minimum grade point average of 2.2 is required for admission to the Upper Division in Teacher Education and to student teaching.

To graduate, a student must have an overall grade point average of 2.0 and also have a 2.0 in the major field of study.

A student who possesses a baccalaureate degree and who is working toward a second baccalaureate degree must maintain an overall grade point average of 2.0 on all work attempted on the second baccalaureate degree.

Probation and Suspension

Grade point calculations are made and the report mailed to the student at the permanent address of record at the end of each semester and each summer term. A student who is not meeting the required scholastic eligibility standards will find one of the following codes printed on the grade sheet:

#2 Academic Warning--This code indicates that the student is performing at the required scholastic level at the present time; however, continued performance at this level will, upon the attainment of the next retention period, result in academic ineligibility and inability to graduate during the normal time frame.

#3 Academic Probation--This code indicates that the student has not met the required scholastic standards. If the deficiency is not removed by the end of the next semester of enrollment, the student will be declared academically ineligible to return (except for summer school).

#4 Academically Ineligible--This code indicates that the student's scholastic performance has not met the requirements necessary to continue enrollment; the student is suspended.

A student placed on probation must meet scholastic eligibility standards at the end of the next semester in which the student is enrolled or he/she will be declared academically ineligible. The first instance of academic ineligibility will result in suspension for one semester followed by readmission on probation. Students becoming academically ineligible a second time will be suspended for one

academic year (two consecutive semesters). If a third suspension occurs, the student will be readmitted only for successful appeal to the Admissions Committee.

During a period of probation or suspension, a student will not be given permission to attend another institution of higher education but is eligible to attend summer school at East Carolina University. In this way, a student may establish good standing during a period of probation or suspension.

#### Readmission and Appeals

Students who have been out of school for at least one semester must apply for readmission. Students who fall below minimum requirements to continue at East Carolina and who wish to petition the Admissions Committee for readmission must present their appeals in writing no later than two calendar weeks prior to Registration Day. Students who have attended the second term of the summer session in order to qualify for the fall semester must present their appeals no later than one calendar week prior to registration.

The Admissions Committee normally will not consider appeals from ineligible students unless they are based on personal or family problems of an extreme nature or evidence of substantial academic improvement.

Students applying for readmission to the Schools of Allied Health and Social Professions, Music, Business, and Nursing must be readmitted by both the Admissions Office and the Admissions Committee of the appropriate school. A student may be eligible for readmission into the University but not into one of the above specified programs. It is not possible to be readmitted to one of the specified schools without meeting University requirements for readmission.

#### Special Readmission

Students who have been ruled ineligible to return and/or who have been out of school during periods of three or more consecutive academic years may appeal to the Admissions Committee for special readmission. Such appeals must be submitted in writing according to the dates scheduled above.

Subsequent grade point averages of students readmitted under this policy will be computed without inclusion of previous course work (completed since Fall, 1966) in which a grade below C was received; credit toward graduation will not be allowed for such course work. However, this work will be included in calculations for consideration for honors. These readmitted students must have a grade point average of 2.0 for the first nineteen semester hours of attempted course work after being readmitted; they must meet catalogue requirements after that time. A student may be readmitted under the provisions of the policy only one time.

-----

(80-2) The Faculty Senate approved the following:

RESOLVED, that the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness shall furnish the Senate with a list of the individuals receiving grants from the committee, including the nature of the proposal and the amount of the funding.



RESOLUTIONS PASSED (Continued)

(80-3) The Faculty Senate approved curriculum changes as shown in University Curriculum Committee Minutes of December 6, 1979 which include requirements for Business Education and Office Administration.

(80-4) The Faculty Senate approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, All citizens of North Carolina who are self-employed or who are employed and provided a non-contributory pension plan are afforded the financial benefits accruing to a tax sheltered retirement program; and

WHEREAS, The employees of the State of North Carolina are by law members of a contributory retirement program which presently allows no option to tax shelter employee retirement contributions;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the President of the University of North Carolina shall urge the Board of Governors to seek a choice of retirement programs for faculty--one which is tax sheltered, the other not; and

RESOLVED, That the State shall, in lieu of a portion of the raise to be granted State employees this year, assume, henceforth, the retirement contributions of all employees who elect the tax sheltered retirement option; that the State shall not report this deferred income to the Internal Revenue Service as gross taxable income; and that the option shall be structured so as to cause no diminution in presently guaranteed State benefits.

-----

(80-5) The Faculty Senate approved the following:

The Faculty Senate selects the Chairman of the Faculty, while in office, as a member of the University Facilities Committee, and directs the Campus Planning and Facilities Committee to elect three of its members to serve on the University Facilities Committee until August 25, 1981. The Faculty Senate directs the Committee on Committees to evaluate the continuance of the Campus Planning and Facilities Committee.

-----

(80-6) The Faculty Senate approved a change of its March meeting date from Tuesday, March 18, 1980 at 2:10 p.m., to Monday, March 24, 1980, at 2:10 p.m., in Room 244, Mendenhall Student Center.