

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

The eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for academic year 1988/89 will be held on Tuesday, April 25, 1989, at 2:10 p.m., Mendenhall 244.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of March 28, 1989
- III. Special Order of the Day
 - A. Roll Call
 - B. Announcements
 - C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
 - D. Vice Chancellors' Reports
 - E. Bill Lewis, Head Coach
Pirate Football
 - F. Search Committee for the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Robert Schellenberger, Chair (Business)
 - G. Faculty Assembly Report
Emily Boyce, Library & Information Studies
 - H. Parking and Traffic Committee
Henry Ferrell, Chair (History)
- IV. Unfinished Business
- V. Report of Committees
 - A. Committee on Committees, Connie Kledaras (Social Work)
First Reading of a proposed revision of the Charge of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (Attachment 1)
 - B. Curriculum Committee, Bill Grossnickle (Psychology)
 1. Curriculum Committee Minutes of March 23, 1989, including the following:
 - a. Revise B.S. in History
 - b. Revise B.S. in Occupational Therapy
 - c. New Minor in Religious Studies
 - d. Revise B.A. in Psychology
 - e. Revise B.F.A. in Dance
 - f. Revise B.S. in Nursing
 - Curriculum Committee Minutes of April 13, 1989, including the following:
 - a. Revise B.S. in Industrial Technology (Professional) and (Tech Inst/Comm College Transfer Program)
 - b. Revise B.S. in Middle Grades Education (from minutes of 2/23/89)
 - c. Revise B.S. in Elementary Education
 - d. Revise B.S. in Science Education
 - e. Revise B.A. in Physics
 - f. Revise B.S. in Social Work
 - g. Revise B.S. in Criminal Justice
 - h. Revise B.S. in Clothing and Textiles (Merchandising Option, Clothing and Textile Option, Housing Major)
 - i. Revise B.S. FNIM (Dietetics Option, Hospitality Management Option, delete Food Services Administration Option); revise minor in Hospitality Management
 - C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Robert Schellenberger (Business)
Resolution Regarding University-level Review of Proposed Programs Prior to the Request to the General Administration to Plan and Establish Such Programs (Attachment 2)

*See Corrections
in minutes²*

- D. Faculty Computer Committee, Chuck Ziehr (Biology)
Resolution Regarding Critical Disk Space Storage (Attachment 3)
- E. Faculty Governance Committee, Bob Woodside (Math)
 - 1. Guidelines for Unit Codes (Attachment 4)
 - 2. Administrator Award Procedures (Attachment 5)
- F. Faculty Welfare Minorities Subcommittee, Prem Sehgal (Biology)
Minorities Survey Data (The statistical data from the survey is to be distributed to the Senators prior to the meeting.)
- G. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Christa Reiser (Sociology & Anthropology)
Memorandum Intending to Eliminate Confusion Over What Appendix C Says in Reference to the Evaluation of Teaching (The Senators will receive a copy of the memorandum at the meeting.)

VI. New Business

Attachment 1

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

CHARGE OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Whereas, The Teacher Education Committee has been disbanded; be it Resolved, That ex-officio membership of the Chair of the Teacher Education Committee be removed from the charge; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Council of Teacher Education elect a representative, from among the faculty representatives of the Council membership, to serve as an ex-officio member of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee.

Attachment 2

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Whereas, The Chancellor has indicated his belief that proposed academic programs should be evaluated for acceptability both before they are submitted for permission to plan and before they are implemented;

Whereas, The Chancellor has requested that the Educational Policies and Planning Committee suggest a procedure for the faculty review of new program proposals;

Whereas, The planning of new academic programs is a matter of serious concern to all faculty;

Whereas, The establishment of new programs can have a significant impact on the funding available for existing programs across the campus; and

Whereas, The Educational Policies and Planning Committee has elected representatives of the faculty and, as ex-officio members, representatives of the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council as well as the Chair of the Faculty; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorse the concept of university-level review of proposed programs before they are submitted to the General Administration with the request to plan and prior to the request to establish such programs.

Attachment 3

FACULTY COMPUTER COMMITTEE

Whereas, Access to and use of computing resources are vital for both teaching and research applications;

Whereas, The supply of disk space on the academic mainframe has been 97% exhausted as of March 16, 1989;

Whereas, One large research account or 42 additional students in a class account will completely exhaust the available disk space;

Whereas, Academic computing has made a concerted effort to recover all available disk space; and

Whereas, Research, teaching, and administrative computing needs can no longer be met by juggling insufficient funds to take care of the most immediate, critical need; therefore, be it

Resolved, That academic computing be immediately allocated sufficient resources to add to computer disk space and that university budgeting for next year and beyond recognize that the growth of computing needs is accelerating.

GUIDELINES FOR UNIT CODE REVIEWS

(Revised by Faculty Governance Committee March 15, 1989)

- I. The two major problems found consistently in almost all codes are ambiguity and inconsistency.
- II. Does the code clearly define the unit's faculty? The unit's graduate faculty? The unit's voting faculty?
- III. Who votes on a given issue? Is a necessary condition for voting (on any issue) that one be a voting member of the unit's faculty?
- IV. What sort of vote is demanded to decide a particular issue? A majority vote, a vote of a majority, a 3/4-vote, a vote of 3/4 (of what subset of the faculty?)?
- V. The content of a unit's code is a matter of considerable debate and codes vary in content and style. As a minimum, each unit code shall:
 - (1) Begin with a statement of the Chancellor's Preamble.
 - (2) a. Establish procedures which allow the faculty to participate by making recommendations concerning all decisions affecting promotion, granting of tenure, and dismissals.....(Appendix L)
b. Address the issue of reappointment. The procedure for dismissal actions is covered in Appendix D...and need not be a concern of the units' codes. Actions regarding salary questions are not included in Appendix L and should not be included in unit codes. Furthermore, Appendix C simply calls for the establishment of criteria for evaluation of faculty for merit salary raises....(memo from Chancellor John M. Howell to the Faculty Governance Committee and all units of the University subject to the ECU Code, dated 8/19/83)
 - (3) Govern, by regulations established in and under the unit's code of operations, evaluation of faculty for purposes of promotion. (Appendix C, p. C-5)
 - (4) The statement in the body of the code regarding relative weight must explain or include a mechanism so that a faculty member can understand clearly the range of weights, in percentage points, of each category of performance within the parameters stated in Appendix C.
 - (5) Define the procedure to amend the code.
 - (6) Follow the prescribed procedure given in "Appendix L" (see p. L-2) for the original formulation and approval of the unit's code by the faculty of the unit.
 - (7) The format for revisions should include eleven (11) copies each of
 - a. the current code, along with
 - b. a cover letter identifying revisions, and
 - c. the proposed revised code.

Among other things that might be included in units' codes are criteria for assignment of annual salary increments. (Appendix C, V.B., p. C-6)

The Faculty Governance Committee strongly recommends that each unit code carefully define the administrative organization of the unit, and the duties and responsibilities of the various committees, both administrative and faculty. It should be clear to whom each committee reports.

**FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
OUTSTANDING ECU ADMINISTRATOR AWARD**

The Faculty Governance Committee recommends that:

1. The Faculty Senate establish an Outstanding Administrator Award to be recognized in some tangible form similar to that of the awards for outstanding teachers and advisors.
2. In the beginning, the award(s) be limited to administrators of voting units represented in the Faculty Senate. In the case of professional schools, administrators of departments or sub-divisions within the schools would be eligible for consideration. (It is the subcommittee's considered opinion that administrators of University units not represented in the Senate might be considered for recognition by the University Administration itself.)
3. The award(s) to an outstanding administrator would be based on a written letter of nomination from faculty within a particular unit:
 - a. The written letter would include specific criteria upon which the nomination is made.
 - b. It would be supported and co-signed by at least 51% of the faculty within that unit.
4. The Senate appoint an ad hoc Outstanding Administrator Award Committee to define, delineate, administer and execute procedures necessary to bring these recommendations to fruition. Further, relative to recognition of administrators whose units are not represented in the Faculty Senate, the subcommittee recommends that the proposed ad hoc committee be charged with exploring this issue.