

Minutes
Faculty Senate of East Carolina University
2nd Regular Meeting of 1978/79 Academic Year
17 October 1978

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 17, 1978, at 2:10 p.m. in Mendenhall Student Center, Room 221. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Henry Ferrell. Upon the calling of the roll, the following members were absent: Davis (Allied Health), Riggs (Geology), Schmidt (Music), Kirkpatrick (Nursing). The following alternates were present: William Smith for Kane (Allied Health), Karl Rodabaugh for Ward (Continuing Education), Wayne Edwards for Hancock (Health and P. E.), G. Lynis Dohm for Pories (Medicine). The following ex-officio members were absent: Holt, Monroe, and P. Adler.

Agenda Item 2: The Faculty Senate minutes for April 18, April 19, and September 19, 1978 were approved.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Agenda Item 3A: Announcements: The Chair made the following remarks and announcements:

1. The Chancellor has received the following letter from President Friday, dated September 29:

Thank you very much for your note of the 27th transmitting Henry Ferrell's letter to me and the copy of the generous resolution enacted by the Faculty Senate of East Carolina on September 19.

I am indeed grateful for this expression on the part of the Senate. I want Henry to know, however, that Dr. Raymond Dawson and Dr. Donald Stedman are the individuals who have carried the responsibility of this Review program and who have been of invaluable assistance in establishing a process to insure faculty participation. They deserve the credit for this signal accomplishment. . . .

2. The Chair has appointed Carl Tadlock (Aerospace) to the General College Committee replacing Ken Lewis (1979).
3. The Senate Office has received the following minutes: Academic Council of UNC-Greensboro, September 6, 1978; Appalachian State Faculty Senate, September 11, 1978; and N. C. Central Faculty Senate Agenda, October 27, 1978.
4. The following committee officers have been elected: Due Process Committee: Chair, Eugene Ryan (Philosophy); Secretary, Robert Hursey (Mathematics); Reconsideration Committee: Chair, Henry Ferrell (History); Secretary, Prem Sehgal (Biology). The Hearing Committee is due to meet on October 19 to elect its officers.
5. On September 17, the E. C. U. Board of Trustees met. It was reported that the University will have an average over the year of 10,735 full-time equivalent students. The Board of Governors had allocated 10,630 FTE's for the 1978/79 academic year, so the University is overenrolled. It is estimated that for 1979/80 the FTE's will number 10,800 and for the following year, 10,900. The Neonatal Center has been opened at the Pitt Memorial Hospital serving eastern North Carolina. Additionally, a helicopter service has been made available to provide regional service. (Schmidt joined the session.)
The Medical School has presently 65 students, 28 in the second year, and 37 in the first. The B68 computer should be in place in the Computing Center by the end of this month. The Alumni Office reported that fund raising for the quarter July-September 1978 had increased 133 percent over the corresponding period of last year. The Trustees approved an administrative reorganization which would provide for a

new Vice Chancellor of Institutional Advancement and Administration and a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, with the consolidation of all undergraduate programs under the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

6. There is available in the Senate Office an Administrative Bibliography, received from Eugene Brunelle, Director of Library Services.

7. The Graduate Council met on October 16, at which time a number of courses were approved in anatomy, biochemistry, microbiology, pharmacology, and physiology. On the basis of these and similar courses, Ph.D. programs will soon be proposed for the approval of the Council.

8. A referendum, indirectly affecting academic programs at E. C. U., will be presented to the voters of Pitt County on November 7; it concerns the elevation of Pitt Technical Institute to Pitt Community College.

9. The program for the installation of Chancellor Brewer has been completed. For the installation, on October 28, Ione Ryan, Chairperson of the Academic Procession Subcommittee, requests that the Senators meet in the Art Building Auditorium between 9:30 and 9:45 a.m.

Agenda Item 3B: Report of the Faculty Assembly. The report was presented by Professor Pat Daugherty. (See attachment.)

Agenda Item 3C: Remarks by Chancellor Brewer. Brewer said he had had a recent meeting with Deans and department Chairpersons to discuss some items relating to the move toward ever increasing excellence for E. C. U., and he now wanted to share these items with the Faculty Senate and, as the occasion arises, with all the members of the faculty. In many ways, everyone working together can make this a better university. But primarily it is up to the faculty to make the university hum; it will be no better and no worse than the faculty want it to be. Brewer pointed out that he was speaking as a Professor of History who now happens to be Chancellor, having spent many years as a full-time faculty member. The University has established criteria for faculty members: teaching, creative activity, and service. These are basically the same criteria as are found in every university. How the criteria are interpreted will determine how the excellence of the university will be judged. Teaching is fundamental to the success of the institution; one of the prime missions of this university is to educate students, and this is done in many ways, one of them being through the teaching function of the faculty. Connected with teaching, about which more will be said later, is creative activity. It is impossible for a person to be a great teacher without a spirit of inquiry, without curiosity about the discipline, without wanting to participate in the advancement of knowledge in that discipline. It is this which separates the faculty from being just teachers; they are professors. Part of the mission of the University is the advancement of knowledge, knowledge which is advanced through the progress of the disciplines and which is shared with students through the teaching experience. If a faculty member has a sense of inquiry and curiosity about the discipline, this will be communicated with students, and the results of it will be shared with other people around the nation.

It has drifted back to his office, Brewer said, that he is "publish or perish." No one who has ever taught at a publish or perish institution could take what has just been said and interpret that as publish or perish. In such an institution, teaching is secondary, a secondary mission of the university. Teaching is fundamental to this institution, but as a complementary activity, creative activity is a necessity for great teaching. All this can be translated into practical terms: what this University can expect by way of creative activity will probably not be of the same magnitude as a "publish or perish" institution. Teaching takes time. Thus there is less time for creative activity than there is at a research-oriented institution.

Further, there is a difference between disciplines. Publication is not always the appropriate avenue for demonstrating creative activity. In some disciplines it is. But in the art and music schools there are other ways of demonstrating creative activity. And there are variations even in the same discipline. In history, for example, a medieval historian who produces one good solid article of quality every five years is probably a good faculty person. But someone in American history doing the same would not deserve to be tenured or, if tenured, to be promoted. Thus, there are different criteria for creative activity.

Teaching and creative activity, Brewer stated, are the two fundamental missions of the faculty. Service is a third mission but does not equate with the first two. Service orientation must not take precedence over the teaching and creative mission.

Some will object that good teachers are not good researchers and good researchers are not good teachers. But, Brewer said, this is not true. There is no dichotomy between good teaching and creative activity. What the University must strive for is the teacher-scholar. This is nothing new; E. C. U. has a good faculty. But everyone can get better. It will take time for the University to improve. Universities do not plateau; they either go up or they go down. There is no way to maintain a status quo.

The teacher-scholar, according to Brewer, is the person who cares about the student, who cares about the classroom, who cares about communicating with students, but at the same time is curious and inquisitive about the discipline and wants to contribute to the progress of the discipline, albeit in a smaller way than someone who is totally research oriented. New faculty candidates who want to go to a place where they will teach and not engage in any creative activity should be told that they have a choice of 2700 out of the 3000 institutions of higher learning where they might be happy; they will not be happy here. If someone comes who is totally research oriented, that person should be told this is not the place for him either.

If the University is to expect faculty to carry out creative activity, it must accept responsibility in certain areas. First, good people must be hired. Someone put on a tenure track must be a person who will in all likelihood perform satisfactorily. Non-tenured people might object that all of these requirements are new; some present faculty members have not participated in creative activity for over ten years. The response should be that this is sometimes the case and it is unfortunate but it does not follow that everyone should get tenure even if there are no accomplishments after six years of probation. Further, faculty members who have not been creatively active should be encouraged to become so, and if they do not, their salaries should reflect this fact. It would not matter if the whole faculty were permanently tenured if they were intellectually vibrant and alive. The University does not have to establish why someone should be denied tenure; the faculty member must establish for the University why the University should grant tenure, by proving themselves worthy colleagues for the next thirty years. This is why the basic responsibility for all this rests with the faculty, and with the department.

Another responsibility of the University if it is to expect creative activity, according to Brewer, is that it provide good facilities if the work is to be done. At present there are a multitude of equipment problems. It is hoped that the \$60,000 provided in research funds will help in this area. Lastly and most importantly, the University has the obligation to provide time for creative activity. Teaching loads will have to be reviewed in an attempt to find such time. If there is perhaps one faculty member along the way who is not going to engage in creative activity and the chairman knows it and his colleagues know it, then there is no reason why that person should not be teaching at least 12 hours.

Thus, in the areas of facilities, support and time, the University is obligated if increased creative activity is to be expected.

Some will say, Brewer continued, that it is impossible to judge teaching. Teaching and creative activity are held up as the significant criteria for faculty members; and since teaching cannot be measured, everybody will measure creative activity since that is quantifiable. First, creative activity is not always quantifiable. We are interested in quality. In history, for example, it would be preferable to have a faculty member produce one article in a national journal than five or six in local publications. The reason is that one cannot know the quality of the latter, since most of these are not refereed. With regard to the claim that it is impossible to evaluate teaching, this depends on how one defines the word "evaluate." Sometimes people want to use the word in a quantifiable way. Measurement people, for example, sometimes claim that they will be able to get teaching down to where they will be able to measure to a standard deviation, put the measurement on a scale, and then tell each one how good or bad they are. This is poppycock. On the other hand, teaching has been evaluated for as long as there has been higher education. If it has not, and creative activity has not been demanded either, then what has been going on? Departmental chairmen always evaluate; it is their responsibility. Guidelines must be developed by the Senate working with the Administration that faculty can follow so as to be able to talk about teaching, to place more emphasis upon it than in the past. These guidelines must be developed by the Senate working with the Administration. The evaluation of teaching is the gathering of judgments; a chairman has many ways to gather those judgments, in order to make a recommendation on increments, tenure, or promotion, etc. One chairman, from another institution, for example, has suggested that there is evidence that can be brought to bear in evaluating teaching: it is known over a period of years which classes a faculty member teaches, what the enrollment and drop rate of each was; which students take which classes; when students seek out teachers for second and third courses; when students are moved to explore the subject further through theses and dissertations; how students perform in exams and in following courses; how teachers are received by students outside of class; how many difficult courses a teacher has taught so as to be able to make some reasonable judgment about his/her range and depth; what texts are used and assignments given; what a teacher's general reputation is. Communication with each other gives further information useful in evaluating colleagues. Brewer then referred to another source for suggestions about teacher evaluation: evidence of innovations in the classroom, development of new courses, outside advising activity, utilization of faculty development grants, attendance at faculty development seminars and workshops.

There is relevance, Brewer continued, in asking students for their opinions about what a teacher has done in that classroom in that semester. It is wrong to cast this in the light of an "evaluation," assuming that the students are "evaluating" the faculty member's performance. There is a difference between asking for an opinion from a student and asking for an evaluation from a student. The one key factor in teaching that 90 percent of students cannot evaluate is whether they are being challenged with the most up-to-date interpretations in this field, or are being given brilliantly material twenty years out of date. Brewer recounted his own experience of having been taught a history course by an instructor who had won the teacher of the year award, but who had been deficient in presenting up-to-date interpretations. Students are not capable of making those kinds of judgments about faculty people. Students are capable, however, of telling the faculty member and the chairman how they thought the faculty member did that semester in that course. Some of the worries that faculty have is that this data is quantifiable; but the faculty should not have this concern. Student opinion is one input among many that a chairman has in rendering some evaluation. Further, by and large, student opinions of faculty are on the high side; students usually think the faculty is good. Student opinion, too, is valuable because it might tend to offset other information a chairman receives from students. Most students who approach administrators do not intend to compliment anyone but to make a complaint. Thus student opinion can work as an offsetting factor. But student opinion is valuable only when it is cumulative. Such an accumulation over a period of four or five years will reveal a pattern if there is one. Usually, the top sixth and the bottom

sixth of the faculty is identified; the others are not identifiable by any sophisticated difference.

Brewer said he would like to see East Carolina have student evaluations; he would like to see administrator evaluations tied to them. If one is going to ask for the opinion of the students, one ought to ask for the opinion of faculty and staff on the performance of administrators. He was not, Brewer stated, referring to the evaluations called for in the E. C. U. Code; (though with regard to these he would like to see them reexamined; a new chairman should not be evaluated irrespective of whether he or she has been in office only one year). He was referring to evaluations by faculty and staff of administrators right on up to the Chancellor. These evaluations would go to the administrator who is evaluated and to the person immediately above him or her. They are very helpful for self-improvement as well as being a useful tool in gathering information about the performance of administrators. Just as in the case of student opinion of faculty, so here an accumulation of data is needed to see whether patterns emerge that call for corrective action.

The administration of a University has to be very sensitive to the concept of collegiality, Brewer continued. Only in this way does a university function properly. But at the same time, faculty people must be sensitive to collegiality with each other. In some institutions this is not always true. In any event, administrators must be sensitive to it, being always willing to discuss any kind of an issue with anyone who wants to discuss it. This is time consuming, but it is essential. Brewer said his theory of administration is based on the view that if he cannot present a position that is logical, then he should rethink it. This is the whole purpose of discussion, dialogue and collegialization. The faculty must approach the administration with the same view. The faculty and the administration are all working for what is best for the University. They will not always agree on how to get there, but they do have the same goals in mind. They may not always agree, but they will operate in an atmosphere of mutual trust. They will disagree as professionals; they will not disagree as personalities. A good administrator, too, must be very much aware of changes in higher education during the past decade and of changes and planning for higher education for the next decade. Administrators are charged with this responsibility of keeping up with the changes and of being able to communicate these changes to the faculty. Administrators must have a good sense of budget, and they must be ready and willing to make a decision when it is necessary. Hopefully, an institution can be run on a consensus basis; but there probably will be a few times when a hard decision must be made. Administrators are needed who will make such decisions fairly after gathering the facts. Such decisions must be procedurally correct. Brewer said he is a believer in written procedures. Once these procedures are written, they should be followed. Procedures should leave as little room for misinterpretation as possible, thus avoiding many pitfalls. It is for this reason that the entire Code needs to be examined this year by the Senate as there are ambiguities and inconsistencies in it.

Donnalley asked what is the present status of Appendix C. Brewer replied that he plans to work on it in the near future. Donnalley asked if Brewer agreed with giving reasons for personnel actions. He replied that he did, and the Code calls for it. The Courts have taken the position that a plaintiff must establish either a procedural error or a violation of civil rights. Brewer said he personally does not agree with this. Nontenured faculty members must be told, on the basis of the established criteria, what their progress is, in writing, without mincing any words. The Courts have never injected themselves into a substantive decision, as, for example, whether a person has published enough so as to deserve tenure. Some of these decisions about granting tenure are tough; probably the toughest job in the University is that of the chairman of a department, since the chairman has to observe, make recommendations, write letters, etc. The nontenured person must have

something to which to respond, and if he or she feels they are not being treated fairly, they can at that point move into the grievance procedure. Grievances ought to be handled for only two reasons: prejudice and procedural error. No grievance committee in the University ought to interject itself into a dispute about whether a person had published sufficiently, if the department has decided he or she has not. A grievance committee should not become involved in substantive issues.

Graham asked who would set the criteria for an adequate amount of creative activity. Brewer responded that the University has already stated the criteria: teaching, creative activity, and service. To work out the details of this procedure will take some time. No department is free to ignore these criteria. Each school and college should determine how it determines the criteria, not to deviate from them, but to determine how that discipline fits these three areas. In something like Arts and Sciences, one needs to go department by department to look at the criteria. All this comes back up the line. When it gets to the dean's office, the dean examines the criteria department by department. A college committee would probably be needed at that level. The criteria would then go to the Vice Chancellor and ultimately to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is not the academic officer of the University; the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is. This latter will then review the recommendations concerning the criteria. There will be disagreement. To help along in this, there could be a college personnel committee or a college advisory committee, and a University advisory committee. Brewer cited the example of one University where the committee on the college level sits with the dean and is advisory to the dean on personnel actions of that college, while the committee on the University level sits with the Vice Chancellor in an advisory capacity. These committees have two functions: to protect the faculty against arbitrary action on the part of an administrator and to help the administrator insure the quality of the college or the University. Often the committee has taken a much tougher stance than the administrator. The quality of faculty has gone up enormously by using this system. These committees on the University and the college level were half elected and half appointed. The appointed members came after consultation, with the chairmen on the college level and with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate on the University level.

C. Adler asked if Brewer was in favor of keeping a certain percentage of the faculty untenured. Brewer replied it would be well to have some roll-over. The way this state is budgeted, if there were 100 percent tenured faculty all of whom eventually would go on up to the senior ranks, these ranks would be paid considerably less than at other institutions with a large percentage of junior faculty members. More money is not appropriated just because there happens to be more full professors. So much is budgeted per faculty position, around 18 thousand this year. There is some faculty roll-over; one thing that would have to be adopted is that all positions that become available would be filled from the bottom. Also departments must be assured that, if they deny tenure, the department will have another chance. If a department denies tenure and the administration takes the slot to move elsewhere, departments will ask why they should deny anyone tenure and thus lose the slot. With regard to the question, should there be 100 percent tenure track appointments, it is necessary to look at each department to see what it is doing, to see if it can afford 100 percent tenure track. For example, a department that is heavily service-oriented, teaching 80 percent of its courses in freshman-sophomore service work, can it afford a tenured faculty to teach such a program or should it maintain enough instructor level people to handle some of this, making sure it has a core of high quality faculty that can handle the majors and the graduate work, and also to teach some service courses, so that a quality faculty is maintained.

P. Daugherty asked what Brewer saw as the Faculty Senate's contribution to the decision making process, about tenuring in, for example. Brewer replied that there

are several committees that would be expected to work with the Chancellor's office, with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and with anyone else involved in making these decisions in a collegial atmosphere. The Senate would thus be doing this through its committee structure. The Senate might look at that structure, since there may be room for some consolidation there. What administrators do best, let them do; what the faculty do best, let them do. There are some things that committees do now which could just as easily be left with the deans, since they are rather trivial administrative type decisions. Faculty time should be utilized most effectively in those matters which concern faculty goals in the University.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Agenda Item 4A: Reconsideration of Committee on Educational Policies and Planning. Ferrell yielded the chair to Vice Chair I. Ryan. Ferrell traced the previous Senate actions which had taken place regarding the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning. The Committee had been submitted to the Senate by the Committee on Committees, following the guidelines in Appendix D. Passed by the Senate, the Committee as established was returned to the Senate by the Chancellor, who then set up another Committee with the same name. The Senate had refused to appoint a representative to serve on this latter committee. Ferrell and Schmidt, Chair of the Committee on Committees, had presented the background on the Committee to the Chancellor during the past summer, with a new proposal for the Committee which was distributed to the Senators. Previously the Committee had been established as a decision committee in the area of the change of programs or financial exigency. The emphasis has been shifted, as the new change indicates. Ferrell commented that most of the membership of the Committee is ex-officio; even so, most of the membership will have been elected by the Senate indirectly, since they are, for the most part, chairpersons of Senate committees; it is to be understood also that the Chairman of the Faculty shall serve on the Committee ex-officio. P. Daugherty moved to amend the change by inserting the following sentence: "The Committee shall report its recommendations and concerns to the Faculty Senate at least on an annual basis." Johnson seconded. P. Daugherty said that if the Committee took any major steps with regard to programs, the Senate should be informed. On a voice vote, the motion to amend passed. Schmidt moved to delete the second sentence in the final paragraph of the change, and insert the sentence: "The Chairperson of the Committee shall be the Chairman of the Faculty." Bolt seconded. Grossnickle said this was putting a burden on the Chairman of the Faculty. Woodside agreed that the Chairman of the Faculty already has a demanding job. Ferrell replied that in a sense he agreed, but that for the purposes of organization it perhaps would be more efficient to have the Chairman of the Faculty chair the Committee. Donnalley asked why the charge did not stipulate that the Chairman of the Faculty was an ex-officio member. Ferrell replied that this was not necessary, since this membership is provided for by the general statement that he or she is a member of each committee. C. Adler asked if there was any other committee whose chair was an ex-officio member. He said he did not think this was a good policy. On a voice vote, the amendment failed. Zincone asked if the Committee would have veto power over new programs. Ferrell replied that it did not, since the Committee would advise on these matters. Zincone moved that after the phrase, "prior to their implementation," the following be added: "so that it may consider them in planning." Hines seconded. Zincone (for the amendment) stated that the charge of the Committee is so broad that it should be clear that schools would still have, for example, the power to change its policy with regard to admissions without approval of the Committee. Ferrell said no committee can make such policy decisions without submitting them to the Senate. Howell said he presumed we are referring to those programs that would come before the Senate. Ferrell agreed. Donnalley said she was concerned with the question of continuity in the committee, since many of the ex-officio members would be new each year. Ferrell said that usually committees elect persons as chair who have already served on the committee once or twice. Thus there would be continuity. On a voice vote, the amendment failed. Shackelford asked what was the

origin of the Committee. Ferrell replied that it ultimately went back to Appendix D and had undergone some evolution since first being submitted to the Senate. E. Ryan asked whether it was odd to have one person as the quorum of the committee. Ferrell answered that according to Robert's Rules ex-officio members would not count in a quorum. Johnson stated that the present arrangement would possibly lead to the problem of having the Chair call a meeting and constitute a quorum. Woodside moved that the quorum be amended so as to read "2 members exclusive of ex-officio." Brewer said that he favored having a majority of the committee constitute a quorum. Johnson asked if it would be in opposition to the rules to have the majority of the committee constitute a quorum. The Chair ruled that this would not be contrary to the rules. Woodside, with the concurrence of Johnson, withdrew his motion. Woodside then moved that a quorum be a majority of the membership, including ex-officio. Johnson seconded. Price moved to amend the amendment to read that the quorum must include at least one elected member of the Committee. Donnalley seconded. Zincone (against) said this did not provide for any significant change. On a voice vote, the amendment to the amendment passed. Zincone called for a division of the house, with the result: for 27, against 11. The amendment then passed by a voice vote. On a voice vote, the main motion as amended passed. (See Resolutions Passed 78-29.) (Ferrell resumed the chair.)

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Agenda Item 5A: Report of the Calendar Committee: The report was presented by Professor Robert Gantt, who presented the Senators a hand-out comparing different possible calendars. The Chair ruled that debate would be limited to twenty minutes, with a majority vote required to prolong debate. Gantt submitted Fall Semester Calendar A, as mandated by the Senate in its April 1978 meeting. Mr. Gil Moore, the Registrar, had earlier requested floor privileges. Moore said that it was more efficient to have no carry-over of registration from one week to the next. It is possible to register the students with one day of registration, and two days of drop-add and late registration, one of these days without class and the other with. (Moore noted that there are 10,314 students preregistered for the Spring term.) If students are given the choice of waiting an additional two or three days to register, they will take that choice. Professor James Hix (Chemistry) had also earlier requested floor privileges and said the sciences found it more efficient to have classes begin on Monday. Also, the sciences were opposed to having an additional break as called for in Calendar A for the Spring Semester. Gantt explained that the Committee had submitted Calendar A in accordance with the Senate resolution but had also developed Calendar B since some felt that having the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off would invite students to take off the whole week, and others were opposed to having organizational meetings in the fall semester after the close of registration on the first day. C. Adler moved to strike and add those elements in Calendar B which differ from Calendar A, Fall Semester. Haritun seconded. Shackelford asked if the Committee had considered a Fall break. Gantt replied that the Committee had considered; it would involve an earlier starting date in August. Johnson said a number of students had approached him concerning a Fall semester break, and this idea has merit. Smith asked if it were necessary to have Preregistration so early in a semester, or could it be placed later. Gantt asked Moore to reply. Moore said that the reason preregistration is so early is due to the procedures presently being followed, involving going through each schedule by hand, to give each student the best possible schedule. E. Ryan asked if Moore had suggested that the drop-add day in the Fall semester could be dropped without inconvenience. The present arrangement takes up enormous amounts of faculty members' time, and it does not seem to be all that worthwhile. Moore replied that it is very worthwhile. Drop-add day without classes is very beneficial. We have grown so large that it is impossible for his staff to do an adequate job. The decisions are supposed to be made in Wright Auditorium so that the students do not have to leave the auditorium to go back to have the chairman or someone else make a decision about letting him into a course if it is closed. To allow the chairman to be there, classes have been suspended on drop-add day. If classes were not suspended, the success rate of students

showing up for class would be practically nil, since they would all be at drop-add. E. Ryan asked if he could quote Moore as saying that the chairman should be there. Moore said he could. The motion to strike and add passed on a voice vote. C. Adler moved to call the question. Zincone seconded. On a voice vote, the call for the question passed. On a voice vote, Calendar B Fall Semester passed. Gantt then presented Calendar A Spring Semester. He explained that the Committee had also prepared Calendar B, which has one break period in the semester rather than two as in Calendar A. Coble moved to strike and add the elements from Calendar B which differ from Calendar A, Spring Semester. C. Adler seconded. I. Ryan moved that drop-add and late registration end on Friday, January 11, and not carry over to Monday and Tuesday, January 14 and 15. Zincone seconded. C. Adler asked why these days were so designated in the first place. Gantt replied that the committee was simply following the pattern adopted for the Fall Semester. Mikkelsen pointed out that the twenty-minute time limit had ended. The Chair called for a vote on the question of continuing the debate. The vote to continue the debate failed. On a voice vote, the amendment to delete the two drop-add days passed. The motion to strike and add passed on a voice vote. Brewer pointed out that Calendar B provides for classes to begin on Friday, which is in effect to start on Monday. On a voice vote, Calendar B, as amended, passed. (See Resolutions Passed 78-30.)

Agenda Item 5B: Report of the Committee on Committees: The report was presented by Professor Rodney Schmidt, Chair of the Committee. On a voice vote, the Committee proposal for the Student Recruitment and Retention Committee passed. (see Resolutions Passed 78-31.)

Schmidt presented the Faculty Professional Development Committee for Senate action. Muzzarelli said that the Instructional Survey Committee recognizes that with a change in its charge, there was a change in responsibility; so the Committee wished to retain ten faculty members in the new committee. The Committee also has experienced a great deal of difficulty carrying out its charge and it would be better if there could be a better understanding between the Senate and the Committee concerning what the Committee should be doing. Zincone seconded the amendment to increase the number of faculty members to ten. On a voice vote, the amendment passed. Muzzarelli moved that the proposed charge be amended to read: "The Faculty Professional Development Committee is charged with the responsibility of studying, developing and implementing methods and procedures for the identification of teaching effectiveness, developing and implementing a program that assesses student and collegial opinion of distinction in teaching, and identifying recipients of the annual Alumni Association teaching awards. The Committee is to assure the confidentiality of the data it gathers. Furthermore, the elected faculty and ex-officio members. . . ." Woodside seconded. E. Ryan moved to amend the amendment by inserting the words "for approval by the Faculty Senate and subsequent implementation. . . ." Hines seconded. E. Ryan said that one of the sources of misunderstanding of the Committee's work was due to a lack of information before the Committee began its survey. Ferrell stated as a point of information that he understood, from previous discussions with the Instructional Survey Committee and the Chancellor, that the information from the student opinion polls is to be shared with the individual faculty person and that person's immediate administrative superior. So it may well be that the phrase referring to the committee's confidentiality may require an asterisk as to what that confidentiality is. Muzzarelli said the Committee has been having a difficult time understanding what this confidentiality involves. Ferrell said that, historically, the confidentiality issue arose in 1969/70 when a lot of information was put in a booklet and passed around by students. C. Adler spoke against the amendment on the grounds that the Senate could meet for fifty hours without being able to approve a survey. E. Ryan responded that it is unfair to the Committee members to ask them to go ahead with a project and have the Senate debate the merits of it afterwards. Grossnickle stated that since the issue of confidentiality had come up, he believed it would be impossible to settle the issue on the floor of

the Senate, and he moved to recommit the matter to the Committee on Committees to more carefully consider the term "confidentiality" and to resubmit an amended charge at the next Senate meeting. Johnson seconded. On a voice vote, the motion to recommit passed. (See Resolutions Passed 78-32.)

Schmidt presented the charge of the University Research Committee. C. Adler asked if this committee would replace the Research Council. Ferrell replied no. Adler then asked what would be the source of funds for this Committee. Ferrell replied it was his understanding that these were state funds appropriated through the Board of Governors; the Research Council deals with other funds. Coble asked if there would be two committees with the same function. Ferrell replied no. Donnalley asked if it would not be well to insure having graduate faculty on this committee since graduate faculty are very much concerned with research. Schmidt replied that the Committee had considered it not necessary to specify graduate faculty as members of the University Research Committee. Ferrell pointed out that members of the Committee were to be those who had done research, and there was no reason to limit the members to graduate faculty. E. Ryan moved to amend the charge, by adding to the present charge, with a comma following the word "creativity," the words, "as evidenced by data submitted for each person nominated by the Committee on Committees." South seconded. E. Ryan, speaking for his amendment, said that, in order to give the committee respect and credibility, it might be well that when people are nominated to the committee their accomplishments be made public. Johnson asked if this information would be supplied to the Senate. The Chair replied that it would be supplied for those nominated by the Committee on Committees. E. Ryan said that if a person were nominated from the floor, the person nominating would have this data available for the Senate at the time the nomination was made. Ayers suggested that words, "or from the floor." E. Ryan agreed, and the Chair ruled this was an editorial change. The amendment passed on a voice vote. C. Adler stated that he would like to return to his earlier point about the Research Council. This group had functioned very well, and Adler was concerned about its future. It is not listed on the roster of Administrative Committees for 1978/79. If the Research Council is being replaced by this new Committee, then there should be more discussion of this point. Adler asked whether or not the Research Council will continue as it is presently set up. Adler then moved to recommit the University Research Committee until the relationship between it and the Research Council is clarified. The motion failed for lack of a second. Brewer commented that it is not the intention of the administration this year to put foundation funds at the disposal of the Research Council, so the Council will have nothing to act on this year. As foundation funds increase in two or three years, at that time it will be necessary to make a decision about the status of the Research Council with regard to research funds. On a voice vote, the main motion as amended passed. (See Resolutions Passed 78-33.)

Agenda Item 5C: Report of the University Curriculum Committee. The report was presented by Professor William Grossnickle, Committee Chair. (See Faculty Senate Agenda for October 17, 1978.) Grossnickle announced that the Committee was withdrawing one item from its report: the B.S. Teaching Degree in Physics. This program has not yet been acted on by the Teacher Education Committee. E. Ryan requested that one course listed in the Committee minutes for 21 September 1978 be returned to the Committee: LATN 2221 (Latin and Greek in Current English Usage) for the purpose of consulting with the departments which might have an interest in this course, including Political Science, Philosophy, Medicine, English, etc. The Chair stated that if there is an objection to a course, by precedent, the course passes back to the Committee. On a voice vote, the Committee report, with the exception of LATN 2221, passed. (See Resolutions Passed 78-34.)
The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Eugene E. Ryan

Secretary

Sharon Johnston

Faculty Senate Office Secretary

Agenda Item 3B: Attachment

FACULTY ASSEMBLY REPORT

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Faculty Assembly took place September 29 and 30, 1978 at the General Administration Building in Chapel Hill. East Carolina University delegates Thomas Johnson, Patricia Daugherty, Robert Woodside, and Henry Ferrell attended. President William Friday was attending the installation of Chancellor Douglas Covington at Winston-Salem State University and did not meet with the Faculty Assembly.

Vice President Raymond Dawson discussed budget allocations for 1978/79 made by the Board of Governors in July. Additional allocation in the "change" budget was four million dollars, of which two million will be used for commitments made in the State Plan for the elimination of racial duality. From the two million dollars allocated for other University-wide needs, \$200,000 will be used for a new Faculty Doctoral Study Assignment Program for faculty development. Vice President Dawson reported that the University plans to present the results of the Faculty Work Load and Tenure Study to the General Assembly February 1. Drafts of the report will be discussed with the faculty committee that helped with the preparation of the work load questionnaire and with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Assembly. A second supplement to the Plan for the Elimination of Racial Duality submitted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare commits the University to a study of degree offerings of institutions close to each other geographically, in order to determine whether there is any educationally unnecessary duplication.

Vice President Felix Joyner gave a progress report on budget preparation. Restrained requests are anticipated. The budget request for capital improvements will emphasize completion of projects already underway. The budget request for 1979/81 includes a request for funds for salary increases of 10 percent per year.

Vice President A. K. King discussed state assistance to private institutions. In the past, the Legislature has granted funds against the recommendations of the Board of Governors. The North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities is requesting an increase from 13 million dollars to 19 million dollars over the next two years.

The Faculty Assembly adopted a resolution of appreciation to the Board of Governors and President Friday for the funding of the Faculty Doctoral Study Assignment Program.

Members of the Faculty Assembly expressed opposition to state funding of private institutions while the University has unmet needs. The Assembly approved a motion that Chairman Roy Carroll attend a meeting of the North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities with a special legislative committee on October 6 to express the concerns of faculty at state institutions.

The Governance Committee presented a proposal of intent to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Assembly to require that all votes of each delegate be recorded. Robert Woodside was elected chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee, replacing a member who resigned from the Assembly during the summer. Other committee assignments of East Carolina University delegates are: Planning and Programs, Henry Ferrell; Budget, Thomas Johnson; Academic Freedom and Tenure, Patricia Daugherty. The committees met and reported on items they will be considering this year.

Many Faculty Assembly delegates attended a dinner meeting of the North Carolina Conference of the American Association of University Professors on Friday evening. Minutes of the session will be placed in the Reserve Book Room at Joyner Library.

East Carolina University Delegation Faculty Assembly

RESOLUTIONS PASSED

October 17, 1978

- (78-29) The Faculty Senate approved the attached charge of the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning.
- (78-30) The Faculty Senate approved the attached calendar for 1979/80.
- (78-31) The Faculty Senate approved the following charge of the Student Recruitment and Retention Committee:
Student Recruitment and Retention Committee - 5 faculty members and 1 student member plus ex-officio: Dean of Admissions.
 Quorum: 3 faculty members exclusive of ex-officio.

The Student Recruitment and Retention Committee recommends policies governing recruitment, orientation, and retention of students entering East Carolina University. The Committee makes special recommendations to the Dean of Admissions, to the Deans of Student Affairs, and to other appropriate agencies, regarding recruitment, orientation and retention problems.

- (78-32) The Faculty Senate approved a recommendation that the charge of the Faculty Professional Development Committee be sent back to the Committee on Committees in order to more carefully consider the term "confidentiality" and to resubmit an amended charge at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- (78-33) The Faculty Senate approved the following charge of the University Research Committee:
University Research Committee - 12 faculty members plus ex-officio: Dean of the Graduate School. All faculty members shall serve staggered three-year terms. The membership of the Committee shall be as follows: 6 from the College of Arts and Sciences with no more than two each from Humanities, Social Sciences and the Sciences/Math; and 6 from the professional schools and other academic units with not more than 1 from each professional school. Each member shall have demonstrated scholarly accomplishment in the pursuit of creativity, as evidenced by data submitted for each person nominated by the Committee on Committees or from the floor of the Faculty Senate.
 Quorum: 9 elected faculty members exclusive of ex-officio.

The University Research Committee shall award University research funds based on the merits of the proposals. It shall develop procedures for application by individual faculty, criteria for the awarding of grants, guidelines for the use of research funds, and procedures for the annual reporting of creative activity to the general faculty through symposia, publication, seminars, and other means. Proposals shall be accepted or rejected by a majority of the elected faculty members of the Committee. Six elected faculty members of the Committee selected by the Committee shall, jointly with the appropriate members of the Faculty Professional Development Committee, award grants for creative or instructional improvement projects which occur outside the normal academic year.

(78-34)

The Faculty Senate approved:

New B.A./B.S. Minor in Music; revised degree programs for Physics: B.S., B.S. Applied Physics, B.A. Major and Minor; (B.S. Teaching in Physics was withdrawn, and objection was raised at proposed LATN 2221, thus recommitting it to the University Curriculum Committee). (See University Curriculum Committee Minutes for September 21, 1978.)

Committee on Educational Policies and Planning - Three (3) elected faculty members plus ex-officio: Chairpersons of the University Curriculum Committee, Teacher Education Committee, Library Committee, Admissions Committee, General College Committee, Continuing Education Committee, Campus Facilities Planning and Development Committee, Faculty Professional Development Committee, University Research Committee, Graduate School Policies Committee and Graduate School Curriculum Committee, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs.

Quorum: A majority of the committee including one (1) of the elected faculty.

The Committee on Educational Policies and Planning shall advise the Chancellor on the educational policies, goals, standards, procedures, and resources of East Carolina University. The Committee shall advise the Chancellor concerning long-range planning of academic programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Division of Health Affairs, the various professional schools, and the Graduate School. It shall participate in the formulation of the University's Five-Year Plan. The Committee shall be concerned with the adequacy, balance, and excellence of the University's overall graduate and undergraduate programs. It shall so advise the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate without duplicating the responsibilities of any other academic committee. The Committee shall be informed of all proposals for new curricula, programs, and academic policies or of changes in existing ones prior to their implementation. The Committee annually shall review with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs the proposed budget of the University prior to its submission to the General Administration. The Committee shall report its recommendations and concerns to the Faculty Senate at least on an annual basis.

The Committee on Educational Policies and Planning shall advise the Chancellor on action to be taken if East Carolina University will experience financial exigency or when it is considering a major curtailment of an existing teaching, research, or public service program (Appendix D., "Tenure Policies and Regulations," Section VI. A.2.)

The Committee shall meet at least once monthly from the beginning of the fall semester until spring commencement. The chairperson of the Committee shall be elected from the elected faculty members. The three faculty members shall be elected to provide for staggered three-year terms.

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

15

FALL SEMESTER 1979

(Actual class days: 14 Mondays, 15 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays, 14 Fridays, 14 Saturdays)

July 30, Monday	Last day for persons holding a bachelor's degree to apply for admission to Graduate School for the Fall Semester
August 17, Friday	Last day to pay or secure Fall Semester fees without penalty
August 27, Monday	Faculty Meetings
August 28, Tuesday	Registration
August 29, Wednesday	Drop-Add; Late Registration
August 30, Thursday	Classes Begin; Drop-Add; Late Registration
August 31, Friday	Last day for Drop-Add and Late Registration (undergraduate and graduate students), and Last day to apply for graduation in December
September 3, Monday	Labor Day Holiday
October 10, Wednesday	Last day to drop a course or withdraw from school
October 8-19	Change of Major
October 15-19	Preregistration for Spring Semester
November 21, Wednesday	10:00 p.m. - Thanksgiving Holiday begins
November 26, Monday	8:00 a.m. - Classes resume
November 29, Thursday	Last day to remove Incomplete given during Spring and/or Summer terms, 1979
December 11, Tuesday	Classes end
December 12, Wednesday	Reading Day
December 13, Thursday	Exams begin
December 15, Saturday	Common Exams
December 20, Thursday	10:00 p.m. - Exams for Fall Semester close

EXAMINATION SCHEDULE

FALL SEMESTER 1979

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one credit hour courses and for evening and Saturday classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes.

Exception: Examinations in graduate courses (5000, 6000, 7000) meeting at night on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and in the morning on Saturday will be held on the first night or the morning of their usual meeting during the examination period (December 13 through December 20), excluding reading day, rather than on the last regular meeting of the class.

Those classes beginning between hours will have the final examination at the time scheduled for the hour during which the class begins (e.g., 9:30-11:00 TTh will meet the exam schedule of the 9:00 a.m. TTh class).

Common examinations will be held according to the following schedule:

Two-hour examinations in Economics 2223 and Accounting 2401 and 2521, will be given on Saturday, December 15 from 8:00-10:00 a.m., 10:00-12:00 a.m., and 2:00-4:00 p.m. Students will be notified which time the examination in each course is scheduled.

French 1001, Spanish 1001, German 1001

and French 1003 . . . Thursday, December 13, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

French 1002, Spanish 1002, German 1002

and Spanish 1003 . . . Monday, December 17, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Geography 1000 . . . Tuesday, December 18, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Chemistry 1120, 1150, 1160 . . . Saturday, December 15, 8:00-10:00 a.m.

Physics 1251, 1261 . . . Saturday, December 15, 12:00-2:00 p.m.

Mathematics 1063, 1065 . . . Friday, December 14, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Other examinations will be held on Thursday, December 13; Friday, December 14; Monday, December 17; Tuesday, December 18; Wednesday, December 19; and Thursday, December 20.

Times Class Regularly
Meets

Time and Day of Examination

8:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Monday, December 17
8:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Tuesday, December 18
9:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Wednesday, December 19
9:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Thursday, December 20
10:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Thursday, December 13
10:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Friday, December 14
11:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Monday, December 17
11:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Tuesday, December 18
12:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Wednesday, December 19
12:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Thursday, December 20
1:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Thursday, December 13
1:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Friday, December 14
2:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Monday, December 17
2:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Tuesday, December 18
3:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Wednesday, December 19
3:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Thursday, December 20
4:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Thursday, December 13
4:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Friday, December 14

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

SPRING SEMESTER 1980

(Actual class days: 14 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, 14 Wednesdays, 14 Thursdays,
15 Fridays, 15 Saturdays)

December 12, Wednesday	Last day for persons holding a bachelor's degree to apply for admission to Graduate School for the Spring Semester
December 20, Thursday	Last day for continuing students to pay or secure Spring Semester fees without penalty
January 9, Wednesday	Registration
January 10, Thursday	Drop-Add; Late Registration
January 11, Friday	Classes begin; Drop-Add; Late Registration
January 15, Tuesday	Last day to apply for graduation in May
February 21, Thursday	Last day to drop a course or withdraw from school
February 18-29	Change of Major
February 25-29	Pre-registration for Fall Semester and Summer Sessions
March 9-16 (Sunday to Sunday)	Spring Recess
March 17, Monday	Classes resume - 8:00 a.m.
April 7, Monday	State Holiday; no classes
April 16, Wednesday	Last day to remove an Incomplete given during Fall Semester, 1979
April 28, Monday	Classes end
April 29, Tuesday	Reading Day
April 30, Wednesday	Exams begin
May 3, Saturday	Common exams
May 7, Wednesday	10:00 p.m. - Exams for Spring Semester Close
May 9, Friday	Commencement

EXAMINATION SCHEDULE

SPRING SEMESTER 1980

There will be no departure from the printed schedule, except as noted below: All examinations for one hour courses and for evening and Saturday classes will be held during the last regular meeting of the class. Classes meeting more than three times a week will follow the examination schedule for MWF classes.

Exception: Examinations in graduate courses (5000, 6000, 7000) meeting at night on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and in the morning on Saturday will be held on the first night or the morning of their usual meeting during the examination period (April 30 through May 7), excluding reading day, rather than on the last regular meeting of the class.

Those classes beginning between hours will have the final examination at the time scheduled for the hour during which the class begins (e.g., 9:30-11:00 TTh will meet the exam schedule of the 9:00 a.m. TTh class).

Common examinations will be held according to the following schedule:

Two-hour examinations in Economics 2223 and Accounting 2401 and 2521 will be given on Saturday, May 3, from 8:00-10:00 a.m., 10:00-12:00 a.m., and 2:00-4:00 p.m. Students will be notified which time the examination in each course is scheduled.

French 1001, Spanish 1001, German 1001
and French 1003 . . . Wednesday, April 30, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

French 1002, Spanish 1002, German 1002
and Spanish 1003 . . . Thursday, May 1, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Geography 1000 . . . Monday, May 5, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Chemistry 1120, 1150, 1160 . . . Saturday, May 3, 8:00-10:00 a.m.

Physics 1251, 1261 . . . Saturday, May 3, 12:00-2:00 p.m.

Mathematics 1063, 1065 . . . Friday, May 2, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Other examinations will be held on Wednesday, April 30; Thursday, May 1; Friday, May 2; Monday, May 5; Tuesday, May 6; and Wednesday, May 7; as follows:

Times Class Regularly
Meets

Time and Day of Examination

8:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Tuesday, May 6
8:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Wednesday, May 7
9:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Wednesday, April 30
9:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Thursday, May 1
10:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Friday, May 2
10:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Monday, May 5
11:00 MWF	2:00- 4:00, Tuesday, May 6
11:00 TTh	2:00- 4:00, Wednesday, May 7
12:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Wednesday, April 30
12:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Thursday, May 1
1:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Friday, May 2
1:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Monday, May 5
2:00 MWF	8:00-10:00, Tuesday, May 6
2:00 TTh	8:00-10:00, Wednesday, May 7
3:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Wednesday, April 30
3:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Thursday, May 1
4:00 MWF	11:00- 1:00, Friday, May 2
4:00 TTh	11:00- 1:00, Monday, May 5