

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

A special called meeting of the Faculty Senate was held at 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, November 25, 1986, in Hendrix Theatre.

Members absent were Cunningham (Medicine), Daugherty (Art), Davis (Technology), Davis (Math), Dudek (Medicine), ~~Glaseoff (Business)~~ <sup>(was present)</sup>, Gregory (Medicine), Hedges (Psychology), Hines (Business), Jones (Music), Jones (Science Education), Keeter (Technology), King (HPERS), Lee (Nursing), Parkerson (History), Pierce (Nursing), Voors (Art), Watson (Music), White (HPERS).

Alternates present were Blomo for Bays (Economics), Castellow for Grossnickle (Psychology), and Kopanski for Knoke (Aerospace).

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Chair Ken Wilson called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Agenda Item II. Special Order of the Day

A. Announcements

1. A moment of silence was observed in memory of Carol Hampton, Science Education.
2. Wilson announced the receipt of a petition from fifteen faculty members requesting a special called meeting of the Senate.
3. The Chair referred the Senators to the handout each had received which included a copy of the letter received from Chairman Ralph Kinsey, Jr., Board of Trustees, in reply to Faculty Senate Resolution #86-24. The handout also included a copy of the form submitted to Mr. Kinsey for use as an evaluation instrument for the Chancellor candidates. The same form which was used in the last chancellor search was used this time except that the parentheses were omitted. (See Attachment 1)

Agenda Item III. Unfinished Business

Discussion of Chancellor Search Process

Hough (Faculty Assembly) directed the Senators' attention to a notice in the Daily Reflector on Monday, November 24, that the Board of Trustees would meet in executive session on December 7.

Atkeson (History) presented a resolution distributed earlier in the meeting to Senators, saying that the main point was to have the resolution on record for future searches. Faculty have had little time with the candidates and the Senate has had no separate time with them. The evaluation opportunities we have been given have been meaningless since only two candidates were offered. (See Attachment 2)

Upon second, general discussion of the resolution followed.

Hough (Faculty Assembly) stated he had seen President Spangler on Friday at the AAUP meeting and had given Mr. Spangler a copy of Senate Resolution #86-24 and asked his opinion. Mr. Spangler quoted "at least two names must be submitted", but added he would just as soon see three or four.

Hough said he felt the public sessions with the Chancellor candidates were insufficient and that questions in reception lines were not adequate. The faculty have had no chance to question candidates regarding faculty governance. The three faculty members on the Search Committee represented us well, but they were outnumbered by Trustees on the Committee.

Joyce (Physics) questioned the resolution wording, quoting the resolution as saying the Search Committee had failed to include the faculty in any way. He pointed out the Search Committee did include three faculty members.

Atkeson (History) responded that he meant in the interview process. Students, Deans, etc., have had more opportunity than the faculty to discuss issues with the candidates.

Boklage (Medicine) said we have three representatives on the Search Committee who were chosen after considerable debate. None of us would have done a significantly better job. These representatives have said they share a consensus that the two candidates who are visiting are the best. The action we are discussing now seems to be an act of spite and has to do with disagreement with the Board of Trustees.

Sadler (Library and Information Studies), speaking against the resolution, said it is too late for action. The time to make our dissent known was when our representatives on the Search Committee dropped from 5 to 2, with Mr. Kinsey picking the third. We need to forget this resolution and work harder for changes in the future.

Rees (Theatre Arts) said he felt that the problem most people have is with the secrecy of the process. Two candidates have emerged and we have been presented with a feat accompli.

Kares (Academic Library Services) agreed with Sadler that it is too late to come forth with this resolution. We knew we had approximately 30% of the Search Committee. She said she could not support the second "whereas" of the resolution since it is not a foregone conclusion.

The AAUP statement on the selection and retention of administrators should be examined before there is another search for any administrator.

We have two good candidates and it would be too bad to foul up at this point and not get a good chancellor because we are upset with the interview process per se.

Chestang (Geography) said he was mystified by the comment he keeps hearing that "It may not be these two." The faculty doesn't know what the process may be to consider others, under what conditions or who can interview more candidates.

Wilson replied that the Search Committee had not discussed that possibility, but he assumed it would require action by the Board of Trustees, probably based on Search Committee recommendations. Situations such as the one we are in now are known to generate rumors.

Mayberry (Foreign Language) stated that she was dismayed that only five questions were asked of the candidates at the general meetings and that these questions were prearranged. At least one of the candidates knew the questions beforehand. The question-and-answer period was more a report for the media than anything else.

Morrison (Chemistry) said he also disagreed with the interview process used and felt we should express indignation and dismay. The first resolution expressed our concern and any further expression should be done with more deliberation. The normal process of referring to a committee and then debating committee recommendations should be used. The resolution under consideration is too negative. We could do something positive with a one-statement questionnaire distributed to faculty, with results tabulated and sent to the Search Committee.

Atkeson (History) said the resolution was not in spite and while he recognized it was late, we need to do something. Other groups had one to two hours with the candidates, but the faculty and the public together got one presentation. We have to live with the new Chancellor a long time, while Mr. Kinsey will not be on the Board of Trustees much longer. We should express loudly that some changes should be made. From 185 candidates, surely the Search Committee could find more than two to present to the University. The Board of Trustees seems not to care about our feelings in the matter.

Joyce (Physics) moved to amend the resolution as follows: In the second "whereas", delete beginning with "with no" through the end of the line. Add "as a body" after "Faculty Senate" and "the" before "General Faculty".

After second, Joyce said the statement would be more accurate, since we did have some input. We should be careful not to be spiteful and should offer an accurate resolution.

The motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Ryan (Administrative Council) moved to drop the entire "whereas" section of the resolution. Upon second, he asked Atkeson's opinion on the motion. Atkeson replied he was trying to link this search with past ones and would like to retain at least the first "whereas". Castellow (Psychology) said the resolution would be weakened by dropping the "whereas" section.

On voice vote, the amendment failed.

Rodabaugh (Continuing Education) said he could not form an intelligent opinion on the basis of the candidates' visits as they were structured and offered as an amendment to the main motion:

"That the Faculty Senate, due to the manner in which the search has been conducted, lacks sufficient information to reach an informed opinion, negatively or positively, regarding the qualifications of the two candidates invited to the campus."

Upon second, Ryan (Administrative Council), speaking against the amendment, said it was contradictory to what we have asked for previously. One day we ask to be able to express an opinion, then we say we can't give an opinion.

Boklage (Medicine) asked if there was any provision in law regarding intelligent opinions from the Faculty Senate. Wilson replied there was not.

The amendment failed on voice vote.

Wilson said he did not think the resolution under discussion was aimed at the faculty members on the Search Committee. They have represented the faculty views on the Committee well, winning some points and losing some. The confidentiality has been necessary. Your representatives and the Executive Secretary, who is a faculty member, have engaged in some vigorous discussion and argumentation. Unfortunately, the confidentiality necessary in a search process means we could not keep you fully informed.

George Bailey said the main point against the resolution seems to be that it is too late. If it is too late for more candidates to come on campus, then the resolution is not in order. If not, then the motion is in order.

Kledaras (Social Work) commended the faculty representatives on the Search Committee and said our quarrel is with the process used and should be aimed at the future. Comparisons would be very difficult if two more candidates came on campus under a different schedule from the two who have already visited. We need to be open and equitable. We cannot represent our constituencies on this resolution because we haven't had a chance to discuss it with them.

Boklage (Medicine) said we are not expressing a problem with "the plate" but rather with "the way that the plate is set before us". We have an emotional and political problem. The resolution cannot help us in any way now. He then moved to table the motion and set up a committee to consider the resolution. The motion was seconded.

George Bailey spoke against the motion to table, saying if we are happy, we should vote against the resolution and if we are not, we should vote for it.

Atkeson (History) noted that a motion to table is not debatable.

The vote was 14-yes, 16-no and the motion to table failed.

Mayberry (Foreign Language) said she felt her freedom of inquiry had been violated since she could not question the candidates in any meaningful way. It is the process we are objecting to.

Schellenberger (Business) said the problem is the relationship of the faculty with the Board of Trustees and the Board's understanding of our involvement in the process.

He moved to delete the third "whereas" in the resolution since it is the most negative. Upon second, the amendment failed on voice vote.

Morrison (Chemistry) said two of the "be it resolved" have no chance to pass the Board of Trustees and moved they be deleted. The motion died for lack of a second.

Atkeson (History) said the resolution was not aimed at the two candidates, but speaks to the process. The Search Committee should have two more candidates who could visit on campus.

Thomas (Allied Health), referring to the letter from Mr. Kinsey, said this resolution would send a message as the other one did. The first resolution did get us more input, whether we liked what we got or not. The second resolution would let the Board know we want a different process in the future.

The question was called. After a voice vote, division was called for. The vote was 17-for, 13-against and 3-abstentions. (Resolution #86-26) Presence of a quorum was questioned. Thirty-four Senators were present, constituting a quorum.

Atkeson moved adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Madge Chamness*  
Madge Chamness, FS Secretary

*Sharon Bland*  
Sharon Bland, FS Office Secretary



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
CHANCELLOR SEARCH COMMITTEE

P.O. Box 7127

Greenville, N. C. 27835-7127

C. RALPH KINSEY, JR.  
Chairman, Board of Trustees  
and Search Committee

Brody Building  
Phone (919) 757-2100

DR. JO ANN H. BELL  
Executive Secretary

October 19, 1986

Dr. Ken Wilson  
Chair  
Faculty Senate  
East Carolina University  
Greenville, NC 27858

Dear Ken:

I have received a copy of the Faculty Senate Resolution #86-24 which was passed on November 18, 1986. I appreciate the concern which the faculty expressed in that resolution. As you know the faculty has been extremely well represented throughout the entire search process. The campus visit was designed to provide broad-based exposure for each candidate. Given my personal desire to have the search process concluded with the same strong faculty support that has been provided throughout, I have directed that a polling survey be available at each of the meetings which the faculty and other constituencies will attend. These forms will be collected at the end of each meeting or will be returned to the Executive Secretary. This information will be transmitted to the Search Committee for use as it deems appropriate.

Unfortunately, I am unable to comply with that portion of the resolution which requests that a meeting with the Faculty Senate be held. Faculty Senators are, of course, invited to attend the presentation which is open to all faculty. At that session, there will be an opportunity for a limited number of questions. I have requested Dr. Gene Ryan to arrange for several of the questions submitted by the Chairs of Arts and Sciences to be asked at that session. These questions address issues in which a broad spectrum of the faculty would be interested.

Again, I appreciate the faculty's interest and look forward to seeing you and them during the campus visits.

Very truly yours,

C. Ralph Kinsey, Jr.

# DATA SHEET ON INTERVIEWEES

CANDIDATE'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

I. My position at East Carolina is (check one)

☐ Member faculty senate
 ☐ Chairperson academic committee  
☐ Dept. chairperson
 ☐ Student
 ☐ Dean
 ☐ Adm. Staff  
☐ Bd. of Trustees
 ☐ Chancellor Sel. Comm.
 ☐ Other

II. With regard to exercising internal leadership (striving for quality staff-adm. appointments; full involvement in university curricular matters, planning, faculty development, student affairs, fiscal affairs; striving to reward quality performance, etc.) Please rank the interviewees on the following scale (one is lowest; seven is highest)

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

III. With regard to exercising external leadership (forceable representation of ECU interest in Raleigh and Chapel Hill; effective deportment in Chancellor peer group and learned associations: Knowledgeable and effective representation of ECU interests to alumni, governmental agencies, foundations, and the general public, etc., etc.) Please rank

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

IV. With regard to student affairs generally (increased recruitment of able students; systematic efforts to upgrade career planning and placement, counselling, publications; alumni development; general quality-of-life variables in student matters, etc.) Please rank

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

V. With regard to enrichment and faculty-staff development generally (funds for appropriate travel; released or "counted time" for research, public service, university service; efforts toward sabbaticals or their equivalent, retirement and other collateral measures; clerical services, etc., etc.) Please rank

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

VI. With regard to promotion of extra-mural programs (athletics, intermurals, drama, art, music, workshops, lectures, museums, consortia, clinics, etc., etc.) Please rank

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

VII. Comments:

RESOLUTION #86-26

Whereas, in most chancellor searches the Faculty Senate and general faculty have had opportunities for open question and answer session with chancellor candidates followed by comment to the Search Committee, and

Whereas, the presentation of but two candidates for the position of Chancellor of East Carolina University indicates that the Search Committee has reached a decision, and

Whereas, the Chancellor Search Committee has failed to include the Faculty Senate as a body or the general faculty in any meaningful way in the search process,

Be it resolved,

- 1) that the Faculty Senate of East Carolina University requests that the Search Committee consider the recommendation of more than two candidates for the position of Chancellor of East Carolina University,
- 2) that the Faculty Senate and the general faculty be given the opportunity for open question and answer sessions similar to those of past searches,
- 3) that the Faculty Senate and general faculty then be offered the opportunity to comment upon the several candidates and to rank them prior to the recommendation of the Search Committee to the President of the University of North Carolina.