

PLEASE POST FOR ALL FACULTY TO READ

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 1992**

The Faculty Senate met in special session on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Student Center, Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

Chair John Moskop called the meeting to order at 2:10 PM.

Agenda Item II. Roll Call

Absent were: Chancellor Eakin, VCSL Matthews, George (Aerospace), Graham (Psychology)

Alternates present were: Campbell for DeJesus (Economics), Denny for Sykes (Continuing Education), Ferrell for Atkeson (History), Gallagher for Snow (Human Environmental Sciences), Chowdhury for Reaves (Industry and Technology), Woodside for Daugherty (Math), Fletcher for Pennington and Markello for Pories (Medicine), Thompson for Reiser (Sociology and Anthropology)

Also present was: Kruger for Chowdhury (Industry and Technology)

Lennon (Academic Library Services) moved to suspend the rules to allow a new matter to be discussed and a resolution presented. Chair Moskop asked if there were any objections to Lennon's request. No objection was heard.

Lennon stated that the State is setting up a plan of preferred provider hospitals. In hospitals across the state agreeing to participate, state employees undergoing health care at those facilities, would receive a 5-8% discount on hospital stays. The N.C. Hospital Association endorsed this proposal and most of the hospitals across the state initially gave their support for it. Under this plan, at participating hospitals, the cost to the patient would be a 20% co-payment, up to \$1000. In hospitals that did not participate in this plan, the co-payment would be 40%, up to \$5000. The Pitt County Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees voted against participating in the program. A General Assembly Committee meeting was planned for January 29 to approve the proposal, which would go into effect April 1, 1992. Lennon further stated that the legislators have assured him that if something is not done to contain health care cost, that when the General Assembly meets in the Spring they will have to increase insurance premiums. Lennon encouraged the Faculty Senate as a body to make our concerns known to the legislators and the PCMH Board of Trustees by approving the distributed resolution.

Thompson (Political Science) questioned if the PCMH Board of Trustees were under the County Commissioners. Ferrell (History) responded that the PCMH Board of Trustees is a public corporation. There are some County Commissioners appointed and the Board of Governors makes appointments to the PCMH Board of Trustees because of the association with the School of Medicine.

Chair Moskop questioned if the PCMH Board of Trustees report to the County Commissioners. Ferrell (History) responded that the PCMH Board of Trustees do report to the County Commissioners but not in a priority fashion.

Thompson (Political Science) moved that an additional "Whereas" be added to the resolution on the floor to include the County Commissioners. Lennon (Academic Library Services) stated that the amendment has worth but the County Commissioners can not explore the alternative plans but could



encourage the PCMH Board of Trustees to participate in the plan. The amendment passed.

Hough (Political Science) asked if there were figures on the dollar amount of money spent by state employees at PCMH that could strengthen the resolution. Lennon responded that the dollar amount was not available, but there were approximately 10,000 state employees in Pitt County.

Ferrell (History) moved that the word "highest" be substituted with "largest" in the second "Whereas". The amendment passed.

The resolution concerning the health care insurance plan was passed as amended (Resolution #92-6). Please refer to the list of resolutions for the full report.

Grossnickle (Psychology) requested that the resolution be reported as approved by unanimous vote. There was no objection.

Chair Moskop indicated that he would forward the amended resolution to the State Legislators, PCMH Board of Trustees, and Faculty Assembly Representatives.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Proposed Revisions to Appendix D, Gene Hughes

Gene Hughes (Business), Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee gave a brief history of the Committee's activities since April, 1989 when the Chancellor directed Draft 8 of Appendix D to the Committee. He thanked the 1989-1992 Committee members and other ex-officio members who served on the Committee.

The 15th draft of Appendix D and recommended changes in Appendix L was distributed to the faculty in the summer of 1991. Public hearings were conducted and well attended. Additional revisions of Appendix D were debated, based on the public hearings, and the 16th draft was distributed to all Administrators, Deans, Chairs, Directors, and Faculty Senators on January 10, 1992.

Hughes stated that while any number of changes in Appendix D (from existing to draft 16) can be noted, it is the Committee's belief that the following represent changes of particular importance:

- 1) Responsibility for the Faculty Manual in the Faculty Senate Office (D-3)
- 2) The term "Unit Administrator" defined for all campus units (D-3)
- 3) Leave of absence with a possible extension of probationary period (D-3)
- 4) Timing of the review process for probationary, tenure-track appointments (D-4 & D-5)
- 5) Faculty may be granted up to three years of credit for prior academic experience (D-4 & D-5)
- 6) Procedures for providing progress toward tenure letters each year during the probationary period (D-6)
- 7) Deletion of section dealing with employment beyond the age of 70 (D-7)
- 8) Consideration for promotion independent of consideration for the conferral of permanent tenure (D-8)
- 9) Deletion of the six-year cap on fixed term appointments (D-9)
- 10) Redefinition of the role of the permanently tenured faculty in personnel decisions (D-9 & D-10)
- 11) Redefinition of the role of the Unit Personnel Committee (D-9 & D-10)
- 12) Establishment of a policy and timetable for external peer review for promotion and tenure (D-11 & D-12)
- 13) Redefinition of the role of Unit Administrator in personnel decisions (D-11)



- 14) Specification of the different types of personnel files to be maintained (D-12 & D-13)
- 15) Addition of material procedural irregularity as a grounds for a hearing (D-17)
- 16) Revisions of procedures for the hearing process (D-18)
- 17) Revision of the appeals procedures (D-21)

Hughes stated that there are at least two changes in the document that will require unit code changes. These are noted on pages D-11, line 33, Qualifications of External Peer Reviewers and D-13, Line 9, Materials for the PAD (Personnel Action Dossier). He stated that normally when a code is presented to the Unit Code Screening Committee, the entire code is evaluated. In reference to this, Don Sexauer (Art), Chair of the Unit Code Screening Committee, indicated that the Senate could mandate a process for the necessary code revisions which does not require evaluation of the entire code.

Hughes stated that in addition, the recommended revision to Appendix L included the change to make the quadrennial evaluations applicable to all administrators, and all faculty members who evaluate other faculty for the purpose of promotion, tenure, appointment, reappointment, and/or the annual merit evaluation. This would allow Appendix L to be consistent with the newly revised Appendix D, page D-3, footnote 2, definition of unit administrator. He then stated that on behalf of the Faculty Governance Committee, he recommended that draft 16 of Appendix D and the recommended changes in Appendix L be adopted by the Faculty Senate.

Chair Moskop asked for questions for information, or clarification regarding the proposed revisions. The Chair informed the Senate that the Faculty Governance Committee members who are Senators and those in the audience could respond to the questions.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) questioned why maintenance of the Faculty Manual was moved to the Faculty Senate office (D-3). Bailey (Faculty Assembly) responded that upkeep would be more efficient in the Faculty Senate office. VCAA Springer asked for a definition of the term "maintenance". The Faculty Manual is currently a function of her office. Bailey responded that the current draft indicates the Faculty Manual be accessible in the Faculty Senate office for the periodic re-publication of the document. The cost would come out of the Faculty Senate office budget.

Harris (Foreign Languages) questioned what is the purpose of the record when a faculty member applies for and then withdraws a request for early consideration (D-8, line 17). Bailey responded that this provision was included in order to provide a record of what had happened if at a later date a concern arose as to why the faculty member had withdrawn the application. Harris then questioned if the Committee considered the use of the record beyond what was stated and would it then prejudice the candidate to have withdrawn. Bailey responded that the Committee did not anticipate that the material would be used against the candidate in future personnel decisions.

Ferrell (History) asked for a definition of "part time appointments". Bailey responded that the Committee chose to leave the definition of "part time appointments" to the individual units.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) stated that page D-5, line 16-20, includes the Unit Personnel Committee, the Unit Administrator, and the Vice Chancellor. He then questioned why appropriate Dean was not included. Bailey responded that the purpose was not to exclude the Dean, if the Unit Administrator and the Dean were not one and the same. Sexauer (Art) referred to page D-3, line 48-49 and stated that the Unit Administrator can



be the Dean in a school without departments.

Thompson (Political Science) questioned why lines 11-13 were omitted on page D-7. Bailey responded that deleting these lines does not prohibit placing the letter and this is included in the next sentence.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) asked for clarification of the "Unit Administrator will discuss...." on page D-7, line 7. He stated that pages D-10, line 33 and D-11, line 11 refer to a joint responsibility and questioned whether page D-7 should also refer to a joint responsibility. Bailey responded that the purpose was for someone in the unit to have the responsibility to discuss this with the faculty member. Page D-7 states that the responsibility is with one person, not with a committee nor a joint responsibility. This allows for continuity and efficiency since the chairs of a personnel committee may change more frequently than the unit administrator.

Ferrell (History) questioned whether lines 13-15 on page D-7 in reference to disagreement with progress toward tenure letters was an editorial deletion or an intentional deletion. Bailey responded that this was a word processor error and lines 13-16 include the previous deletion of lines 11-13.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) asked for clarification of the word "early" on page D-8, line 39. Bailey responded that it was listed on the errata sheet, distributed prior to the meeting, as a deletion.

Bell (Education) questioned why the six year cap was eliminated on page D-9, line 18. Bailey responded that the six year cap was deleted because the professional schools, including the School of Medicine, employ faculty members in positions that do not require terminally qualified personnel. In particular, part time positions that are ongoing in the unit, but are positions that will have to be filled indefinitely by the unit, do not require terminally qualified, research competent personnel. In those units it was felt that continuing to hire people from the community to do a job a semester or two and then only being able to rehire for a short period was not feasible. In addition, the argument was added that in some cases, even though a terminally qualified person may be sought, no such person is available. The best a person could do would be to hire people with a masters degree, for example, to teach certain types of courses in the School of Nursing, and therefore in order to be fair to these people who were able to do this, it would be best to employ them for an indefinite period of time, rather than lose them in six years if there is a cap. This may leave no one to replace them except persons also not terminally qualified. Bailey continued that the other way to do this was to define every position in the University that someone considers to be an exclusion to the six year cap. It would not be impossible, but that is not the route included in the revised draft.

Ferrell (History) questioned if the Committee considered making administrative appointments rather than faculty appointments for those who can not get tenure through the regular procedure. Bailey responded that since a large number of these positions are teaching positions, that was not considered.

Harris (Foreign Languages) questioned that in departments with more assistant professors than associate and full professors, what happened if the faculty member was recommended for promotion and did not get recommended for tenure. Sexauer (Art) responded that promotion and tenure are separate actions. Hughes (Business) further elaborated that this would not be possible because assistant professors could not vote except for those instances below the assistant professor rank. Bailey related a hypothetical



case to explain the issue. For example, a department is made up of ten tenured people, one full professor, one associate professor, and eight assistants. Within this department a faculty member comes up for promotion to associate professor and the full professor and the one associate professor vote, and the other eight tenured faculty members do not vote. Assume the faculty member then gets a recommendation for promotion, but assume also that the majority of the ten tenured faculty members do not support him/her for tenure.

Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) stated that he believed that Professor Harris' question was related to units with a large body of tenured assistant professors. Bailey responded by stating that in this hypothetical case, it could happen that a person would be denied tenure but promoted in his or her one terminal year.

Singhas (Biology) stated that the argument is that the tenured faculty at the higher rank would have less power according to the new draft. Bailey responded that in the unusual situation described above, the majority of the people voting on tenure do not affect the promotion vote. Woodside (Math) responded that we are talking about a majority vote so the rank makes no difference.

Chowdhury (Industry and Technology) questioned if the Committee considered the effect of having faculty members outside of the school sitting on the personnel committee if the department does not have enough tenured faculty members (page D-10, line 17). Sexauer (Art) responded that there has to be some mechanism to allow action on personnel matters and this is the one that the Committee decided on if a unit does not have sufficient tenured faculty.

Holte (English) questioned about departments with forty tenured faculty members acting on the personnel matters. Sexauer (Art) responded that in the Committee deliberations, the Department of English came to mind, and the Code procedures that they presently use ~~will have to be changed.~~

↳ Follow these procedures.

Stangohr (Health Sciences Library) questioned the rationale for excluding non-tenured faculty from the personnel committee. Sexauer (Art) responded that the ~~Faculty Governance~~ Ad Hoc Committee used the AAUP guidelines which specify tenured faculty.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) questioned if page D-9, line 31 could reflect not only faculty responsibility but also more shared governance. Sexauer (Art) responded that this is taken directly from the statement on governance policy of the AAUP and as the statement indicates, faculty matters should be primarily a responsibility of the faculty.

Ferrell (History) questioned what administrative status was as cited, and if there were a defining characteristic for the personnel committee, or is that a general or part time status (page D-10, line 24). He went on to state that it is an important issue because in the Faculty Affairs/Grievance Committee, this issue has been brought up and needs to be defined. Sexauer (Art) stated that there was no definition.

Givens (Allied Health Sciences) asked for clarification on the make up of personnel committees as noted on page D-10, line 15. Sexauer (Art) responded that in any unit, there would be appropriate tenured faculty to deal with personnel actions. From the appropriate tenured faculty, the personnel committee would be elected and the personnel committee would act as a liaison for the appropriate tenured faculty. Givens questioned what would happen if the unit code called for a school personnel action. Sexauer (Art) responded that if the proposed revised Appendix D is approved, ~~some~~ codes will need to be changed.



Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) stated, as a non-tenured faculty member, that this was a concern to him. He disagreed with the structure that the personnel committee only be elected by tenured faculty members. Bailey responded that a conflict of interest may arise when one tenure track person is in a position to make a decision that may influence the career of another tenure track person. Another conflict of interest issue may arise when a tenure track person is voting on a committee with a tenured person about someone else and that tenured person may be seen as exercising an intimidating influence over the tenure track person.

Jarvis (Music) questioned the rationale in having a personnel committee elected by tenured faculty. Bailey responded that in personnel decisions, the full tenured faculty must vote, except in fixed term appointments and initial probationary appointments. Those decisions can be delegated by the tenured faculty to the Unit Personnel Committee, which functions as a subcommittee of the tenured faculty.

Singhas (Biology) questioned if the original Appendix D read this way or was this also a revision. Sexauer (Art) stated that in the old Appendix D, the personnel committee was loosely defined as the body that makes personnel decisions. In 1987-88, the Faculty Governance Committee brought a resolution to have a consistent procedure for all units on campus before the Faculty Senate. The Chancellor would not approve that resolution until Appendix D was revised.

Singhas (Biology) questioned whether the tenured faculty concept was in the old Appendix D. Sexauer responded that it was not.

Thompson (Political Science) questioned if it would be appropriate to have the non tenured faculty act in an advisory capacity to the tenured faculty. Atkeson (History) responded that there seemed to be some concerns about fixed term faculty not voting on the personnel committee and that he agreed with Sexauer's rationale.

Givens (Allied Health Sciences) questioned whether in a small department, the two track system would be threatened if the administrator appointed additional tenured faculty to the Unit Personnel Committee. Sexauer responded that it reads "...the next higher administrator...." so it is not the chair making the appointment but rather the dean in consultation with the appropriate tenured faculty.

Lennon (Academic Library Services) stated that in reference to page D-10, line 15, as related to item B, Hughes had earlier stated that unit codes would have to meet the revised Appendix D criteria, and as part of that, the changes of the code could be done without opening the entire code. Lennon questioned if that could also be related to part B for those units that will need to restructure their personnel committee. Hughes (Business) responded that currently the Committee does not know how many units allow non tenured faculty to be on their personnel committees. If the revised draft is adopted by the Senate then the codes will have to be changed. Sexauer (Art) stated that if the revised draft is adopted, each unit could take personnel committee roles out of their codes because it would have to conform to Appendix D.

Thompson (Political Science) questioned the draft as it relates to unit administrators not having a vote as a faculty member in a personnel matter as noted on page D-11, line 14-16. He questioned if voting for membership to a personnel committee was the same as voting on a personnel matter. Sexauer responded no because that is not voting on a personnel action.

Harris (Foreign Languages) noted that on pages D-10, line 52 and D-11, line 1 the functions of the unit administrator include leadership, support, and



guidance to the unit. He then noted that the administrator also serves in a major academic role and asked whether it is fair to the candidate if the administrator is not counted as a faculty member. Sexauer responded that after the public hearings, it seemed appropriate for the tenured track faculty to be separate from the administrator vote. Harris questioned if this limited the role of the administrator. Chair Moskop responded that the current draft established a two track system for personnel matters, but the intention of the Committee was not to rule out the academic activities of the unit administrator in areas other than personnel matters.

Harris stated that he was looking at the language on page C-11, lines 14-16 and he questioned if the administrator shouldn't also have a faculty vote. Sexauer responded that the unit administrator would send forth a recommendation along with that of the tenured faculty.

Worthington (Medicine) stated that page D-9, Part IV, is concerned only with the administrator's role in dealing with personnel matters, and fails to describe all of the administrator's qualifications, just those related to personnel matters.

Ferrell (History) questioned whether the unit administrator is a member of the faculty. Sexauer responded that in items that are not personnel matters, the unit administrator is a member of the faculty. Ferrell then questioned if the Committee believes that the best way to run a unit is to have a faculty person in charge of the unit. Sexauer responded that this document deals with reappointment and tenure, whereas the code deals with all matters. Ferrell then questioned if it was really the case that the unit administrator must be a faculty member. Sexauer responded that this issue was not discussed by the Committee.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly) questioned if the unit administrator could be a member of the personnel committee. Sexauer responded no. The document states, at the end of each arabic number, "...but excluding the unit administrator." Woodside (Math) stated that the unit administrator will not function as a faculty member in this particular situation.

Woods (Geology) questioned if it was the Committee's intent to exclude from selection as an external reviewer all but one name in the candidate list on page D-11, lines 46-47. Hughes (Business) responded yes. The result would be that one external reviewer would be selected from the list supplied by the candidate and two from the list supplied by the personnel committee. Holte (English) asked what would happen if the same name were on both lists. Hughes responded that if a reviewer were on the committee's list as well as the candidate's list, that reviewer could be selected in addition to a reviewer on the candidate's list only.

Jarvis (Music) questioned what the effect of an honorarium would be upon the quality of the reviewers and why there was no honorarium. Hughes (Business) responded that in VCAA Springer's budget, the amount of money set aside for honorariums seemed too low. The Committee's discussion centered around not the amount of money, but whether these reviews should be done as a professional responsibility. VCAA Springer stated that an honorarium of \$50 does not compensate the reviewer but rather is given as a token of appreciation. The matter may be left to the units for a decision.

Singhas (Biology) questioned if each time a faculty member came up for tenure or promotion, there would be another outside review of the work. Hughes (Business) responded that these are two separate personnel actions and in many cases involving two different outside reviewers.

Lennon (Academic Library Services) questioned if the Committee had any concern that with institutions now going to an outside peer review process,



it may be difficult to get reviewers. Sexauer (Art) responded that since the external reviewer process has been put in place by the Vice Chancellor's office, the Committee felt that it was appropriate to have a role in this.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) questioned why the unit administrator is not asked to produce a list of reviewers on page D-11, line 28. Hughes (Business) responded that the Committee was trying to make sure that the person who is up for action has a review by his/her colleagues in his/her own unit, so this would come from the personnel committee.

Ferrell (History) questioned if it was implicit that the faculty member also have right to review the PAD (page D-12, lines 45-47). Sexauer (Art) responded yes. Ferrell then questioned if it is stated somewhere in the document. Sexauer responded yes. Ferrell then stated that redundancy is not a weakness when it relates to personnel policies.

Harris (Foreign Languages) questioned what the implications of the selection of materials to be sent or included in the PAD were. Sexauer (Art) responded that it is a necessary part of the PAD. Harris then questioned why not have the candidate do the gathering of the information. Hughes (Business) responded that in this interpretation, a person must be careful about the things put in a personnel file and those things used only for reference. The Committee's recommendation would basically include everything but note that there are some restrictions, such as articles, which must be published.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly) questioned if voting could be done by absentee ballots, rather than mail ballots (D-14, line 24-25). Sexauer (Art) responded that this was a method to get all faculty to vote. Wilson questioned why there was no provision for absentee ballots. Bailey (Faculty Assembly) responded that a quorum may be difficult to get for voting. Worthington (Medicine) stated that Robert's Rules of Order discourages two votes on the same matter. The mail ballot would allow for a one time vote by all faculty.

Dorsey (Council of Academic Deans) questioned, in reference to page D-14, line 32 relating to the chancellor's discussion of the issue with the faculty, if it were appropriate to also put an administrator there for discussion with the faculty. Sexauer (Art) responded that in the event that the vote was unanimous by the appropriate tenured faculty and the chancellor voted contrary to the faculty votes, the discussion should be with those two bodies. Dorsey questioned whether that would be opening lines of communication. Hughes (Business) responded that all the recommendations from the unit administrator, the personnel committee, and the chancellor have to be considered, so the only way to find out what went on is to have discussion. Atkeson (History) further responded that page D-15, line 10 gives the answer to Dean Dorsey's question.

Ferrell (History) questioned if the Committee was joking when they put in unanimous vote. Hough (Faculty Assembly) stated from an Arts and Sciences perspective, he has a concern that as stated in this document and a unanimous faculty vote goes to the chancellor without a reference to the dean, department chairs or vice chancellor. Hughes (Business) stated that Section I. should have followed Sections J. and K.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly) questioned why the document refers to a unanimous vote rather than 39 of 40 votes. Hughes (Business) responded that it was the Committee's choice and they were trying to make it as strong as possible.

Hough (Faculty Assembly) questioned how can it be required that the resignation be by May 15th (page D-15, line 24). Yarbrough (Faculty



- Governance Committee) responded that AAUP used this date as a matter of professional courtesy.

Bell (Education) questioned the footnote that related to material procedural irregularity on page D-16, line 47. Atkeson (History) responded that the Committee was trying to describe the irregularity. It relates to if a person went back and re-did it, he or she may have a different result or the original decision. Bell then questioned who would decide. Atkeson responded that the Hearing Committee is subject to the chancellor's approval. Chair Moskop stated if the faculty member believed he/she had a grievance under this section, he or she would prepare the case and present it to the Hearing Committee and then the Committee would determine if, in fact, there is sufficient cause to go to a hearing. Atkeson (History) further responded that the Hearing Committee could determine that a material procedural irregularity had occurred and forward it to the Chancellor who could return the personnel matter to the Unit Personnel Committee to be reconsidered.

Bell (Education) questioned the rationale for item (a) on page D-17, line 34. Atkeson (History) responded that the request for the hearing states that he or she has a grievance and the documentation must be supplied. Bell restated his original question as it reads in the document "...to set forth in the original request...." Hughes (Business) responded that in a second hearing the faculty member can submit documentation, but whatever is submitted must support the original request. The faculty member can not bring up different data (line 40) because this could not be considered.

VCAA Springer questioned that if the faculty member requested the hearing and the hearing is based only on what the faculty presents, what opportunity is there to determine the validity of the documents. Atkeson (History) responded that the purpose of a hearing is to determine the validity. VCAA Springer stated that she was not clear on how to determine when to have a hearing if the Committee only has one side of the story, and the other side invalidates the need for the hearing. Atkeson responded that that is the Committee's charge.

Bailey (Faculty Assembly) responded that what is considered is whether the allegations that are raised and submitted by the person if true, would ground their claim. If so, then the Committee would go ahead and have a hearing. Ferrell (History) stated that his interpretation was that a person would automatically have a hearing. Yarbrough (Faculty Governance Committee) responded that if the claim were established to be true, then there are grounds that support the claim (page D-17, lines 42-49). Ferrell stated that the faculty member with a grievance has the opportunity to make a presentation to the committee but the committee is not required to look at sources other than the grievance documents.

Woods (Geology) questioned the definition of "incompetence" and "neglect of duty". Joyce (Physics) responded that this section is straight from the current Appendix D and has not been changed. For further definitions, a person could go to the legal literature.

There were no further questions in reference to the proposed revisions to Appendix D.

B. Proposed Revisions to Appendix L, Gene Hughes

Ferrell (History) questioned the unit administrator being a faculty member if the administrator evaluates the faculty as noted in the proposed revision of Appendix L. Hughes (Business) responded that it was discussed among the Committee members and if a person directs a program and evaluates other faculty, the person would still take the quadrennial evaluation. The unit administrator is the representative to the next highest level.



Wilson (Faculty Assembly) questioned if any consideration was given to voting faculty in relation to the six year cap. Hughes (Business) responded that after investigation, voting faculty is anyone who has been at least employed one year.

There was no further questions in reference to the proposed revisions to Appendix L.

Chair Moskop stated that the proposed revisions of Appendix D and Appendix L are now ready for consideration by the Senate. He proposed that the Senate continue with this report at the regularly scheduled February 18, 1992, Faculty Senate meeting. If the consideration is not completed at that meeting, a special called meeting would be held on Tuesday, February 25, 1992, to complete action on the report, with the Faculty Senate meeting every Tuesday thereafter until it is complete. Because of the complexity of the issue the Faculty Senate will proceed section by section with the reading, motions, and/or amendments.

Yarbrough (Faculty Governance Committee) suggested that the amendments be submitted in writing in advance to the Faculty Senate Office so that the Committee could review the amendments prior to the next meeting. The Chair accepted the suggestion as advice for the Senators.

Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) asked for point of order and if there was other business usually addressed at the February meeting which was being delayed. Chair Moskop responded that the Senate was obligated to only one action, that being an election of a Nominating Committee, and that would occur. Grossnickle (Psychology) stated that the Curriculum Committee would also have a report.

Worthington (Medicine) voiced appreciation to the Faculty Governance Committee. The Senators gave a standing ovation to the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Frances Eason*  
Frances Eason  
Secretary of the Faculty

*Lori Lee*  
Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate Secretary

**RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE JANUARY 28, 1992, FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

92-6 **WHEREAS,** Pitt County Memorial Hospital is the major hospital care provide to state employees in Pitt County including the faculty and staff of East Carolina University;

**WHEREAS,** Pitt County Memorial Hospital is the second largest provider of state employee patient services in North Carolina;

**WHEREAS,** The State Health Plan has recently offered hospitals the option of participating in a plan which would designate participating hospitals as preferred health care providers for state employees;

**WHEREAS,** If this plan is implemented, state employees would pay a 20% co-payment up to a maximum \$1000 for care at participating hospitals and a 40% co-payment up to a maximum \$5000 for care at non-participating hospitals;



**WHEREAS,** The Pitt County Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees recently voted not to participate in this preferred provider plan on the grounds that it would not control health care costs and would force the hospital to shift costs to other payers unfairly;

**WHEREAS,** If this plan is implemented, state employees in Pitt County will be required to pay much higher costs for care at Pitt County Memorial Hospital or to travel long distances, if possible, to participating hospitals out of the county;

**WHEREAS,** If this plan is implemented, it will pose a major new barrier to access to hospital care for a large number of state employees in Pitt County.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** That the ECU Faculty Senate urges Pitt County's state legislators to make their colleagues in the General Assembly aware of the hardships implementation of this preferred provided plan without the participation of Pitt County Memorial Hospital would pose for state employees in our area;

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That the ECU Faculty Senate urges Pitt County's state legislators to explore alternatives to the proposed preferred provider plan less burdensome to state employees in Pitt County;

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That, should the State proceed with this preferred provider plan, the ECU Faculty Senate request that the Pitt County Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees reconsider its decision not to participate in the plan in view of the financial burden and potential health risks posed to state employees by the hospital's non-participation in this plan;

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That, should the State proceed with this preferred provider plan, the ECU Faculty Senate requests the Pitt County Commissioners to urge the Pitt County Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees to reconsider its decision not to participate in the plan in view of the financial burden and potential health risks posed to state employees by the hospital's non-participation in this plan;

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That, the ECU Faculty Senate directs the ECU representatives to the UNC Faculty Assembly to express the concerns of the ECU faculty regarding these issues at the February 7, 1992, meeting of the Assembly.

**Disposition:** N/A