

PLEASE POST FOR ALL FACULTY TO READ

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FULL MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 1992**

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1991-1992 was held on Tuesday, January 21, 1992, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order

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

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of December 3, 1991, were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Absent were: Hughes (Business), Wilson (Faculty Assembly Representative)

Alternates present were: Campbell for DeJesus (Economics), Chowdhury for Reaves (Industry and Technology), Fletcher for Pories (Medicine), Thompson for Reiser (Sociology and Anthropology)

Also present was: Weeks for Clark (Theatre Arts)

B. Announcements

1. Resolutions #91-46, #91-48, #91-49, and #91-52 as adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 3, 1991, were approved by the Chancellor.
2. Special thanks to the following Alternate Senators serving as Tellers today: JoAnn Jones (English) and Emily Boyce (Library & Info. Studies)
3. **Please make note** that there has been a revision to the approved 1992 Summer Session Calendar, Second Term. The July 4th. State Holiday will be observed on Friday, July 3, 1992, and not Monday, July 6, 1992. This change is necessary to make the summer schedule correspond to the state holiday schedule announced by the State Personnel Commission.
4. The Faculty Senate will meet in special session on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Great Room to discuss the proposed revisions to Appendix D and Appendix L.
5. Academic and Administrative Committee Preference Forms have been distributed to all faculty. If you are not currently serving on a committee or your term expires Spring 1992, and you are interested in serving on one of these committees, a completed form, along with a brief statement indicating qualifications for potential service, must be submitted to the Faculty Senate Office by Friday, February 14, 1992.
6. In order to begin preparation for the 1992-1993 academic year, it is necessary for your department or school to fill any Faculty Senate vacancies which will occur at the close of this academic year. Election results should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by Monday, March 2, 1992.
7. The Career Education Committee is sponsoring a Majors/Minors Fair as a resource for students who are undeclared, uncertain of their majors, or just curious about what possibilities are available at ECU. The Fair will be held on Wednesday, March 18, 1992, from 12:30 to 3:30 in the Great Room of Mendenhall Student Center. Please notify your Chair if you are interested in participating in this event.
8. Any course changes needing approval for this academic year must be received by the Curriculum Committee no later than Monday, March 16, 1992.

C. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Eakin reported that enrollment for the Spring Semester is once more at an all-time high, with 15,853 students enrolled. This enrollment represents an increase of 432 or 2.8% over last Spring. Of the total,

13,102 (82.6%) are enrolled as undergraduates.

The Chancellor's Forum has been held for several years in early January. This year the Forum is planned for September 17 and 18. The Forum Director Dr. Henry Peel and the Forum Planning Committee will consult with the leadership of the Faculty Senate in preparation for the event.

Sexauer (Art) asked about the purpose and who paid for a blue one page flyer with the word "WAVE" on it that was placed in faculty mailboxes. The question was directed by Chancellor Eakin to Vice Chancellor Matthews who responded that the flyer was a promotion for the Health Promotion and Wellness Program. He stated that it was intended to get people's interest in a positive sense. Although it did get a lot of negative attention, it did create an awareness of what is to come soon. The cost of this mailing came out of the Medical Staff Student Health budget.

#### D. Vice Chancellors' Report

Dr. Marlene Springer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, reported that last year through the cooperative efforts of Business Affairs and Academic Affairs and with the support of the Chancellor, the University was able to undertake a Faculty Computer Workstation Program. This year the University is again offering ECU tenured and tenure-track faculty an opportunity to participate in the program. Last year 51 faculty members were awarded computer workstations, and a like number will be awarded this year. Information on making application for a workstation has been forwarded to Deans and Department Heads. The deadline for submission of an application is Friday, February 7, 1992.

As noted at an earlier Faculty Senate meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee on Honors Program has submitted its report. One of the recommendations of the committee is to establish a Faculty Senate Honors Program Committee. In the next few weeks, Dr. Springer will be sending forward a proposal to the Faculty Senate for the establishment of such a committee.

The Student Computer and Technology Fee Award Program Committee has submitted its recommendations, and Dr. Springer will soon be announcing the awards. The Committee is applauded for its fine work in reviewing the many proposals and making their recommendations.

Last week, Dr. Springer announced that Myra Cain has accepted the appointment as Acting Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs with the University of North Carolina University General Administration, effective immediately. Her duties in this new role will be varied but will have special emphasis on academic program reviews and outcomes assessment programs. Mrs. Cain anticipates returning to East Carolina University and her post as Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in early July. In Mrs. Cain's absence, Dr. James LeRoy Smith will assume oversight of the duties associated with Mrs. Cain's office. Dr. Smith, assuming this role immediately, will coordinate the ongoing work of the office as he works to bring to closure the initial phase of the SACS review.

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

Dr. James Hallock, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, reported that a Dean for the School of Allied Health Sciences has been employed. Dr. Harold P. Jones will start on March 1, 1992. He is currently Chief of the Science Policy and Analysis Branch of the National Institute on Drug Abuse. He has a Ph.D. in Biochemistry and served as Associate Dean in the Allied Health School at the University of South Alabama in Mobile.

Dr. Hallock stated that the strategic and master site plan with the hospital was now completed. This plan calls for the Schools of Nursing and Allied

Health Sciences to move to the west campus as soon as possible. This may be within an 8-10 year period. Planning will start with the Deans of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences. The plan also includes the construction of a new clinical facility of approximately 100,000 square feet for the School of Medicine.

Currently, there are two searches in the School of Medicine, one for a Chair of the Department of Anatomy and the other for a Chair of the Department of Internal Medicine.

E. Dave Hart, Director of the Athletics Department

Dave Hart expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the Faculty Senate. Hart was invited to the meeting to share information concerning the system used to distribute Peach Bowl tickets.

Hart began by stating that when the bid was accepted to the Peach Bowl, he was asked to project how many tickets would actually sell. Based on what data was available, which included approximately 8,700 season ticket holders and over 4,000 Pirate Club members, the Athletics Department hoped to sell 15,000 tickets. They were willing to commit financially to the Bowl to sell 20,000 tickets.

For years at ECU, a system for ticket allocation has been in place through the Educational Foundation (Pirate Club). This system really becomes important in sell out events. For example, in 1987, the last year ECU played N.C. State in a regular season game, this system was in place and we turned people away who wanted to buy tickets. Since that game, there has always been an adequate ticket supply. This system is much like every athletic ticket system in Division 1-A and 1-AA Levels, so it was not an invention by the Athletics Department. The system is based on levels of contributions. Since 1983 every ticket application and Pirate Club application states that Bowl priorities will be implemented through this system.

The Athletics Department did not know if they could sell more than 15,000 tickets. It became apparent in the first week that the supply would not keep up with the demand. ECU accepted the Bowl invitation on a Sunday and on Monday received approximately 500 orders for tickets. On Tuesday the department received 800 orders. On Thursday, it received over 2700 orders. After 10 days, the Athletics Department implemented the priority system, already in place, to distribute the 20,000 tickets at its disposal. Based on this system those people who qualified were allocated tickets. Some members of the Pirate Club ordered 50-100 tickets but ended up getting 6-10 tickets. The most any single individual qualified for was 16 tickets. These were individuals who had endowed Athletic Scholarships for \$50,000 or more.

Faculty members have asked what system was used for faculty to obtain tickets. Faculty were treated like any other person according to the system. If the faculty member was a member of the Pirate Club, then they were allocated tickets according to their priorities in the Club. Using the established system, all the tickets available for the Peach Bowl were allocated to Pirate Club members. Hart stated that the next group he would have liked to get to, if the supply had lasted, would have been season ticket holders who were not members of the Pirate Club. Everyone was restricted in obtaining tickets, even the players and coaches. Many players' parents wanted extra tickets but could not obtain them.

In summary, the problem was created when the demand exceeded the supply of tickets. Despite the many letters that the department has received, Hart believes that it was a good system to follow. ECU has the potential to have this problem in any season, since the Minges Coliseum has a capacity of 6,500 seats. One half of the seats is allocated to the 16,000 students. So

the system may have to be implemented again when the demand exceeds the supply.

Atkeson (History) stated that he was satisfied with the explanation but made this observation. A person in Alaska, who is 5,000 miles away, was able to get tickets and a season ticket holder of 25 years and was not able to get them. Atkeson thinks the system didn't go far enough since it didn't reach season ticket holders. Hart responded that many people have asked how others got tickets. For example, if Mr. X qualified for 8 tickets and purchased them, then what he does with them is beyond anyone's control. The entry level for the Pirate Club starts at \$50 so one does not have to pay a large amount to belong. Atkeson asked if the system pro-rated the Pirate Club members. Hart responded that yes they had to do that and even then they did not serve all of the members. Hart also stated that there were more than 20,000 ECU fans at the game. Many fans purchased tickets through N.C. State. Also there were less than 280 tickets sold in North Carolina by Ticketron. The Ticketron mainly served the Atlanta area.

Chenier (Allied Health) asked if there was a provision for those people who donate money to the University outside of the Educational Foundation (Pirate Club); for example to the Medical Foundation. Hart responded that athletic event provisions were not made for anyone who donated money to another Foundation, and that this is common practice. Since at most institutions athletics is asked to be self supporting, people are not given athletic perks for contribution to other programs within the University. Chenier asked should they be given such perks? Hart responded that he did not think so. Many people give to the Athletics Department for special considerations, such as stadium parking locations or seats at the 30 yard line.

Chenier asked about the orders taken initially and charged to a credit card, yet the person was unable to obtain a ticket. Hart responded that financial auditors informed the Department that it could not hold or delay processing the credit cards. The auditors advised them to process and then reimburse.

Singhas (Biology) asked what were the foundations at ECU? Hart responded that there are 3 foundations, the ECU Educational Foundation (Pirate Club), ECU Foundation, and the ECU Medical Foundation. The Pirate Club is the only one where contributions result in benefits. Singhas asked if people are likely to contribute money to the Educational Foundation because they will receive benefits? Hart responded that the contributor is asked where they would like for the money to be used. Hart noted that the ECU budget for athletics is 6.6 million which is in the bottom level of the 65 schools that are members of the College Football Association.

Dennard (History) asked about the impact that new foundation members had on the supply of tickets. Hart responded that there were 400 new Pirate Club members since January 1, 1992, and not all were able to get tickets. In some cases, people raised their contribution level in order to purchase two more tickets.

Harris (Foreign Languages) voiced appreciation for the success in football at ECU. Harris then, responding to a news announcement in which Bill Lewis complimented the Georgia Tech academic program for athletes, asked if there was data to support the claim that Georgia Tech has a stronger academic program for athletes than ECU. Hart responded that the comments that Bill Lewis made to USA Today were not intended to be a comparison nor intended to be negative toward ECU. Academics came first with Bill Lewis. Hart stated that he was not happy about the article because it read as a comparative statement but was not intended to be. ECU has taken great strides to make academics important. ECU Athletes have been just behind N.C. State in graduation rates. ECU will graduate 19 of its 24 senior athletes on time. The other 5 will take more time but are intended to

graduate. Our program is on solid ground academically. Some athletic students, like general students, do struggle with grades but are able to maintain a C average.

Givens (Allied Health) stated it still concerned him that the ticket allocation was based on the amount of one's contribution. He expressed his belief that being a faculty member and a season ticket holder should be factored into the distribution system. Hart responded that faculty can purchase tickets at half price and that that is an expression of gratitude and acknowledgement of the faculty's role by the institution. The general public does not have this benefit.

Givens asked how much money was made at the Peach Bowl and how will the money be used. Hart responded that the final figures are not available at this time. The news media indicated that there was a record crowd at the game. The budget was based on a pay out of \$840,000, and the expenses totaled \$492,000. We hope to net \$350,000 to \$400,000. Of that \$225,000 will go back into the fund balance to replace funds that was taken out of the fund balance at the beginning of the year during the budget freeze. The Athletics Department has an endowment approaching \$1 million. The Department is on a 3 year plan to meet new guidelines that the NCAA has mandated for Division 1-A participation. This money will help us to meet those guidelines.

F. Eddie Payne, Head Basketball Coach

Eddie Payne was unable to speak to the Senate as scheduled. He was in Jackson, Tennessee recruiting a player with a SAT of 1200 interested in studying Accounting at ECU. Coach Payne will speak to the Faculty Senate on February 18, 1992.

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

James LeRoy Smith made reference to the SACS Newsletter (Vol. 3 No. 1) distributed to all Senators and asked that each person share this information with others in their departments/schools. Smith reported that Dr. Charles Sidman's 2 day visit was successful and ECU has been approved for the SACS visit. "The University Follow-Up Plan" has been approved. It spells out the activities related to the non-compliance areas. That follow-up plan will be circulated at the end of the month.

IV. Unfinished Business

Henry Ferrell (History), Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented Appendix X: Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Sexual or Racial Harassment or Discrimination Brought Against ECU Faculty Members or Administrators Holding Faculty Status. He made reference to Attachment 1 of the January 21, 1992, Agenda for editorial corrections.

Ferrell gave a brief history of the evolution of this Appendix. The process started about 3 years ago with the committee holding open hearings and developing drafts. Many faculty spoke before the committee during this time on various issues. Additional drafts were written during the summer and fall.

Ferrell then gave an overview of the document. The Committee has suggested the policy become a part of freshmen orientation information and new faculty be given an opportunity to review this document.

Bruner (Social Work) suggested an amendment to the proposed Appendix X. The change is offered as a substitution for page 8, Section G., paragraph 4. The new paragraph would read as follows:

"In conducting its inquiry the Board may call witnesses. The Board may seek the assistance of the University attorney in obtaining statements from persons who will not be present at the hearing. Such statements will be

submitted to the Board for consideration during the hearing. In making its determination, the Board shall consider only such evidence as is considered during the hearing. The Board may use its own judgement in deciding the admissibility and/or relevance of any testimony of any person before the Board, and the admissibility and/or relevance of any evidence whatsoever." Ferrell stated that the amendment would allow for the Board to call its witnesses and the University attorney to ask questions. Anderson (Education) asked for the word "inquiry" to be changed to "hearing" on the proposed amendment. This was considered to be an editorial change. The proposed amendment was passed.

Appendix X: Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Sexual or Racial Harassment or Discrimination Brought Against ECU Faculty Members or Administrators Holding Faculty Status was passed as amended. (Resolution #92-1)

V. Report of Committees

A. Committee on Committees, Doug McMillan

Doug McMillan (English), Chair of the Committee on Committees, presented the ballot for nominees for Alternate to the Faculty Assembly. No nominations were offered from the floor. Miriam Quick (Nursing) was elected to another 3 year term as Alternate to the Faculty Assembly.

The ballots were as follows:

Nominees:	Ballot #1	Ballot #2	Ballot #3
John Canterino	--	--	--
Margie Gallagher	11	11	8
Robert Morrison	12	13	11
Miriam Quick	15	19	28*
Bob Woodside	10	7	3
illegal ballots:	4	--	--

B. Curriculum Committee, Bill Grossnickle

Bill Grossnickle (Psychology), Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the curriculum matters as contained in the Curriculum Committee Minutes of December 12, 1991. The minutes were approved as distributed. (Resolution #92-2)

Grossnickle offered, for the Senate's information, a statement designed to clarify the approval process for 5000-level courses. This statement was drafted by Grossnickle, Ken Wilson (Chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee) and Steve Tacker (Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee) and reviewed by Diane Jacobs (Dean of the Graduate School) and James LeRoy Smith (Director of SACS Self-Study) who agree with its content. The statement reads as follows:

"Many questions and concerns have been raised about the implications of the action on 5000-level courses taken by the Graduate Council on November 18, 1991. This statement is designed to give our understanding of what the Graduate Council did and did not do.

First, 5000-level courses are special courses taught by graduate faculty that can be taken for both graduate and undergraduate credit. Each 5000-level course must have two sets of requirements, one for graduate students and the second for undergraduate students. To count toward an undergraduate degree, the course and the undergraduate requirements must be approved by the Faculty Senate. To count toward a graduate degree, the course and the graduate requirements must be approved by the Graduate Council. If the two bodies disagree, the course cannot be offered as a 5000-level course but it can be renumbered to fall entirely within the domain of the body that approved it and offered as a 4000- or 6000- level course. This position was adopted by both the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council last Spring.

The actions concerning 5000-level courses taken by the Graduate Council on November 18, 1991, were primarily editorial and designed to make the catalog consistent with the action taken last Spring by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. Two changes will occur because of the action. First, all undergraduates would have to have departmental approval to take 5000-level courses. Before, senior majors were exempt from this requirement. The Dean pointed out that departments were free to develop whatever criteria or standards best served their program and that none were being imposed by the Graduate Council. This change would make departments aware of any undergraduates who were enrolled so that professors could be informed of the need to have separate requirements. Given the fact that a department could decide to admit any senior major, this change seems fairly minor.

Second, by removing the sentence that states, "Senior undergraduate majors may be required to take 5000-level courses," the Graduate Council is clearly indicating that it will not approve any NEW 5000-level courses that are required for undergraduate programs unless there is a compelling justification for the course being at that level. NO EXISTING COURSES OR PROGRAMS ARE COVERED BY THIS CHANGE.

The Graduate Council is objecting, in general, to undergraduate programs that require specific 5000-level courses and does not object to undergraduate programs that require students to take 5000-level electives. This seems to be part of a general move by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to require that all new 5000-level courses be designed primarily to serve the needs of graduate programs.

The Graduate Council did not say that 5000-level courses cannot be required. Such a policy could only be enacted in cooperation with the Faculty Senate since it applies to undergraduate degrees. We hope that the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee will be able to work together to develop a common policy.

Finally, we should note that this item of business was not listed on the Agenda of the December 18, 1991, meeting of the Graduate Council but grew out of a request by the Graduate Curriculum Committee for direction from the Council in dealing with proposals for 5000-level courses. Consequently, faculty whose programs would be affected were not consulted in advance and a lot of confusion arose after the fact."

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee, James LeRoy Smith  
James LeRoy Smith (Philosophy), Vice Chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, presented the resolution regarding the Counseling Center as a unit code (please refer to attachment 3 of the January 21, 1991, Senate Agenda). The Committee met with Vice Chancellor Matthews, Dr. Wilbert Ball, and Dr. Jim Pinkney to discuss this issue. The resolution is offered as a follow up to the Resolution #91-37 from the November 12, 1991, Senate meeting. There were a number of concerns and each is addressed in the above mentioned resolution.

Singhas (Biology) stated that Condition (2) may be precedent setting since it is an "after the fact" action. Smith responded that he believed that if the resolution was passed and another situation came forth, no decision would be made until a formal process could be developed.

Chair Moskop stated that if the resolution did pass, he intended to refer the issue to the Faculty Governance Committee to investigate and bring a recommendation for a formal policy back to the Senate.

Hough (Political Science) asked if ECU has tenured professors at large or do they all belong to a unit? Also, do they have a choice about which unit they are assigned? Smith responded that the Committee had some of these same concerns. The presumption is that if the resolution is passed, all of

these things will be worked out between the tenured faculty and administration. Hough stated that he believed the process should be developed before action on the policy for dissolution is taken. He then made a motion to defer consideration of the status of the Counseling Center until the Faculty Governance Committee can adopt a formal procedure regarding the dissolution of code units.

Donnalley (Library and Information Studies) asked how the professors in the Counseling Center could retain their tenure as faculty members if the Counseling Center becomes a non-faculty unit. Chair Moskop referred the question to the Chancellor who responded that the 2 tenured professors would not lose any of the tenure privileges or status. They would be tenured as faculty members. Smith stated that the conditions would have to be met prior to the dissolution of the unit. Donnalley expressed support for the motion to defer action on the Counseling Center.

Worthington (Medicine) asked how opportunities for research and teaching would occur in a non-teaching unit. Smith responded that the concern is real and he believes that the solution should be worked out between the 2 faculty members and the administration. The Committee did not attempt to specify provisions of an agreement between these professors and the University.

Springer (VCAA) stated that any professor with tenure would have an appointment in an academic discipline.

Pinkney (Counseling Center) stated, as one of the 2 faculty members involved, that he appreciated the Committee getting involved and he sees no easy answer. He stated that he would not be happy to work in one department and be tenured in another and would dislike having tenure split from where he worked.

Atkeson (History) asked if it were Hough's intent to have the task of developing a policy for dissolving a code unit referred to the Faculty Governance Committee. Hough (Political Science) stated that he believed the Faculty Governance Committee should take this under advisement and the Senate should defer action on the status of the Counseling Center.

Joyce (Physics) stated that the body that created a unit code should be the body to de-activate the code and that is the Faculty Senate. The Educational Policies and Planning Committee was to study the issue and make a recommendation to the Senate. They have done that. At this stage not much more could be gained by additional procedures. The conditions make clear to the Chancellor our beliefs and if we are not happy with the conditions then we need to defeat the motion to postpone and vote on the main motion as was presented to the Senate by the Committee.

Thompson (Political Science) stated that the Faculty Governance Committee may not be able to quickly write a procedure so some action needs to be taken now regarding the Counseling Center.

The motion to defer consideration on this until the Faculty Governance Committee can adopt a formal procedure failed. Chair Moskop called for further discussion on the main motion.

Ayers (Chemistry) stated that the Counseling Center has gone from 5 to 2 tenured faculty members and he is concerned about the future of the Center. He further stated that he is concerned that the faculty input would be taken away when it is operated without a code. He then asked whether the input of the Counselors would be considered in development of procedures. He also questioned if this move would increase or decrease the service to our students. VCSL Matthews responded that the number of positions have gone from 5 to 4 positions. A new position in mental health was established in

the Student Health Center. Today, compared to 2 years ago, especially related to psychological concerns, ECU is better. On this campus the administrators focus on a democratic environment in all units and he believes that it is a participative type of environment.

With no further discussion, the vote was called. On a division of the house with 29 Yes and 14 No votes, the Educational Policies and Planning Committee's recommendation was passed. (Resolution #92-3) Please refer to the list of resolutions for the full report.)

D. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Margie Gallagher  
Margie Gallagher (Human Environmental Sciences), Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, presented the Committee's report on peer evaluations.

Harris (Foreign Language) noted that the report makes reference only to Diamond and asked why this reference was singled out for special recognition. Gallagher responded that the Diamond method was suggested only as a guide and that other methods can be developed. Chair Moskop asked if Harris had a suggestion for a word change. Harris indicated that he did not.

Chair Moskop asked Gallagher if the Faculty Senate was being asked to take action on the Committee's report or was it to be used as information only. Gallagher responded that Faculty Senate Resolution #91-28 listed the kinds of procedures that might be used for peer evaluations and that the intent of this report was to clarify those procedures in reference to peer evaluations. This report could be considered as an expansion of Resolution #91-28.

Joyce (Physics) moved adoption of the Committee's report as a sense of the Faculty Senate. Bailey (Philosophy) stated that the purpose of the Committee's report was to make it possible for units to use the suggestions without further approval. Ordinarily the Senate and the Chancellor have to approve evaluation methods. However, if this resolution passes as a motion anyone who wanted to implement the procedures could do so without getting further approval. Gallagher responded that the intent of the Committee was to provide a guide for units that are developing peer evaluations. Joyce stated that if that was the intent of the Committee then he would withdraw his motion.

Thompson (Political Science) asked if peer evaluations are not in a unit code, how could they be pre-approved. Gallagher responded that the intent is to have peer evaluation procedures in compliance with the unit codes and Appendix C.

Grossnickle (Psychology) asked that if the Committee's report passed would it be mandatory that a unit use the peer evaluation process? Gallagher responded that the Committee avoided the use of the word "mandated". Grossnickle responded that if a unit used peer review, would it mandate the use of this tool? Gallagher responded that this Committee report was being suggested as a guide.

Harris (Foreign Language) made a motion to return the Committee's report back to the Committee to clarify that this process is not mandatory.

Graham (Psychology) spoke against returning the report to Committee but recommended rewording the second paragraph to read: "...items from Faculty Senate Resolution #91-28 be considered for use in development of a peer...." Dennard (History) suggested to insert the word "as a guide" after the word "use" in the above mentioned amendment.

Thompson (Political Science) spoke against sending the Committee report back

since it has been stated that it is not a mandate.

Sexauer (Art) asked for clarification if Resolution #91-28 provides models that could be used to evaluate peers. Bailey (Philosophy) responded that Resolution #91-28 approved various things that could be done that have lacked approval in the past. Sexauer responded that in effect Resolution #91-28 allows units to develop models of evaluation without having to go to the Chancellor for approval. Bailey responded that it is in keeping with Appendix C, which states "...and other methods....".

The motion to refer the Committee's report back to the Committee for further clarification failed.

Harris (Foreign Language) asked if the Committee's report would read as amended by Professors Graham and Dennard? Gallagher responded that the Committee would accept the amendment since it further clarified the intent of the Committee.

Chair Moskop also noted that an editorial change was necessary under 2) c). Section c) should be renumbered to "3)" and the remaining "1), 2), 3)" should be renumbered "a), b), and c)".

The Teaching Effectiveness Committee's report, listing items that can be considered as a guide in development of a peer review process passed. (Resolution #92-4). (Please refer to the list of resolutions for the full resolution.)

#### VI. New Business

David Dennard (History) presented a revision to the 1990-1992 Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5, page 46, Schedule Changes. He stated that the first aim was to reduce the amount of time students have to drop a course since ECU does encourage students to finish a degree as quickly as possible. The second aim was to allow additional students to take advantage of slots that are now closed as result of the lengthy drop period.

Thompson (Political Science) spoke against the motion. He questioned whether the 40% would be comparable to other institutions in the state and whether 15% was adequate time for a student to decide to drop a course. He further stated that the 15% drop time may not allow the faculty an opportunity to give the student some type of indication of their grade in the class since this would be within the first 2 weeks of the semester.

Chenier (Allied Health) spoke against the motion stating that if a student is allowed to drop within 2 weeks, other students still could not be reasonably integrated into the class and catch up on the material they had missed for the first 2 weeks.

Sykes (Continuing Education) spoke against the motion because 40% may be too long and 15% may be too short. He felt that someone needed to look at what other institutions were doing in reference to this issue first. He moved that this issue be referred to the Credits Committee for further study.

Atkeson (History) stated that some faculty didn't have a midterm examination and other faculty only had a final exam so many students do not have an evaluation before they would have to drop the course. Also the motion does not refer to adding courses, only dropping them. He spoke in favor of referring this to the Credits Committee.

The motion to refer the revision to Section 5, Page 46 to the Credits Committee for further study was passed. (Resolution #92-5)

With there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

-11-

*Frances Eason*

Frances Eason  
Secretary of the Faculty

*Lori Lee*

Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate Secretary

**RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE JANUARY 21, 1992, FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

92-1 Approval of Appendix X: Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Sexual or Racial Harassment or Discrimination or Conflicts of Interest Brought Against East Carolina University Faculty members or Administrators Holding Faculty Status. (A copy is available in the Faculty Senate Office.)

**Disposition:** Chancellor

92-2 Approval of curriculum matters contained in the Curriculum Committee Minutes of December 12, 1991.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

92-3 Approval of the recommendation that the Counseling Center Unit Code be dissolved on the conditions that:

- 1) the tenured professors retain tenured appointments in the University;
- 2) the procedures in this instance are not precedent setting;
- 3) the Faculty Senate move immediately to develop and institute a formal process for dissolving a unit code;
- 4) a formal, written, mutually satisfactory agreement be reached between the University and the tenured professors to provide for research, teaching, and service activities suitable for continued professional growth and development;
- 5) the Counseling Center clarify the impact of dissolving the unit code on the Office of the Student Counseling Center's Operational Plan, Objective 4.a.1: Establish a doctoral intern site and training program at the Counseling Center.

**Disposition:** Chancellor

92-4 Approval of suggestions that may be considered for use as a guide in the development of a peer review process. The suggestions are as follows:

- 1) Peer evaluation procedures for a unit should be determined by the faculty of that unit and be in compliance with Appendix C and the unit code. Evaluation procedures should be well defined and use proven instruments. In addition, faculty must be trained in the proper use of these procedures before they are implemented.
- 2) Some methods are better suited for evaluation of teaching for purposes of merit, promotion and tenure and other for development or improving teaching. Of the methods cited above, two are more suitable for evaluations by colleagues. They are:
  - a) Annual Goals Assessment
  - b) Analysis of Instructional and Other Materials  
Diamond (1987) contains examples of how evaluations of these two kinds could be conducted.
- 3) Classroom observations are a beneficial tool for developing teaching effectiveness. We make the following recommendations:
  - a) When faculty classes are observed, at least two observers be used and each observer visit a class at least twice.
  - b) It may be helpful to have faculty teaching observed by members outside the unit.
  - c) Observation teams can be a useful way of collecting data. The team members observe one another and discuss observations. This method can build teaching support as well as data for

development. It is often helpful if the team is interdisciplinary and consists of junior and senior faculty. Observation teams should consist of not more than four people.

Diamond (1987) also contains examples of forms that could be used for such evaluations. It should, however, be noted that some pedagogues do not follow traditional lecture/discussion methods. In order to encourage and facilitate alternate and innovative pedagogues appropriate formats should be sought by the unit.

References: Diamond, R.M. (Ed). 1987. A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure. Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University. Copley Publishing Group, Littleton, Massachusetts 01460, 63 pp.

Disposition: Chancellor

92-5 Refer a recommended revision to the 1990-1992 Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5, Page 46, Dropping Courses to the Credits Committee for further study. (Please refer to the January 21, 1992, Faculty Senate Agenda, Attachment 5 for the full recommended revision.)

Disposition: N/A