FACULTY SENATE MINUTES February 19, 1985

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1984-85 was held on Tuesday, February 19, 1985, in Mendenhall Student Center, Room 244, with Chair James LeRoy Smith presiding. Members absent were: Bays (Soc/Anthro/Econ), Kledaras (Allied Health), and Boyce (Faculty Assembly Rep.). Alternates present were Thornton for Capen (Business), Holt for Jones (English), Hancock for Johnson (HPERS), Steele for Gallagher (Home Economics), Boklage for O'Brien Medicine), Merrow for Spickerman (Nursing). Doug McMillen will be replacing Malcolm South who is on a leave of absence for the spring semester.

The Chair asked the Senate's approval of Agenda Item VC presented only for discussion. The purpose of leaving action for the March meeting was to permit senators to discuss the report of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee and the dissenting report with the individual units and faculty at large. By consensus the agenda item was approved.

APE Balder, Head Football, Coach

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes P. Bredderman requested a change on page 5, Agenda item IV.A., second paragraph, second sentence from, "Since that Library was separated from the old Division of Library Services, Medicine had . . ." to "Since the dissolution of the Health Affairs Division, Medicine has . . ."

everal thinks are being done on the state and local le

A. Volpe requested the change on page 2, paragraph 3, first line from "Associate or Assistant to the Vice Chancellor" to "Associate or Assistant Vice Chancellor."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

Agenda Item IIIA. Announcements 1. Elizabeth Dole, a native North Carolinian and Secretary of Transportation in Washington, D.C., will be our commencement speaker this spring. She will receive an honorary Doctor of Letters degree.

- 2. Chancellor and Mrs. Howell will host a reception for Faculty Senators and spouses/friends on the evening of March 18.
- 3. The "on-line" registration "go, no-go" decision will be made in late February. Terminal operator training sessions are underway this week. The Liaison Committee is preparing recommendations for Dr. Volpe. I will send our results to all senators once they are available. I have attended one of the training sessions, and I am confident that all concerned will see

Francisco - The service Francisco

the distinct advantages of this system, once hands-on familiarity and a bit of experience is gained.

4. The Committee on Committees has prepared the annual letters seeking nominees for the important work of faculty and administrative committees for next year. I cannot say enough about the importance of these endeavors, and I wish to thank Chancellor Howell of his support for this effort, as indicated in the cover letter from him that is attached to the call. Please give every consideration to this matter and discuss it with your colleagues. I remind you of the availability in your unit of the committee handbook.

5. The Rotterdam Symphony will perform Wednesday, February 27 at 8:00 p.m. in Wright Auditorium.

Agenda Item III.B. Faculty Assembly Advisory Committee Report on Presidential

Search Hough stated that there was little to report because no faculty appointments have yet been made to the Advisory Committee.

Agenda Item III.C. Art Baker, Head Football Coach The Chair introduced and welcomed Art Baker, the new head football coach. Baker reported that recruiting has been completed and 18 young men signed with ECU. He thanked those faculty who helped in the process. With regard to faculty interest in the academic capabilities of athletes, Coach Baker reported that in his last two positions, 95% of the football players had graduated. Several things are being done on the state and local level to assure that athletes' academic standards be raised. Although it is true that usually the higher the SAT score, the longer the 40 yard time (the slower the athlete), many factors affect performance. The coach announced that one young man with a grade point average of 3.9 had just broken Terry Long's squat lift record with a 825 lb. squat lift. He noted that there is a very difficult football schedule in place for the next two years. Coach Baker invited faculty to support the team, indicating that the faculty was welcome to watch drills or to attend film viewings.

Agenda Item IIID: Election of Five Members of the Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate officers for 1985-86

Wide Change lost

The following candidates were nominated to the Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate officers for 1985-86:

Larry Hough, Political Science JoAnn Jones, English Artemis Kares, Academic Library Services Bea Chauncey, Music Ken Wilson, Sociology/Anthropology/Economics

Rees moved and Crawley seconded that nominations be closed. The motion passed on a voice vote and the five nominees were elected by acclamation to the committee.

Kares and Hough were nominated and both declined the chairmanship of the committee. Wilson was nominated and elected by acclamation to be the chair of the Nominating Committee.

Agenda Item IV.A. R. Fulghum reported on a meeting of the Parking and Traffic Committee with

2

Chief of Security Calder. Calder explained that ticketing of cars does not begin until registration day because of the large numbers of unregistered parent cars, and because there is insufficient manpower for the heavy traffic. Traffic regulations are enforced, however, during registration and examination periods. The policy is not to tow a vehicle until three tickets have been issued. ands Iten V. Record of Committees

merry presented the Eurricelulum Committee report. If a faculty member wishes to make a complaint of an illegally parked vehicle, he/she can do so and the car will be towed. The faculty member who complained will have his/her name included on the ticket. I note change in ticket kept

Some students drive their parents' cars with faculty stickers and some students have obtained staff stickers with old ID cards similar to staff cards. Efforts are being made to halt these practices. Clarificatione

ranal advising. Faculty need to be made more

Discussion followed concerning a consulting firm report on parking, only parts of which have been implemented, notably the increased parking fee. Income from these fees has been used to pave and prepare more parking lots.

The remainder of the report is in the Planning Commission Report. Atkeson noted that his original motion had been to enforce traffic regulartions and if this is the intent of the security forces during registration and exam periods, he was satisfied.



asked if the committee had any specific red B. Chauncey moved that the name of a faculty member who reports a traffic violation not appear on a ticket given to a student. Atkeson seconded. Ed Rayn spoke against the motion noting the right of the student to know his accuser and the obligation of faculty to acknowledge their complaint. Rees suggested delaying action until more information was acquired. The motion passed after a voice vote was too close to call and a division of the house revealed a vote of 24 for and 17 against. Resolution 85-7.

Agenda Item IV.B: Second Reading of Calendar Charge Revisions J. Sadler presented the second reading of the Calendar Charge revisions. H. Ferrell asked for the purpose of the charge and whether the function of the Calendar Committee would be mainly to formulate guidelines or did the committee's function remain the creation of calendars. In order to guarantee the latter, he suggested the addition of a section 6. Sadler indicated that the Calendar Committee shall submit the appropriate calendar(s) to the Faculty Senate for its approval. The revised charge of the Calendar Committee was approved as amended. Resolution 85-8

The revised charge reads as follows: 2. Membership: Six (6) faculty members and one student member, plus ex officio: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or an appointed representative and the Vice Chancellor for Student Life or an appointed representative.

4. A. Committee Functions: . . . down to line 5: term; (3) the scheduling of examination periods; (4) the scheduling of holidays and vacation periods; (5) and other matters affecting the calendar. The committee (a) develops and presents guidelines to the

Faculty Senate for its approval, (b) makes recommendations based on these approved guidelines and other matters affecting the calendar; and (6) the Committee shall submit the appropriate calendar(s) to the Faculty Senate.

periods. The policy is not, to tow a vehicle intil these tides to be

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

Stella Daugherty presented the Curriculum Committee report. (See Agenda.) The actions of the Committee as recorded in the minutes of January 24, 1985, were approved by the Senate on a voice vote. Resolution 85-9

Agenda Item V.B. Student Recruitment and Retention Committee Susan Smith reported for the Recruitment and Retention Committee. The committee has studied statistics on student retention nationwide. Two factors were discovered to be most important, student involvement in University activities, and academic and personal advising. Faculty need to be made more aware of the services available in these areas at E.C.U. While it is true that many students are lost because of academic weaknesses, we are also losing good students. A memo has been circulated to faculty alerting them to aids and services available and faculty are urged to spend a little extra time with students needing advice. Professor Smith read a letter from a faculty member pointing out three factors: it takes only a little time, students are appreciative of the attention and faculty appreciation of students rises.

Ferrell asked if the committee had any specific recommendations concerning advising, particularly general college advising. Susan Smith replied that the committee supports the report of the Planning Commission on advising. K. Wilson suggested that better advising might take place if faculty had fewer advisees and more faculty participated in general college advising more frequently. B. Chauncey asked if data were available on attrition among General College students versus students with declared majors. Volpe replied that retention is a greater problem at the freshman and sophomore levels. Overall, approximately 50% of the freshmen who enter graduate in four years, and this figure seems to compare favorably with other universities.



Agenda Item V.C. Teaching Effectiveness Committee Belinda Lee presented and read the Teaching Effectiveness Committee report as distributed to the faculty. J. Longhill then presented his dissenting report.

The Chair announced rules for discussion on the report. Each Senator could speak once to the issue until every Senator who wished to speak had done so. Comments from committee members would not be included in the one-time rule, and committee members would be given the opportunity to make a statement before the floor was opened.

In reply to Longhill's report, M. McGrath noted that the many objections she had heard from faculty regarding evaluation had all dealt with the evaluation instrument. None had dealt with the idea of having evaluations of teaching effectiveness. 1. A Constitutet functions: . . . down to line 5:

Bloodworth, a member of the committee, spoke to the integrity of the use of the instrument. Ed Ryan noted that Appendix C mandates the development of an evaluation instrument. Longhill was asked if his statement that the majority

4



1 .. .

of the faculty do not favor student evaluations, was an opinion or the results of a poll. Longhill replied that a scientific poll was not taken and the statement was his opinion. Rees asked if Longhill favored the continued use of the old long form or if he was opposed to all forms. Longhill replied that the latter was his position.

J.O. Smith (Business) asked if this form will be final and if the TEC would go out of business for three years until data on the results could be compiled.

Boklage asked if other forms of teaching evaluation had been considered,

particularly the measurement of learning in pre- and post-tests on the course subject matter.

L. Hough raised his departments' objections to the wording of some questions on the short form, particularly in reference to how students would interpret questions containing two or three elements. Bloodworth responded that although interpretations by students cannot be controlled, the analysis of the responses can be controlled.

C. Adler also noted concern with some multi-part questions and the inhibitions on teaching style that might result. McGrath noted that the questions dealing with respect and fairness were addressing the old problem of sexual or racial discrimination rather than a teaching style. Adler asked if "good teacher" was not better than "effective teacher" and also questioned student interpretation of course goals, which for most students meant to pass the course.



have all a support the second second

H. Ferrell noted the history of the 12 questions designed to help improve intruction. The request for evaluation of teaching by administrators came from the Board of Trustees. The short form now designed for administrative use will affect tenure-track professors and promotion more than established professors. Longhill noted that his objection to administrative use of student evaluation was aimed not at the effect on professors or their careers, but at its effect on higher education.

Bloodworth reported how ineffective the present long form is for administrative evaluation of teaching. Brenda Lee urged faculty to remember that the committee recommended that this four-item instrument be only one of several methods used to evaluate teaching.

Ferrell asked why one form could not be used with four questions pulled out for administrative evaluation purposes. Bredderman questioned the scale and asked why there was no clear indication of what a student could label as unacceptable. Wilson summarized the debate as having three parts:

1. Do we want student evaluation of teaching at all?

Do we support this procedure of two forms, and
Do we support the specific items and questions?

He suggested that future debate be aimed at these separate categories.

Dudek spoke to the issue of evaluation versus measurement. Students can evaluate but not measure, and data from student evaluation cannot be used as a measure. Good teaching depends on traditional mutual respect and discussion among colleagues rather than on student opinion. Bloodworth responded that measurement of data collected from the responses of those four questions would be valid as a measurement if used as outlined on the committee report. Boklage objected on the grounds that the only objective data would be data based on subjective responses, and therefore such data could not be objective.

Bloodworth replied that the meaning attached to the survey numbers must be consistent and statistically significant as carefully outlined in the report.

C. Adler spoke in favor of peer evaluations being used in conjunction with student evaluations. In his department of 13 faculty, the correlation between the two kinds of evaluation had proved to be exactly the same. Discussion on these issues will continue at the next Senate meeting.

Agenda Item V.D. Revised Academic Library Services Code Eldean Pierce presented the revised Academic Library Services Code. The Senate approved the Code on a voice vote. Resolution 85-10

Agenda Item VI. New Business There being no New Business the Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

course analis. Wilde for most students meant to pass the

Nancy Mayberry Helen Broaddus

Secretary of the Faculty Office Secretary of the Senate

Resolutions passed by Senate: 85-7 Motion which states that the name of a faculty member who reports a traffic violation not appear on a ticket given to a student.

85-8 Calendar Committee Charge Revisions

85-9 Curriculum Committee Minutes of January 24, 1985 85-10 Revisions in Academic Library Services Code

Fer rell selectivity one form could not be used with four questions builted out for administrative evaluation purposes. Breddenam, questioned the scale and asked why there was no chair indication of what a student could label as unadceptable. Milson summerized the debate as having three parts:

Le Devie want student evaluation of tendining at all.

J. Do we support the specific items and questions?