

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE FULL AGENDA

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for academic year 1991/92 will be held on Tuesday, February 18, 1992, at 2:10 p.m. in the Mendenhall Student Center, Great Room.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of January 21, 1992, and January 28, 1992
- III. Special Order of the Day
 - A. Roll Call
 - B. Announcements
 - C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
 - D. Vice Chancellors' Reports
 - E. Eddie Payne, Head Basketball Coach
 - F. Larry Hough, Faculty Assembly Report
February 7, 1992, Meeting
 - G. James LeRoy Smith, Director of Self Study for Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools
 - H. Election of Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers
(Please refer to Appendix A, Page A-4, Section VII.)
- IV. Unfinished Business
 - Proposed Revisions to Appendix D and Appendix L
(Please refer to the January 28, 1992, Faculty Senate Agenda for the
proposed revisions to the appendices.)
- V. Report of Committees
 - Curriculum Committee, Bill Grossnickle
 - Curriculum matters contained in the January 23, 1992, meeting:
 - 1. Revise BA in English
 - 2. Revise BS in School and Community Health Education
 - 3. Revise BS in Health and Physical Education, Teaching Option

PLEASE POST FOR ALL FACULTY TO READ

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 18, 1992

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1991-1992 was held on Tuesday, February 18, 1992, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of January 21, 1992, and January 28, 1992, were approved with the following revisions. Of the Full Minutes of January 28, 1992, page 5, paragraph 5, replace "will have to be changed" with "follow these procedures"; paragraph 6, delete "Faculty Governance"; paragraph 9, delete "some". On page 6, paragraph 3, change "decisions" to "recommendations".

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Absent were: Anderson (Education), George (Aerospace), Dennard (History), Spickerman (Math).

Alternates present were: Lapas for Lennon (Academic Library Services), Denney for Sykes (Continuing Education), Ferrell for Atkeson (History), Gallagher for Snow (Human Environmental Sciences), Markello for Pories (Medicine), Thompson for Reiser (Sociology and Anthropology).

B. Announcements

1. Resolutions #92-1, #92-2, #92-3, and #92-4 as adopted by the Faculty Senate on January 21, 1992, were approved by the Chancellor.
2. Special thanks to the following Alternate Senators serving as Tellers today: John Satterfield, Art; Michael Felts, HPERS; Ruth Shaw, Music.
3. A letter was received from Mr. Linwood Mercer, Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners on February 4, 1992, acknowledging receipt of the Faculty Senate's State Health Plan resolution. He stated that the Board would meet with Dave McRae, PCMH Administrator, to review the plan and to discuss the Hospital Board of Trustees' position and would then consider the Senate's request.
4. In order to begin preparation for the 1992-1993 academic year, Senators are asked to ensure that their departments or schools fill any Faculty Senate vacancies which will occur at the close of this academic year. Election results should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by Monday, March 2, 1992.
5. Any course changes needing approval for this academic year must be received by the Curriculum Committee no later than Monday, March 16, 1992.
6. The Career Education Committee is sponsoring a Majors/Minors Fair as a resource for students who are undeclared, uncertain of their majors, or just curious about what possibilities are available at ECU. The Fair will be held on Wednesday, March 18, 1992, from 12:30 to 3:30 in the Great Room of Mendenhall Student Center.
7. Each Academic, Appellate, and Senate Committee Chair is reminded of the need to complete a Committee Annual Report by Friday, May 1, 1992.
8. The Faculty Senate office has received from Planning and Institutional Research the annual Full-time Faculty Salary reports for 1991-1992. Copies of these reports are available for examination in the Faculty Senate office.
9. The ECU Minority Presence Initiative Program is sponsoring a lecture "Cultural Impact on Learning Styles: Implications for Minority Children," by Dr. Janice Hale, Professor of Education at Wayne State University on March 19, 1992, from 3:00 to 5:00 in GCB #1031.

Interested faculty should contact Dr. Claudia Melear at 757-6736 for more information and to reserve a place at the lecture.

C. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Eakin reported that the General Assembly will be in session on May 26th. One consideration is whether or not a bond issue, including three projects at East Carolina University, will be put before the public next fall. Those projects include a 25.8 million dollar Joyner Library addition, 7 million dollar School of Medicine addition, and 7.1 million Regional Advancement (Phase I) addition.

D. Vice Chancellors' Report

Dr. Marlene Springer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that the Student Computing and Technology Fee Committee reviewed 20 proposals for funding from the Student Computing Technology Fee for 1991-1992. The selection process was a difficult one, representing efforts by the Committee, and cooperative efforts between the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Business Affairs. Unfortunately, it was not possible to fund all proposals; however, units not receiving support this year are encouraged to reapply next year. The following is a summary of this year's awards: School of Allied Health Sciences (\$51,264) to upgrade the computing lab; School of Art (\$46,699) to enhance existing "school" Macintosh Computer; Biology Department (\$46,000) to upgrade existing Interactive Computer Assisted Instructional Laboratory; School of Business (\$72,686) to upgrade the computing labs; Chemistry Department (\$43,656) to upgrade computer labs; Communications Department (\$31,737) to establish a computing lab; School of Education (\$49,000) to aid in adaptive technology; Foreign Languages Department (\$5,354) to support the purchase of foreign language word processing; History Department (\$23,213) to support a computer-assisted drawing lab; School of Human Environmental Sciences (\$84,429) to continue support of the school's general purpose student computing lab; School of Industry and Technology (\$27,000) for additional PC workstations for students; Joyner Library (\$53,149) to enhance existing student computing located in MTRC area; College of Arts and Sciences - Kim Lab (\$46,385) to enhance existing multidisciplinary lab; Mathematics Department (\$26,000) for additional computer equipment; School of Music (\$46,180) to continue support of the Macintosh based MIDI lab; School of Nursing (\$46,000) to enhance existing Learning Resources Center computing lab; and Physics Department (\$487) for acquisition of software to be used in Macintosh lab.

The search for the Dean of the School of Social Work has reached the interview stage with four candidates being brought to campus. The search for the Director of Continuing Education and Summer School has also reached the interview stage. The search for the Director of International Programs is progressing with more than 110 applicants for the position.

Promotion and Tenure recommendations are now in the Chancellor's office and letters will be in the mail as soon as they are available.

In the way of new initiatives, Dr. Springer announced that she will soon send to all deans and directors a position description for a .5 released time position as Director of Assessment and Program Development. A second position, .5 released time initially, is for a coordinator of Faculty Development Programs. Both of these will be in-house searches within the University so work can begin according to the strategic plan.

Dr. Al Matthews, Vice Chancellor for Student Life, had no formal remarks but was available for questions.

Dr. James Hallock, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, had no formal remarks but was available for questions.

E. Eddie Payne, Head Basketball Coach

Coach Payne stated as an individual employed at ECU for two years in the early 1980's, and since his return last spring, he has noticed many changes. He stated that there is a broader base of excellence not present 10-12 years ago. He stated that as he talked with parents and prospective students, he spends much of his time talking about the academic programs and the role of the faculty. Coach Payne expressed appreciation and a continued need for the progress reports regarding the basketball players' activities in the classrooms. He stated that he is interested in promoting ECU as a program of excellence across the board.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly Rep.) asked how the academic ability of the players was evaluated. Payne responded that he believes that some players may be underachieving. The goal is to recruit those who can be both successful and graduate.

F. Larry Hough, Faculty Assembly Report

Larry Hough presented a summarized report of the February 7, 1992, meeting of the Faculty Assembly. The complete report is available in the Faculty Senate Office.

G. James LeRoy Smith, Director of Self Study for Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

James LeRoy Smith reported that the visit is six weeks away. A February newsletter has not been distributed because he is waiting for a final list of the committee members. He will distribute a schedule of the visit along with a list of committee members at the March Senate meeting. During February, each department is updating the student learning outcome assessment plans. Also the general education objectives are being reviewed.

H. Election of Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers
(Please refer to Appendix A, Page A-4, Section VII.)

The following senators were nominated from the floor with the results as follows:

Greg Givens (Allied Health Sc.)	43*
Jim Joyce (Physics)	47*
Worth Worthington (Medicine)	45*
Don Sexauer (Art)	35*
Margie Gallagher (Human Environ. Sc.)	43*
Marie Pokorny (Nursing)	33

Professors Givens, Joyce, Worthington, Sexauer, and Gallagher were elected to the Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers.

Chair Moskop suggested that the Senate suspend the rules and hear the Curriculum Committee's report before beginning discussion on the proposed revision to appendices D and L. There was no objection.

V. Report of Committees

Curriculum Committee, Bill Grossnickle

Bill Grossnickle (Psychology), Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the curriculum matters as contained in the Curriculum Committee minutes of January 23, 1992. The minutes were approved as distributed (Resolution #92-7).

IV. Unfinished Business

Proposed revisions to Appendix D and Appendix L. (Please refer to the January 28, 1992, Faculty Senate Agenda for the proposed revisions to the appendices.)

Section I.

Ferrell (History) moved to amend page D-1, line 17, adding "administrators" before "faculty". Ferrell stated that the rationale for

the motion was self explanatory. The motion passed.

Section II.

Ferrell (History) moved to amend page D-1, line 28, adding "spokepersons for" after "as". Hough (Faculty Assembly Rep.) referring to the words that read "without authorization", questioned if anyone had authorization to speak for the administration. By a standing vote of 21 for and 19 against, the motion passed.

Hough (Faculty Assembly Rep.) asked who should a faculty member ask for authorization to represent himself as a spokesperson for ECU. Bell (Education) asked who gives that authority. Chancellor Eakin responded that technically the role resides with the Chancellor as the person charged by the Board of Trustees with that responsibility. There are many times that responsibility is delegated to others on an ongoing basis. The point is that one should exercise care in representing ECU.

Section III.

Ferrell (History) referring to page D-2, line 49, asked if the Chancellor's designee should be limited to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and exclude the Vice Chancellor for Student Life. He stated that it may be an editorial point to consider and exclude at a later date. Chair Moskop responded that the issue involving the Counseling Center is currently pending. The role of the Vice Chancellor for Student Life may be a matter to be considered in the Senate when the issue is resolved. Chancellor Eakin responded that this seems to be a reasonable limitation as the sole reason to include the Vice Chancellor for Student Life is because of the faculty status in the Counseling Center.

Singhas (Biology) questioned if the Chancellor could designate anyone he desires to serve as his designee. Chair Moskop responded that the footnote on page D-2 limits the Chancellor.

Ferrell (History) referring to page D-3, line 39, asked if in the case of stopping the tenure clock it would be reasonable for the request to go directly to the Chancellor or rather go through the Dean for procedural purposes. Chair Moskop responded that in the errata sheet provided at the January 28th meeting, this was corrected by the addition of the words "by the unit administrator".

Worthington (Medicine) asked about the extension of the probationary period such that faculty in one unit may have an advantage because of an extension that other faculty may not have. Chair Moskop responded that the discretion to grant or not grant an extension rests with the unit administrator and the faculty member pending approval by the Chancellor. Chair Moskop further stated that his interpretation was to imply that different units act differently on this issue in different circumstances. This adds the opportunity to stop the tenure clock for such time periods. This would not be done on a routine basis but on an individual basis.

Lapas (Academic Library Services) moved to amend page D-7, line 2 by adding "who also must have faculty status" after "administrator". She stated that it so happened that they did not have a faculty member as chair of their department and they learned this a year after the appointment. Since page D-7, line 2 is the first time "unit administrator" appears in the document the department wanted the clarification regarding faculty status inserted here. Chair Moskop offered a point of clarification that the term "unit administrator" first appears on page D-3, line 1 and is defined in footnote #2. He then questioned Lapas if she desired to place the amendment on page D-3 instead. Lapas responded that the desire was to place the wording behind "unit administrator" when it first appeared in the document, so page D-3

may be the appropriate place. Chair Moskop referred the Senators back to page D-3, line 1 where the word "unit administrator" first appeared. Lapas' amendment is to add the words "who also must have faculty status" behind the word "administrator", on page D-3, line 1.

Stangohr (Health Sciences Library) questioned if the intent was to hire unit administrators who are faculty. If not, administrators who are not faculty would be somewhat powerless in relation to personnel matters. That would be an awkward situation in which to be. Joyner Library is not the only unit with a chair who is not a faculty member. Hughes (Business) stated that the term "unit administrator" is rightly defined in Appendix L and that would require a rewrite if it is changed here. Each unit code defines what a unit administrator does and to further define it here would put a restriction on the unit's ability to define. Chancellor Eakin stated that this was a back handed way to define the term. If the term is to be defined it should be done so in Appendix L and not done because of a particular instance.

Ferrell (History) stated that the document defines faculty rank and the UNC General Administration requires its primary administrators on campus to hold faculty rank so it is part of their procedures. The reason to be explicit is to be straightforward and to continue in that line of definition by defining the middle administrator in the same fashion. Supporting reasons are: 1) If a person is evaluating a professional performance or a publication he/she should have passed through the same type of procedures as faculty. 2) If the person holds faculty rank which included tenure it allows the administrators to have some independence in actions with those administrators above him or her.

Joyce (Physics) spoke in reference to the placement of the additional words. If the proposed amendment is put in this location, it may imply that when the word "unit administrators" is used in another place they don't have to be faculty members. He suggested that it is more properly located in Appendix L.

Hughes (Business) stated that Appendix L brings all non-faculty administrators who evaluate faculty under the quadrennial vote. The change was placed in that footnote.

Grossnickle (Psychology) asked for clarification as to where the definition of "unit administrator" should go. Hughes (Business) responded that he believed it should go in Appendix L and that defining "unit administrator" as a faculty member in Appendix D limits rewrites of Appendix L. Grossnickle asked if Appendix L could be rewritten so a definition was not included. Hughes responded that "unit administrator" has various meanings throughout the University. The Committee's idea was to have a common terminology that could be used throughout the University. The Committee did not feel it was fair to have an administrator such as a dean or director evaluating faculty who was exempt from the quadrennial evaluation yet required to evaluate faculty. Grossnickle reminded senators that included in the Committee's report on the last page is a definition of "administrators" as those who evaluate others and are subject to quadrennial evaluations.

> insert paragraph from page 6 here!

Ferrell (History) asked for an interpretation of the vote. Chair Moskop responded that the minutes would read that "the Senate did not approve the proposed amendment to be added in the designated place." Ferrell then questioned if it were the intention of the Senate not to speak to the issue of the faculty status of unit administrators. Ferrell stated that the sense of the Senate at this particular point was to say that the Senate did not define the issue at this time. Chair Moskop said the discussion was about the placement of the amendment but the vote is open to interpretation. Ferrell offered a motion that it is the sense of the

Senate that it is not ready to define faculty status for administrators except as already expressed in the document at this particular time. Bailey (Parliamentarian) ruled the motion out of order since it did not pertain to the motion on the floor.

The motion on the floor to amend page D-7, line 2 adding "who also must have faculty status" after "administrator" ~~was approved.~~ *Failed*

move to page 5.

Hough (Faculty Assembly Rep.) referring to page D-7, line 4, questioned if the faculty member would be given a copy of the letter of progress toward tenure, since it was written about the faculty. Chair Moskop stated that he believed the interpretation is that the original would be sent to the faculty member. Jarvis (Music) stated that the faculty would be involved in discussion so the faculty member would have a copy.

Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) referring to page D-7, line 3, suggested changing the word "for" to "to" as an editorial correction. The editorial correction was accepted.

Dorsey (Academic Deans) moved to amend page D-8, line 9 by adding after the word "promotion": "but sound academic practice supports the concept that people eligible for tenure should normally have credentials that merit promotion". He stated that this addition provided guidelines and clarification. Hough (Faculty Assembly Rep.) stated that the amendment provides clarification to a point but there is a point in which a person may be eligible for permanent tenure who is already full professor. This then may give an exclusion. VCAA Springer stated that the tenor of the amendment is to have tenure and promotion together but, with good reason, ECU has separated it. The amendment would provide a clear message that from the beginning a faculty member should have the credentials for both. The wording in the amendment does allow some flexibility to consider promotion and tenure together or separately.

Ferrell (History) questioned if this meant that no one could be a tenured assistant professor. Dorsey (Academic Deans) stated there were no qualifiers in the sentence.

Singhas (Biology) questioned that if this amendment were passed would it create a problem for people applying for promotion who are granted early tenure. VCAA Springer responded that even more importantly people coming up for early promotion should know they need strong credentials to be granted early tenure. This should give clear directions for all new faculty. Thompson (Political Science) stated that some units do not currently separate promotion and tenure.

The motion on the floor to add after the word "promotion" on page D-8, line 9 "but sound academic practice supports the concept that people eligible for tenure should normally have credentials that merit promotion" after "promotion" was passed.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly Rep.) moved to amend page D-9, line 16 adding the following: "After a fixed-term faculty member has completed three years of service, the decision not to reappoint shall not be based upon 1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; 2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's race, sex, religion, or national origin; or 3) personal malice." He stated that when he served as Chair of the Faculty, he was informed that people who are hired or fired are not protected and that he feels their rights on this need to be guaranteed in a basic way. Joyce (Physics) agreed with the sentiment of Wilson's amendment but stated that it is never a decision to reappoint because fixed term faculty are issued a new appointment, not reappointment.

VCAA Springer questioned if the University was automatically bound to follow the laws of the U.S. Constitution and the N.C. Constitution. If so, why is the mention of the Constitution necessary?

Hughes (Business) stated that the document does not need Wilson's proposed amendment because all appointments are covered under Section 604 C. of the Code of the University of North Carolina. Page 2 of this document states that all persons have protection of tenure during their employment.

Ferrell (History) stated that the intention was correct but he would recommend it to be after the first term not the third term for two reasons. He went on to state that limiting these guarantees to appointment for a third year was inappropriate, and it hints that a fixed term person has a probationary right after three years. Wilson (Faculty Assembly Rep.) responded that he was assured by a former University Attorney and a former Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that faculty were not protected. Wilson agreed to accept the suggestion by Professor Joyce to delete the word "reappoint" and replace with "recommend another appointment"

Bailey (Parliamentarian) speaking as a member of the Faculty Governance Committee stated that the intent of this addition seems to be to afford certain rights to certain people that they do not have now. He pointed out that they do have these rights but, not the right to seek redress. This addition will not provide that privilege.

Hughes (Business) pointed out that all hearing processes are available. If faculty members are appointed with the rights of tenure they fall under Section 604 C. which the University of North Carolina provides for appeals. Chair Moskop questioned if Hughes was referring to dismissal during the period of their appointment or failures to recommend for additional appointments after the expiring of a fixed term contract.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly Rep.) asked for clarification from University Attorney, Ben Irons. Irons agreed with Bailey that if this is passed several other amendments would have to be incorporated. While not prepared to give a definitive answer, Irons stated that the term reappointment refers to people in the tenure track and not fixed term. Bailey (Parliamentarian) questioned if a person could extend any right to someone up for an appointment without extending that for every candidate for the job. Irons responded that it would create a substantial problem.

Sexauer (Art) stated that Section 604 A. does deal with reappointment and Section 604 B. does guarantee those rights in Wilson's proposed amendment. Thompson (Political Science) stated that this is not a reappointment so all EEO guidelines do apply.

Wilson (Faculty Assembly Rep.) asked to delete "after a fixed-term faculty member has completed three years of service," from his proposed amendment. There was no objection to Wilson's request to change his proposed amendment.

VCAA Springer stated that the three year date gives an ambiguous message and creates more problems.

The motion on the floor to amend page D-9, line 16 by adding "The decision not to recommend another appointment shall not be based upon 1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; 2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's race, sex, religion, or national origin; or 3) personal malice" failed.

Ferrell (History) referring to page D-8, line 52, questioned the length of fixed term appointments and what time frame are the terms. Sexauer (Art) responded that at present there are units on campus with fixed term appointments for extended periods of time.

Ferrell (History) moved to amend page D-9, lines 18-23, by replacing Section III.C.4.c. with the following: "It shall be the practice of ECU not to re-employ faculty with fixed-term appointments for extensive periods of time beyond their initial date of employment. Re-employment of a faculty member with a fixed-term appointment beyond six years in a state-funded position in order to avoid the awarding of tenure is a misuse of this category of appointment. Persons who are employed primarily as athletic coaches or clinical instructors are excluded from this provision." Ferrell provided a brief history according to the 1940 AAUP statement. Basically a person employed after six years should be given tenure or notice of non-reappointment. The six year term with one additional year to find another employment is the standard in academic mainstream in the United States. The current draft does not include a length limitation on six year appointments. It allows persons to be hired indefinitely without ever having applied for tenure. The discussion of this issue in the previous Senate meeting dealt primarily with clinical appointments. He stated that clinical appointments are not a big issue and could be defined in particular policies. However, to satisfy those persons who want the six year cap lifted from clinical instructors, the proposed amendment exempts them.

Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) questioned how the term "clinical administrator" would be defined. Ferrell responded that it would be defined by unit codes.

Gallagher (Human Environmental Sciences) stated that some schools have accrediting bodies that require certain faculty to be practitioners, requiring that designers be clinical instructors.

Worthington (Medicine) stated that there is a need for faculty who are free from some of the responsibilities to be more scholarly. The need is to bring faculty in to take care of the health care needs of eastern North Carolina. He feels that the School still needs faculty who are productive as scholars, researchers, and teachers, and are not expected to have to provide service to meet the community needs. These faculty need time to do those scholarly activities.

Harris (Foreign Languages) stated that elimination of the six year cap would jeopardize principles that are indispensable. He further stated that the university should consider the proposed amendment not because of vested interest but because of the principles of maintaining an intellectual environment without fear.

Thompson (Political Science) stated that to remove the six year cap would produce a second class citizen with no real rights.

Givens (Allied Health Sciences) stated that the clinical aspects meet the needs of his department but we must recognize the diversity within ECU and be able to address this diversity.

VCAA Springer stated that ways have been devised to get around the six year cap such as giving 50% or 75% appointments and allowing faculty to stay here without benefits. That is an inhuman process. The departments/schools have many ways of hiring good people and the decision of how long a person stays should be based on that and viewed as a way of quality control. Good people then should not be forced out.

Hough (Faculty Assembly Rep.) made reference to page D-8, Section f. and stated that departments/schools could adjust their codes and offer what Professor Ferrell called a "clinical appointment".

Yarbrough (Faculty Governance Committee member) stated that he was a part of the Faculty Senate when the six year cap was put into effect and if he thought the six years would lead to more permanently tenured faculty members then he would support the continuance of it. But, the University is going to maintain a certain number of fixed term appointments for financial reasons and we all can appreciate that. All the six year cap has done is to require that after six years some good people get pushed back out into the community. Then the department/school has to find someone else to cover the next six years.

Grossnickle (Psychology) stated that removal of the six year cap will lead to a second class of citizens. He pointed out that the current regulations already allow departments to keep a person for twelve years, because the person can stay six years on a fixed term and six more on the tenure track. Tenure does not protect faculty members from lay offs but rather establishes the order by which people are laid off.

Engelke (Nursing) stated that the clinical track term is so broad it is meaningless. For example, could there be clinical instructors in math.

Gallagher (Human Environmental Sciences) stated that professional schools turn out professional people and these schools must be accredited by that profession. Many of these accreditors require the professionals to be practicing.

Ferrell (History) stated that faculty should stand together because, after all, this is a definition that holds administrators accountable. Tenure track positions as presently existing may well disappear. Ferrell noted that all of the arguments against the six year cap are based upon the sense of necessity, a poor argument because it is a management function and for the last ten years the university has not fallen apart. He stated that some years ago he served on a search committee for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After a search, four candidates were selected. Each of these four were asked how they stood on the American Association of University Professors' concepts of academic freedom. All four supported it and stated they would defend these concepts. Therefore he is distressed that VCAA Springer now tends to back off from that.

VCAA Springer responded that she did not need to defend or in any way back off from the AAUP's concepts. The reason AAUP put that in was to say that it should not be used to avoid tenure. Springer stated that she has never spoken against tenure principles nor does she intend to. If it were good in principle, why is it not good for clinical faculty, as well as, everyone else. The proposed amendment on the one hand argues principle and on the other hand affords a loophole for that principle.

Worthington (Medicine) stated that in many professional schools faculty who have tremendous skills are also scholars. He sees faculty who are frustrated in their efforts because of the demand for service and they are unable to be productive as scholars and researchers because of the clinical load. The frustrated faculty leave the University and force the departments/schools to train other people. It would be easier to hire people to assume some of the clinical load to allow others to be more productive scholars and researchers.

Bailey (Parliamentarian) called for a point of order for future reference. Robert's Rules of Order prohibits addressing specific members of a group by name in a person's response or making remarks about their personal position.

Senators can only address the issue and the merits of the issue on the floor.

Singhas (Biology) pointed out that the time set earlier for interrupting debate on the proposed revisions to Appendix D (4:30 pm) had passed. Chair Moskop responded that his intention was to complete action on the pending amendment, but reminded the Senators that the motion to adjourn was a privileged motion which can be made at any time. Chenier (Allied Health Sciences) moved to adjourn. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Frances Eason
Frances Eason
Secretary of the Faculty

Lori Lee
Lori Lee
Faculty Senate Secretary

RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE FEBRUARY 18, 1992, FACULTY SENATE MEETING

92-7 Approval of curriculum matters contained in the Curriculum Committee Minutes of January 23, 1992.

Disposition: Chancellor

WHITEFIELD
20% COTTON FIBER