

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 15, 1983

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1983/84 was held on Tuesday, November 15, 1983, at 2:10 p.m. in Mendenhall Student Center, Room 244, with James LeRoy Smith, chair, presiding. Members absent were: Longhill (Business), Downing (Drama), Atkeson (History), Daugherty (Mathematics), O'Brien, Brinn, and Laupus [ex officio] (Medicine), Watson (Music), and Read (Science Education). Alternates present are listed as follows: Thornton for J.O. Smith (Business), Terrell for Powers (Education), Gallagher for Rosenfeld (Home Economics), Haggard for Davis (Math), and Adler for Sayetta (Physics).

Approval of Minutes: One correction was made in the minutes of October 25, 1983:

Under Agenda Item #4, Old Business, add:

The action of the Committee on Committees regarding the Student Recruitment and Retention Committee's recommendation to form a Task Force to investigate certain matters was that:

The Student Recruitment and Retention Committee establish a subcommittee in order to address the questions, and after consultation with appropriate officials as necessary, report to the Senate. Upon joint request of the sub-committee and the Chairperson of the Faculty, the SR&R Chair would make a report to the Senate. Suggested officials are the Registrar, Supervisor of Student Supply Store, Vice Chancellor for Student Life, Director of Continuing Education, among others.

Kledaras (Allied Health) asked for clarification on the section of the Faculty Assembly report which stated that . . . "each institution was to have discretion within certain bounds to distribute the monies as they saw fit." The Chair stated that the minutes were correct and that Vice President Dawson had indicated that the criteria listed were to be applied in an order and with a weight decided down the line, even to the unit chair deciding that order and weight on some campuses.

Agenda Item 3A: Announcements from the Chair

1. 1983-1984 Faculty Teaching Evaluations

Since the announcement of the April dates for the running of the student opinion survey on faculty teaching effectiveness, the Senate office has had several inquiries about timing, Appendix C requirements and related matters. The following clarifications, discussed with and approved by Chancellor Howell and Vice Chancellor Volpe, are therefore here listed:

(1) The rationale recommended by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee for alternating semesters was that professors often teach different types of courses from semester to semester and any teaching evaluation instrument should be applied over all of that spectrum. Thus, since it was run in the fall of 1982, it should be run in the spring of 1984. In order to present an accurate picture of the course, late spring was chosen. Another reason for the scheduling was hopefully to decrease apathy among respondents by not running it every semester.

(2) The requirements by Appendix C are:

(i) that each tenured and probationary term faculty member shall receive an annual evaluation which shall include an evaluation of

- the quality of teaching, and
- (ii) that that quality must be evaluated by means of data from surveys of student opinion, when such data have been gathered in accordance with established procedures of the department or the university which guarantee the integrity and completeness of that data, and
  - (iii) that each unit shall either develop and use its own instrument(s) as approved by the Chancellor or utilize the instrument developed by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and
  - (iv) that, additionally, peer evaluations and other unit code procedures, properly approved (cf. page C-4, Appendix C), may be used in the evaluation of the quality of teaching.

(3) The options\* for 1983-84 are thus as follows:

- (i) units should use a unit-developed poll which has been approved by that unit's faculty, the unit chair, and the Chancellor so as to guarantee the integrity and the completeness of the data thus gathered, or
- (ii) units should use the TEC instrument and unit heads should prepare the annual evaluations of as to utilize the data on quality of teaching last and the university administration should request that Institutional Research provide that data upon the completion of final exam period of the Spring Semester, or
- (iii) units should use the TEC instrument earlier than April and tabulate the results in the unit.

\*Should data from either the TEC instrument or a unit-developed, approved alternative not be available even with the best of planning in time for the faculty evaluation, that unavailability would not mean that teaching quality would go unevaluated.

2. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee will hold open meetings on November 22 and 29 at 3 p.m. in Brewster B-103 for the purposes of considering changes in the style and the items used in the current Student Opinion of Instruction survey instrument. The faculty is invited to speak and to submit written comments.
3. A subcommittee of Arts and Sciences' chairs is currently working on a proposed revision of the faculty evaluation form that is used for annual evaluations. The subcommittee members William Bloodworth, Ray Martinez, Martin Schwarz, and James LeRoy Smith will report to the Chairs at the December meeting of the Chairs of the College.
4. Chancellor Howell has received authorization from the Board of Trustees to reorganize the Planning Commission membership along the lines that have been discussed in the past. He discussed the reorganization with the Educational Policies and Planning Committee at the November 8 meeting. The new commission will be composed of the following members: Chancellor; Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Institutional Advancement, and Student Life; Vice Chancellor & Dean of the School of Medicine; Director of Athletics, undergraduate professional school dean nominated by deans and appointed by Chancellor; Dean of Arts and Sciences; Dean of Graduate School; three faculty members elected to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee; the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Faculty; two members of the Board of Trustees selected by the Chairperson of the Board.
5. From the Faculty Senate will be a new column in Pieces of Eight which deals with items of interest regarding the joint effort in governance at East Carolina. Items will be coordinated through the Faculty Senate Office and

all faculty as well as specifically committee and unit chairpersons are invited to send such items to the Senate office.

6. Dr. Joseph Boyette, Dean of the Graduate School, has asked me to make the following announcement: East Carolina University granted two Honorary Doctoral Degrees in May, 1983; and the Honorary Degree Committee will examine recommendations for possible nominees to receive Honorary Degrees in May, 1984. To be eligible for consideration, a person must show eminent achievement in scholarship, public affairs, service to the University, service to the state or nation, or in activities recognized as significant in the educational world. Names with substantiation of qualifications should be sent to Joseph G. Boyette, chair of Honorary Degree Committee, Graduate School, Brewster Building A-215. Deadline for recommendations is February 1, 1984.
7. The Faculty Affairs Committee will hold an open hearing for those concerned with the question of removing the six-year cap on non-tenured, full-time, state-supported faculty positions. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 29 at 4 p.m. in Brewster D-103. Those wishing floor privileges should notify Ione Ryan, committee chair, through the Faculty Senate office, by November 23. A notice of this hearing will be sent to all faculty including fixed term appointees. The Chair commented that this announcement may or may not have a bearing on Agenda Item 6A.

Agenda Item 4A: Report of the ad hoc Committee on Awarding Second Undergraduate Degrees with Distinction

Castellow (Psychology) presented data collected by the committee from other universities (see Faculty Senate Agenda of November 15, 1983). The following resolution was proposed:

The committee recommends the awarding of second undergraduate degrees with distinction under the following conditions:

1. The student must complete a minimum of 30 semester hours, including the final semester's work, at this University.
2. To qualify for a second undergraduate degree with distinction, the student must have a minimum GPA of 3.5 on course work for the second degree and an overall average on all course work attempted for the first degree as well as for the second degree which meets the requirement for the degree with distinction. The level of distinction on the second degree can be no higher than allowed by the GPA on the work toward the second degree.
3. The student must meet all other scholastic requirements for a second degree as listed in this catalogue.

If the Faculty Senate approves of the above recommendation to implement a policy of awarding second undergraduate degrees with distinction, the committee recommends that such policy first go into effect for students who will graduate summer, 1984.

The resolution passed without dissent. (Resolution 83-44)

Agenda Item 5A: Curriculum Committee

Grossnickle (Psychology) presented the following degree changes and courses from the October 27, 1983, Curriculum Committee:

1. Deleting History 1040, 1041 and adding 1030, 1031 changes BA/BS History (Majors & Minors); B.S. Elem Educ.; BA/BS French, German, & Spanish majors;

- BS Pol. Sci; BA Art History; BS Home Economics (Clothing and Textiles, Merchandising and Clothing and Textiles options).
- 2. Revise Latin American Studies minor
- 3. Changing Advanced General Physics changes the BS Physics, BS Applied Physics, BA Physics (Major and Minor, BS Physics - Teaching (Options I, II, III), BS Chemistry, BS Biochemistry, BS Biology, pre-engineering, -dental, and -medical curricula.
- 4. Revised English minor for all degrees.

All changes and new courses were approved without dissent. (Resolution 83-45)

Agenda Item 5B: Research/Creative Activity Committee

M. Gallagher (Home Economics) presented a revision of the criteria for proposal review used by the committee:

- A. The application shows that the research or creative activity: (a) is in the general area of the applicant's field, (b) is of scholarly importance, (c) promises permanent worth, and (d) may be completed during the grant period.

That is:

- The research/creative activity has the probability of leading to significant contributions in the field and or to the individual's enrichment and growth.

And

- The research/creative activity is based on current knowledge in the field and shows how the proposed research or creative effort extends, expands, and/or explores new directions, techniques or processes.

And

- The research/creative activity possesses evidence of scholarly potential, that is, it consists of more than mere data collection or confirmation of easily anticipated results,

And

- The research/creative activity is methodologically sound and within the competency of the principal investigator.

- B. For proposals that are judged to be meritorious based on the above criteria, the following secondary criteria will be used:

- The research/creative activity would provide "seed money" to initiate a large scale project when, in the judgment of the committee, the project promises long term success and the possibility of attracting outside funding,

Or

- The research/creative activity represents continued or expanded creative activity or research that has been successful over a period of time,

Or

- The research/creative activity represents initial research effort for a

faculty member who has not been previously engaged in creative activity or research,

Or

- The research proposal(s) represents reentry into creative activity/research.

C. For proposals that are judged to be meritorious based on the criteria listed in A and B above, the following budgetary criteria also will be applied.

- Travel: Sites to which travel is proposed must clearly be essential to completion of the project. Travel outside the continental United States will be approved only when the evidence presented as justification for such travel is very convincing. Examples of such evidence are full explanation of data collection/observations that are site specific and attempts to obtain international travel funds from other (Non-ECU) sources.

- Need for travel within the region (i.e. Southeast) must be documented. Applicants requesting payment for use of a personal car must explain why ECU cars cannot be used. Reasons for multiple, short-distance trips must be given. Travel and subsistence should be budgeted at state-approved rates.

- Equipment: Requests for major equipment purchase or repair (i.e. in excess of \$500) will not be considered when the needed equipment exists elsewhere on campus and is accessible to the applicant, when the equipment is thought to be essential to the department or school and therefore is the responsibility of the department or school and the Academic Affairs office to purchase and maintain, and when the equipment requested appears to represent one-time use by one investigator. Applicants requesting funds for computing equipment must include a statement that the request has been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Computer Committee (Jim Joyce, Physics, chairperson).

D. No proposal will be considered if a progress and/or completion report has not been submitted for a previous committee award.

The proposed criteria are different from the criteria which have been used in that under the proposed criteria: 1) All conditions in section A must be met. 2) One or more of the criteria in section B must be met. 3) Section C more clearly delineates the guidelines for travel and equipment expenses. The proposed criteria were approved without dissent. (Resolution 83-46)

Agenda Item 6A: Carl Adler Amendment:

Adler (Physics) presented the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Senate instruct the Faculty Affairs Committee that, prior to drafting a final report, the committee should notify all fixed-term faculty of any tentative conclusions and or recommendations and invite them to a public hearing on said recommendations.

Adler stated that he did not want to withdraw the motion based on Announcement #7 by the Chair. Adler stated that action by the Senate was needed to insure: 1) that all fixed term appointees would be individually notified, 2) that all fixed term appointees would receive a copy of all

tentative conclusions and recommendations prior to the hearing. Haggard seconded.

The Chair stated that Adler's first concern was addressed and all fixed term appointees would be notified.

Chauncey (Music) suggested the resolution be amended so that a copy of the recommendations be sent to all faculty members. Kledaras seconded. Johnson (HPERS) felt that the language in the resolution might imply that the Faculty Affairs Committee had not planned to have open meetings or notify those affected. The Chair stated that he had no indication on this. Haritun (Music) stated that as a member of the committee, she felt the committee might prefer to get input at the hearing and then distribute their recommendations. E. Ryan (Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences) said that the resolution would not prohibit the committee from holding two hearings. Johnson (HPERS) asked if the resolution requires that an individual letter be sent to each faculty member or would the routine method of distribution be followed. The Chair suggested that the individual notice be sent to the unit heads and include a cover letter from the Faculty Chair. Haney (Art) suggested that the notification be sent to unit heads and faculty senators. This was acceptable to Chauncey and Adler.

Thus, based on friendly amendments from Chauncey, Johnson and Haney, the original resolution was amended to read:

Be it resolved that the Senate request the Faculty Affairs Committee, that prior to drafting a final report, the committee should notify all faculty, through sending sufficient copies for all unit faculty to all unit heads and through sending separate individual copies to all senators, of any tentative conclusions and/or recommendations and invite them to an open hearing on said recommendations.

This wording was acceptable to Adler and to Haggard and Kledaras. The motion passed without dissent. (Resolution 83-47)

There was no other new business. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Martha Keehner Engelke  
Secretary of the Faculty

Helen Ruff Broaddus  
Office Secretary of the Faculty Senate

-----  
Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate November 15, 1983:

- 83-44: Policy concerning awarding of second undergraduate degrees with distinction
- 83-45: Curriculum revisions found in Oct. 27, 1983, minutes
- 83-46: Revised Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Proposal Review
- 83-47: Resolution concerning providing faculty members with Faculty Affairs Committee recommendations concerning removing six-year cap on non-tenured, full-time, state-supported faculty positions.