

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 18, 1986

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1986-87 convened in Hendrix Theatre, Mendenhall Student Center, on Tuesday, November 18, 1986, with Kenneth Wilson, Chair, presiding.

Member absent was Atkeson (History). Alternates present were Shank for Jones (Music), Stephenson for Kares (Academic Library Services), and Holt for McMillan (English).

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 21, 1986, were approved.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Mr. C. D. Spangler, President, University of North Carolina

Kenneth Wilson introduced President C. D. Spangler, who had been invited to address the Senate and the East Carolina University faculty.

President Spangler spoke of his introduction to the office of President of the UNC System, saying that while he is enjoying the job, he has had to learn to deal with the media (reporters and television cameras) and to being asked such questions as "What is your philosophy of life?"

While he does not have an academic background, he said that he is dedicated to education, particularly public education and will work to preserve access to public education. He quoted a portion of the North Carolina Constitution which states, "Benefits of the University of North Carolina shall be extended to the people of the state free of expense so far as practical." The low tuition rates in our universities help preserve access, and the investment in the students has long-term benefits to the state.

President Spangler remarked that even though he has a business background, he recognizes the University is not a business and cannot be run as a business.

Diversity of thought is one of the assets of a university, he stated, and academic freedom is not for the benefit of the faculty, but for the benefit of society.

President Spangler closed his remarks by reminding the Senate that North Carolina is one of the most supportive states of the higher education system. He then asked for questions from the floor.

Thomas (Allied Health) asked if there were plans for faculty input to the President's office. Mr. Spangler replied that input is readily accepted and that since there are 7,000 faculty in the system, most concerns are expressed through the Chancellors and the Faculty Senates. He said that a faculty representative on each Board of Trustees had been suggested in the past. Faculty often write directly to the President's office.

Mayberry (Foreign Language) complimented President Spangler on his published remarks supporting international studies and foreign languages in a university education and asked if there was anything he as President could do to remedy the lack of education in foreign language in both high schools and university graduates.

Mr. Spangler repeated his support for foreign languages and expressed his feeling that the economy and foreign trade of both the state and the country would benefit if more students were literate in a foreign language. He added that a knowledge of computers was also necessary today.

Dunn, speaking for the Faculty Welfare Committee, asked about the possibility of a University-wide sabbatical system. Mr. Spangler replied that use of the word "sabbatical" is a tactical error. Business realizes the need to support updating for its executives, but universities have not done as well. He said he felt there is more support in the General Assembly than in the past, but he does not feel the General Assembly would address the issue now.

Simon (Political Science) asked about the financial aid problems many students have encountered this fall, commenting he felt some students might have to leave school because of the delays in awarding grants. Mr. Spangler quoted the axiom from law that "Justice delayed is justice denied" and said that he has asked the chancellors to provide him information about how delays have affected students on their campuses. If there seems to be a purposeful attempt to circumvent the law by delaying paperwork, then he feels the college presidents should act.

King (HPERS) asked about the relationship President Spangler has established with the General Assembly. Mr. Spangler said that while serving as Chair of the State Board of Education, he had spent a great deal of time with the General Assembly and felt he had good friends there. Remembering to express thanks and to tell what's right and what's wrong with education helps make a good relationship with the legislators.

Ferrell (History) spoke of the perception among ECU faculty that there is prejudice against the schools that were not part of the "old" university system. ECU is no longer a four-year school but is also not a Ph.D. granting institution. He asked if there was an explanation why we at ECU seem to work more and be paid less. Mr. Spangler said that resources are allocated over a long period of time to benefit the whole state, with some schools faring better than others in any given year. He stated he was not "pro" any one school and felt his responsibility was to support ways that would help us grow as a university.

Maiola (Sociology/Anthropology) asked for Mr. Spangler's suggestions of how the faculty might feed back to him our thoughts about the candidates for Chancellor. President Spangler replied that the process for selecting a chancellor is stipulated by the University Code. The Trustees recommend to the President at least two candidates and he recommends to the Board of Governors. Faculty are represented on the Search Committee.

Farr (English) noted that over 50% of the students in U.S. universities are women and asked Mr. Spangler if he had any special plans for mentoring women and minorities in his administration. President Spangler replied that he is aware of the problems in administrative appointments for women and minorities and knows there is room for improvement. He noted he has appointed the first woman to serve as a Vice President in the UNC General Administration, Wyndham Robertson, Acting Vice President for Communications.

After the question-and-answer session, the Senate recessed briefly and re-convened at 2:35 p.m.

B. Announcements

Kenneth Wilson reminded the Senators they had received the resumes and the schedules of the two candidates for Chancellor who would be visiting on campus. The faculty representatives on the Search Committee feel either of the candidates would be a good chancellor. The schedule for the on-campus visits is not the one suggested by the Faculty Senate Committee and argued for by the faculty representatives on the Search Committee.

As the Chair opened the floor for discussion, James L. Smith (Faculty Assembly) presented a resolution concerning the on-campus visits. He said that we seemed to have stepped backward in the process of faculty input into the selection of the chancellor. The resolution had multiple seconds (See Attachment 1).

Ryan (Administrative Council) moved to amend the resolution to add to (b) that "the data from these surveys be given to the members of the Chancellor Search Committee and to the members of the Board of Trustees". After second, much discussion ensued. Hough (Faculty Assembly), speaking in behalf of both the resolution and the amendment, said that we have the opportunity to "look upon" the candidates, but there is not a process in place to gather opinion. We seem to have regressed since the last two chancellor searches.

Rees (Theatre Arts) asked why we are doing it this way this time. Kenneth Wilson said the argument in favor of the system being used is that it is more consistent with the way higher-level administrators are being selected now. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges recommends this type of interview process. Interviews are less intensive than in the past so that candidates can better evaluate the University and its strengths. Smith (Faculty Assembly) remarked that serious candidates should be capable of fielding some hard questions and that public relations should not be that big a consideration.

South (English) remarked there was a lot of secrecy and a breakdown in confidence in the whole process and suggested we need more freedom in the interviewing process.

Ryan (Administrative Council) asked about the Chair's personal feeling and Wilson replied that he and the other faculty representatives argued for the process as suggested by the Faculty Senate. Ryan asked if the faculty representatives on the Committee support the present system. Wilson replied he would have preferred another structure and argued for another structure.

Duckett (Medicine) said that the faculty representatives presented the plan and supported it but that the scheduling of on-campus visits was not controlled by the Search Committee, but by the Board of Trustees.

Schellenberger (Business) suggested that the Senate set up an evaluation method to be used if one is not approved.

Hough (Faculty Assembly) asked about the process once the campus visits are over.

Duckett (Medicine) said that after campus visits, the Search Committee will meet and discuss the candidates and if no others surface, then a ranking of the two will be given to the Board of Trustees. He reminded the Senate that the comment had been made that the search will not be closed until the Chancellor is selected.

Wilson said lots of candidates were visited on their own campuses, and the two who have been invited to visit ECU surfaced as clear leaders. Bringing others to campus in order to have more than two would not have been fair to the others.

Mayberry (Foreign Languages) said the way the on-campus interview process is set up is not an interviewing situation. The whole process reminds one of how visitors are ushered through Russia.

Simon (Political Science) said the Chairs in Arts and Sciences need an opportunity for serious discussion with the candidates and have compiled seven or so questions they think would be of interest to candidates as communicating concerns. The meetings as scheduled seem mostly social and not substantive. What can happen on campus now is only a ranking and not a selection process. If one candidate should withdraw, the other is automatically put forward as Chancellor.

Ferrell (History) stated he had served on one Chancellor Search Committee and thought the agenda put forward this time by the Senate is more complex than that used the past two times. The opinions of faculty were taken to heart by Ferrell, Daugherty and Davis when they served as faculty representatives. A survey instrument should be used to gather faculty opinion.

Johnson (HPERS) stated he had served on a previous Chancellor Search Committee and feels faculty input into the process has eroded. Four faculty members served on the last Search Committee; three serve this time. The last time faculty controlled the on-campus visits.

Ryan (Administrative Council) moved to amend the resolution further by adding "Be it also resolved that the Chair present this resolution to the Chancellor as soon as possible and request the Chancellor to forward the resolution to the members of the Board of Trustees, and that the resolution be transmitted immediately to the faculty members of the Chancellor Search Committee requesting that they share it with the other members of the Chancellor Search Committee." Upon second, general discussion continued.

Kledaras (Social Work) called the question.

The amendments and the resolution passed on a voice vote with no dissenting votes.
(Resolution #86-24)

Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business

There was none.

Agenda Item V. Report of Committees

A. Curriculum Committee

Committee Chair Grossnickle referred Senators to Curriculum Committee minutes of October 9, 1986. The motion to accept the report was carried on a voice vote.
(Resolution #86-25)

B. Committee on Committees

Chair Holly Mathews presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for changes in the charge of the Faculty Governance Committee and for the formation of a new Unit Code Screening Committee. An enabling resolution was included. Mathews referred Senators to a revised copy of the proposed change to the charge for the Faculty Governance Committee. In discussion, the phrase "and passed by the Faculty Senate" was added after "Faculty Governance Committee" in Section 4.A. Committee Functions of the Proposed Charge for the Unit Code Screening Committee.

Laupus (Medicine) moved the membership of the Faculty Governance Committee be expanded to include the Vice Chancellor for the School of Medicine or appointed representative as an ex-officio member. Upon second, the motion carried, 26 in favor, 12 against.

This being the first reading of the Committee on Committee's recommendations, a vote was postponed until the next Senate meeting. (See Attachment 2)

Agenda Item VI. New Business

There was no new business.

Kenneth Wilson reiterated that the faculty representatives on the Search Committee want faculty input in the selection process. Grossnickle (Psychology) suggested a boycott of the on-campus visits if Senate suggestions are not taken. South (English) said he was strongly against boycott and that as much input as possible was needed from faculty. Rodabaugh (Continuing Education) moved the Senate recess rather than adjourn until such time as the Chair could report on the resolution. The motion was seconded and Smith (Faculty Assembly) spoke in support. Morrison (Chemistry) spoke in opposition and moved the meeting adjourn.

The Senate voted 20 in favor, 13 opposed, and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Madge Chamness

Madge Chamness
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Sharon Bland

Sharon Bland
Secretary to the Faculty Senate

Resolution 86-24 Regarding the Chancellor Selection Process

86-25 Curriculum Committee Minutes of October 9, 1986

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION #86-24

Whereas, the rendering of advice by all of the valid constituencies of a University loved by so many is a vital and important part of the trust that must pervade the University, and

Whereas, the advice of the faculty and of the other constituencies of the University cannot be seriously considered unless it is solicited, gathered, and summarized in a thorough and comprehensive manner, and

Whereas, mechanisms have been utilized in the past whereby such a goal has been accomplished, such that the faculty and other constituencies have had both the possibility of direct interview and the consequent opinion survey form to fill out, and

Whereas, it is understood that no meeting has been scheduled with the Faculty Senate and no plans for formal survey of the opinion of constituencies are in place,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate urgently request that its representatives convey to the Chancellor Search Committee the faculty's dismay and the requests that

- (a) a meeting with the Faculty Senate, open to all faculty, be scheduled for each candidate, and that
- (b) such polling surveys as have been used in the past be made available at all meetings that the faculty and other constituencies have with the candidates, and that the data from these surveys be given to the members of the Chancellor Search Committee and the members of the Board of Trustees.

Be it also resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Chair present this resolution to the Chancellor as soon as possible and request the Chancellor to forward the resolution to the members of the Board of Trustees, and that the resolution be transmitted immediately to the faculty members of the Chancellor Search Committee requesting that they share it with the other members of the Chancellor Search Committee.

PROPOSED CHARGE FOR THE UNIT CODE SCREENING COMMITTEE

1. Name: Unit Code Screening Committee
2. Membership: 7 faculty members, plus ex-officio: The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or an appointed representative and the Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee or an appointed representative from that Committee.
3. Quorum: 5 elected faculty exclusive of ex-officio.
4. A. Committee Function: The Committee insures that unit codes conform to the East Carolina University Code and the guidelines for unit codes recommended by the Faculty Governance Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate. All new codes and changes to existing academic unit codes are submitted to the Committee, for its review, before submission to the Faculty Senate.
B. To Whom the Committee Reports: The Committee shall inform each petitioning unit of its decision on the proposed code or changes to the existing code for the unit and allow the unit an opportunity to answer any objections to the Code's acceptance. The Committee recommends approval of new codes and changes in existing codes to the Faculty Senate.
C. How Often the Committee Reports: The Committee reports to the Faculty Senate as often as necessary, but at least once a year.
D. Power of the Committee to Act: The Committee is empowered to screen all new unit codes and changes in existing unit codes and make its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE CHARGE OF THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

2. Membership: 7 faculty members, plus ex-officio: The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or an appointed representative, the Vice Chancellor and Dean for the School of Medicine or an appointed representative, the Chair of the Unit Code Screening Committee or an appointed representative from that Committee, and the immediate Past Chair of the Faculty in residence.
4. A. Committee Function: The Faculty Governance Committee considers matters relating to the Constitution & By-Laws of the Faculty Senate; the Faculty Manual, where there is no conflict with the functions of the Committee on Committees; Unit re-evaluations; and the ECU Code; and recommends overall guidelines for unit codes. The Committee considers additions and deletions to the East Carolina University Code and hears appeals by any faculty member concerning the application of governance procedures of both the East Carolina University Code and the Unit Code within his or her unit.
B. To Whom the Committee Reports: The Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate changes in the Constitution & By-Laws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Manual, and the East Carolina University Code. When evaluating the implementation of governance procedures, the Committee makes recommendations to the unit and to appropriate administrative officials.