

FULL AGENDAS WITH ATTACHMENTS ARE DISTRIBUTED TO ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS, SENATORS, CHAIRS OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEES, AND AVAILABLE ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH "FSONLINE".

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE AGENDA

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for academic year 1992/1993 will be held on Tuesday, October 13, 1992, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of September 15, 1992.
- III. Special Order of the Day
  - A. Roll Call
  - B. Announcements
  - C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
  - D. Vice Chancellors' Reports
  - E. Dave Hart, Director of Athletics
  - F. Patricia Campbell, Faculty Assembly Report  
September 18, 1992, meeting
- IV. Unfinished Business

Faculty Governance Committee, Gene Hughes  
Amendments to the revised Resolution #92-16, Appendix D: Tenure Policies and Regulations of ECU (attachment 1).
- V. Report of Committees
  - A. Committee on Committees, Caroline Ayers
    - 1. Second Reading of a Change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws (attachment 2).
    - 2. Election of Appellate Committees (A list of nominees will be forwarded to Faculty Senators/Alternates prior to the meeting.)
  - B. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, David Lawrence  
Selection Procedures for Alumni Teaching Awards (attachment 3).
  - C. Unit Code Screening Committee, Don Sexauer  
Amendment to the School of Medicine Unit Code (attachment 4).
  - D. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Regulations, Dave Watkins  
Revised Academic Regulations: Section 5 of the Undergraduate Catalog (Faculty Senators and Alternates will receive the report in its entirety. Others may review it by way of their department/school Senators and Alternates or by using FSONLINE.) (attachment 5)

**MINUTES OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE  
FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA**

September 18, 1992

The eighty-second meeting of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina was held in the Board Room of the General Administration Building in Chapel Hill on September 18, 1992. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Ken Wilson-ECU, at 1:40 P.M. with 42 delegates in attendance. Monica Brown alternate for Ray Von Beatty, PSU.

**PRESIDENT SPANGLER'S REMARKS**

1. See the attached PRESIDENTS REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY, September 18, 1992, for the full text of President Spangler's remarks.

2. President Spangler introduced, through an interpreter, a visiting delegation from China. The delegation members are all distinguished faculty from their universities elected by their colleagues. President Spangler has explained to the delegation what the Faculty Assembly is. The Chinese delegation is in the United States to learn about educating minorities. There are 46 minority groups in China but 5% of the minority controls 50% of the land, so the majority must attend to the minority. The delegation presented a gift to the Faculty Assembly, a knife.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Q. George Bailey (ECU). Is there a cap on the percentage of growth that will be funded?

A. Spangler. There is a ceiling on what will be funded. If more students than forecasted show up they will not be funded until next year, maybe.

A. Joyner. 100% of anticipated growth was funded this year. Some institutions are over their projections and some are under.

Q. Alan Hauser (ASU). What is your perception of the Legislature's attitude toward graduation and retention rates?

A. Spangler. We all know that we have a great University. This creates some jealousy and there are those not always willing to give us what we need. This jealousy causes some to give us a hard time. They want us to do better. Most of this is based more on suspicion than on hard evidence.

Q. Maggie Parish (UNCW). Are graduation rates a nation-wide problem?

A. Spangler. Yes, they are. Graduation requirements have escalated and it is difficult to keep to four years.

Q. Thad Dankle (UNCW). Given the decline in student aid, is the University of North Carolina looking at other ways to help?

A. Spangler. This is having a negative impact and it is always a problem. If students must work and it gets in the way of their education, it becomes a problem.

**CHAIR'S COMMENTS** (Ken Wilson-ECU)

1. The Board of Governors' Governance Committee is revising the policy on faculty running for political office. The policy will be based on the presumption of an inherent conflict of time, not interest.

2. The Chair reinforces President Spangler's comments on the University's five year strategic plan.

3. Chairman Poole's remarks of April 24, 1992, raised four basic questions. The Executive Committee has assigned one question each to four of our standing committees. The quality of undergraduate experience has been assigned to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. The quality and effectiveness of undergraduate advisement has been assigned to Professional Development. The problems of retention and graduation rates have been assigned to Planning and Programs. The effective utilization of resources has been assigned to the Budget Committee.

4. If anyone is really unhappy with their committee assignments please talk to the Chair.

5. **The February, 1993, Faculty Assembly meeting will be held Friday, February 19, 1993.**

6. Shirl Hoffman (UNCG) asked Roy Carroll to talk to the entire Faculty Assembly about the University of North Carolina long range plan instead of just the Planning and Programs Committee.

**ROY CARROLL**

1. For the first time we have a mission statement for the University of North Carolina system. He read a draft of the new mission statement which is a new section of the plan.

3.

2. Another new section contains a set of interrelated strategic directions for the university:

- a. access and opportunity,
- b. improve the quality of undergraduate education,
- c. strengthen role and scope of research,
- d. strengthen role and scope of public service,
- e. stronger links between research, education, and publics,
- f. use of information technologies,
- g. improve productivity,
- h. acquire and effectively utilize funds to carry out mission.

3. The new strategic plan also contains the different types of institutions and their missions.

#### **CHAIR'S COMMENTS** (continued)

The Chair asked that the Delegates review the minutes of the April 24, 1992, Faculty Assembly meeting. The minutes were reviewed and approved as presented.

The Faculty Assembly adjourned to committee meetings at 2:42 P.M.

#### **EVENING PLENARY SESSION**

The Chair, Ken Wilson-ECU, called the evening plenary session to order at 7:10 P.M.

#### **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **BUDGET COMMITTEE** (Jim Peacock for Jim Murphy-UNCCH)

1. The Committee was briefed by Felix Joyner. On the matter of salary and benefits the administration will ask for merit raises as opposed to flat sums. The administration will press forward on the bond issue and will work to improve benefits for all. Local Boards of Trustees will have to review fees. As to the 30% reversion of retiring faculty salaries, the reversion will probably be removed for faculty positions but perhaps not SPA positions.

2. Chairman Poole's issue of effective resource utilization was assigned to the Budget Committee. There are some criteria such as enrollment numbers and number of degrees conferred. Are there more subtle measures? The Committee will write a letter to President Spangler with a copy to Chairman Poole.

3. The Committee brought to the floor Resolution 91-1, RESOLUTION ON NEED FOR SALARY INCREASES. With some minor corrections Resolution 91-1 passed.

4.

4. Thad Dankle (UNCW) asked that the Chancellors' reports on special responsibility institutions be made available to faculty.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE** (Roger Lowery-UNCW for John Stephens-UNCA)

1. The Committee has no resolutions.
2. The Committee discussed, and will continue to discuss, the following issues:
  - a. A policy about the length of non-tenure track appointments. Apparently the practices vary widely across the University.
  - b. Chairman Poole's concern for the undergraduate experience, particularly as it concerns the evaluation of teaching.
  - c. The role of external accrediting agencies re curriculum.
  - d. Breaches of professional ethics.
  - e. The reimbursement of legal fees for faculty who have won appeals.
3. The Committee distributed a handout titled "Currently Employed Instructional Faculty By Contract Status & I Situation From Fall 1987 To Fall 1991," dated September 18, 1992.

**FACULTY GOVERNANCE**

1. The Committee has no resolutions.
2. There are three things the Committee is going to work on:
  - a. Collate the data from last year's survey of faculty chairs.
  - b. Determine which campuses have committees that deal with the campus not following established policies.
  - c. Changing The Code to include material procedural irregularities as a basis for reconsideration. An alternative is to suggest to President Spangler that Chancellors change local procedures.

**FACULTY WELFARE** (Robin Dorff-NCSU)

1. The Committee has no resolutions.
2. The Committee will work on the following issues:
  - a. Liability insurance, what it covers, and who will defend us. Betsy Bunting and Dave Edwards agreed that before the November meeting that they would figure out how to present the information to the Faculty Assembly.
  - b. Campus security and crime are of continuing concern. There are seven campuses not represented on the Committee. Heads of those seven Delegations please

5.

provide input to the Committee on the state of crime and security on their campuses. What is being done about it?

- c. Faculty benefits to include health insurance, tax sheltered vs. pre tax dollars, early retirement, age discrimination, and general faculty morale.
- d. Status of graduate students.

3. There are two issues that the Committee cannot handle. Perhaps they belong in another committee. They are incentives for teaching and advising and the issue of classroom resources.

### **PLANNING AND PROGRAMS** (Peter Petschauer-ASU)

1. Roy Carroll talked about the long range planning document and process. There were some handouts to Committee members on pieces of the plan. The Committee found the strategic directions fascinating. They should be interesting to faculty and the Faculty Assembly and its standing committees.

2. The Committee yearly looks at university calendars but the 1992-1993 calendars are not ready yet.

3. Enrollment data are not yet available.

4. The Committee brought to the floor Resolution 92-2, RESOLUTION REGARDING THE MANDATORY 30% REVERSION UPON RETIREMENT. After considerable revision, Resolution 92-2 passed.

5. Preliminary SAT scores indicate that last year's scores increased by 11%. Many students are now taking the PSAT and more are taking the SAT.

6. The Committee will present a graduation and retention rate resolution at our November meeting.

7. The Committee continues to discuss the potential shift in the FTE funding base from 12 hours to 15 hours.

### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT** (Harmon Watson-FSU)

1. The Committee has no resolutions.

2. The agenda is dominated by two issues:

- a. Assessment and review of the June, 1992, professional development conference. The Committee will provide the Faculty Assembly a summary at our November meeting. There is some possibility of a biannual conference.

- b. Faculty advisement of students. What aspects of advising have been negatively reported? How do we assess advising? How do we reward advising? The

6.

Committee may have a resolution later.

3. The Committee will present the final report of John Moskop's survey of unreimbursed expenses.

**OLD BUSINESS**

As the previously established date for the February, 1993, meeting conflicted with other scheduled events, the meeting will be held on **Friday, February 19, 1993.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

None.

THE EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ADJOURNED AT 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*William Kane*  
William Kane  
Vice-Chair and Acting Secretary

Resolution 92-1  
Budget Committee  
September 18, 1992

**RESOLUTION ON NEED FOR SALARY INCREASES**

**Whereas**, it is apparent that faculty salaries at UNC are not keeping pace with inflation, cost of living, or with our competition among other public and private institutions, and

**Whereas**, the consequences are loss of outstanding faculty and decline in the quality and effectiveness of the University's service to the state,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Faculty Assembly at the University of North Carolina urge President Spangler to seek a salary increase of 8% for this next fiscal year.

---

Ken Wilson  
Chair of the Faculty Assembly

*William Kane*

---

William Kane  
Vice-Chair and Acting Secretary  
of the Faculty Assembly



Resolution 92-2  
Planning and Programs Committee  
September 18, 1992

**RESOLUTION REGARDING THE MANDATORY 30%  
SALARY REVERSION UPON RETIREMENT**

**Whereas**, the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina mandated that the sixteen institutions of the University of North Carolina in the 1992-1993 fiscal year return to the general fund 30% of the funds appropriated for a given position upon the retirement of the person holding that position, and

**Whereas**, this reversion reduces the pool of salary funds available to particular universities, and

**Whereas**, this reversion especially penalizes institutions which have pursued controlled growth and retained their faculty during the years of fiscal strength, and

**Whereas**, this reversion reduces the ability of faculty and administrators to hire qualified personnel, particularly senior personnel essential in some fields, and thus places the University of North Carolina in a weakened position vis a vis private institutions operating in this State and private and public institutions in other states, and

**Whereas**, this reversion will rapidly reduce the ability of the University of North Carolina to provide quality education,

**THEREFORE BE IT BE RESOLVED THAT** the Faculty Assembly requests President Spangler to urge the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina to abandon this harmful approach to fiscal management.

---

Ken Wilson  
Chair of the Faculty Assembly

*William Kane*

---

William Kane  
Vice-Chair and Acting Secretary  
of the Faculty Assembly

## PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

September 18, 1992

I wish to welcome you to the first of your Faculty Assembly meetings for our new academic year, and to especially welcome those of you who are new members of the Assembly. You will enjoy serving on this important body, much as I enjoy working with the Assembly each year.

Let me begin by making brief comments on two of last year's resolutions that you passed. FIRST, I want to thank you for your resolution 91-4 in support of our efforts to secure additional funding for the University from the General Assembly. I assure you that we will do everything, we can to secure the most favorable response to the change budget request, which will be presented to the Board of Governors on October 16. SECOND, your resolution 91-5 urged again the appointment of a benefits officer here in General Administration. Again, I can assure you that we recognize the need for such an officer, but we cannot create such a position until additional funds are available to us. I am sure you recognize that here in General Administration we suffer the same problems with budget cuts that your campuses have been experiencing for the last few years.

Let me make a few comments on actions taken by the recent short Session of the General Assembly as they affect the University.

We were all disappointed that the General Assembly did not authorize a referendum on capital improvements bonds for the University. The problem was simply differing judgments on the part of the House and the Senate as to when would be the best time to put a referendum before the people. We are confident of the support of both houses for a bond referendum when the 1993 General Assembly comes into session in January.

Overall, the University was treated fairly and well in this period of economic difficulty. This was a better year than last year, thanks to the courageous step that the General Assembly took last year in increasing taxes.

There are many bright spots in the budget that was authorized for this fiscal year. Our expansion budget provided for enrollment increases at our institutions. The State has reduced the amount of overhead receipts that it retains from our sponsored programs from the extraordinary 50% retained last year to the previously scheduled 20%. In keeping with commitments made in the previous biennium, the stated retention should drop to 15% next year and to 10% in the second year of the biennium and then to 5% in 1995-56 and to zero in 1996-67. This means a great deal to externally sponsored research and training programs on our campuses. These funds are much needed to provide the infrastructure -- facilities, repairs, scientific equipment, renovations and some personnel support for those programs.

We also were treated well in what was a relatively small capital improvements budget. Some \$40 million in capital projects to the University included a new physical education facility at Fayetteville State, a new building for the School of Social Work at Chapel Hill, and almost \$12 million for repairs and renovations.

While we were disappointed with the State's ability to provide more substantial funds for faculty and EPA staff salary increases, we did receive 1.13% of the salary base for such increases, no increase in the cost of the State's health plan, and an increase of 3.7% in the State retirement program at no cost to our employees, with a comparable upward adjustment in the State's contribution for those in the Optional Retirement Plan.

We were disappointed that tuition was increased for both our in-state and out-of-state students, and we were disappointed with the provision that

requires us to revert 30% of the salary of retiring faculty and staff during the year 1992-93. This provision could have a serious long-term effect on our institutions, and we will be giving special attention to this problem during the next Session.

The General Assembly has a strong and continuing legislative interest in graduation rates, student fees, faculty workloads, and service to the public schools. Chairman Poole mentioned some of these concerns in his comments to the Assembly back in April. (You have his remarks attached to the minutes of that meeting.) Your chief academic officers are giving attention to these things and will be discussing them with Vice President Little when he meets with them in October. I urge you and the faculties that you represent to give serious thought to how we can improve the retention rate of our students and can shorten the time required for graduation. I might note that these issues are not just North Carolina issues; they are, as you undoubtedly know, national issues.

The institutions that you represent are already at work on some of the results of the recent Mission Review and the actions taken by the Board of Governors following the report of the consultants. Planning is underway at your institutions on many of the new programs that were authorized in connection with the Mission Review.

Earlier this summer the chancellors submitted material for the revision of the University's Long-Range Plan, to cover the period 1992-97. Those materials have been reviewed and a draft Plan has been presented to the Board's Planning Committee by Vice President Carroll. Following a series of meetings, that Committee approved a draft plan on September 10. The new planning document will be the most extensive and significant revision

of the University's plan since the first plan was adopted in 1976. The new plan will contain:

- a statement of overall mission of the University as a whole;
- a set of eight interrelated strategic directions to pursue over the next five years;
- an outline of major principles and priorities for new academic program development;
- a general statement of the academic mission and authorizations for program planning and development for each institution; and
- enrollment projections through the fall of 1996.

This plan will be presented to the full Board of Governors in November. I have asked Dr. Carroll to share the highlights of the draft plan with your committee on Planning and Programs. At the next meeting of the Assembly (on November 20), you can expect to receive copies of the plan as adopted by the Board of Governors.

I mentioned earlier the Biennial Budget Request for 1993-95 that will be presented to the Board of Governors on October 16. Among the items of high priority will be faculty salary increases, funds for enrollment increases, and support for the libraries, which will include a major request for updating the library network. Special attention will also be given to networking for information technology and improving the computing facilities on our campuses, as well as enhancement of our instruction and academic support budgets. I will be seeking the advice of your chancellors on salary increases at our Administrative Council meeting on Tuesday of next week.

The Board of Governors Committee on University Governance is still studying the policy on employees running for public office. The real issue is not whether or not an employee or faculty member can run for office but

rather under what circumstances must the employee or faculty member take partial or full leave of absence to campaign for the office or in some instances to serve in an elected office. The issue is one of conflict of time, not conflict of interest, and the Board is most concerned that the interests of your students be protected.

Finally, let me report that the 12 institutions authorized by the Board of Governors to operate under the flexibility legislation for the 1991-92 fiscal year have submitted their reports on how this authorization was utilized. These 12 institutions, after meeting their required reversions carried forward \$10 million into fiscal year 1992-93 to be used at the institutions' discretion for non-recurring items. These same institutions reallocated another \$17 million within their operating budgets during the year, allowing them to meet needs that were more pressing than those for which the funds were initially budgeted. It appears that the flexibility legislation is benefitting these institutions in significant ways. Of the four not included in this report, one was designated a special responsibility institution effective July 1, 1992, and we expect the remaining three to request this status during the coming year.

Again, it is good to be with you and I look forward to learning the results of your deliberations at this meeting.