

THE PROVOST'S OFFICE
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
An Informal History
1955-1993



By
Nash N. Winstead

Nash N. Winstead

*Dedicated to the memory of C. David Jackson (1966–1998)
for his outstanding service as head of the Special Collections Department at the NCSU Libraries.*

Published by the Special Collections Department
North Carolina State University Libraries
Raleigh, North Carolina

The Special Collections Department of the NCSU Libraries assisted in the final production of this work and mounted it on the Web but is not responsible for its contents.

The digital version is available at:

http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/libraries/archives/archives_programs/provost_office.html

©1999

130 copies of this public document were printed at a cost of \$3,321 or \$25.54 per copy.

Contents

Introduction and Acknowledgments	v
Chapter One: Duties of the Provosts and Their Staff	
Functions	3
Responsibilities of Assistant and Associate Provosts, Assistants to, and Coordinators	20
Personnel Office	26
Dean's Council	30
Cooperating Raleigh Colleges	31
Other Organizations	32
Chapter Two: Academic Matters and Degrees	
Advising	37
Courses and Curricula	46
Graduate School	59
Grading Systems and Scholarship	64
Chapter Three: Faculty and Other Personnel Exempt from the Personnel Act	
Personnel Policies and Procedures	73
Rank and Tenure	77
Named Professors	82
Teaching, Research and Extension Faculty	85
Professional EPA Faculty Who Hold No Academic Rank	92
Salaries and Salary Administration	95
Off Campus Scholarly Assignment and Leaves of Absence	102
Faculty Benefits and Privileges	104
Retirement Age	113
Interns in Academic Administration	114
Faculty Adviser's and Teacher's Handbooks	115
Chapter Four: Affirmative Action	
Issues Concerning Women	117
Issues Concerning Race	125
Chapter Five: Other Administrative Matters	
Budget Development	153
Budget Allocations	154
Creating New Administrative Units	161
Procedures to Select Academic Officials	167
Space Utilization and Allocation	173
Committee on Committees	177
Institutional Studies and Planning	179
Chapter Six: Other Units and Activities	
Computing Center	181
Library	189
Archives	193
University Studies	193
Admissions	201
Cooperative Education	209
International Programs	209
Radiation Protection	215
Fort Bragg	216

Chapter Seven: Administrative Relationships and Activities

Faculty Senate	219
Student Affairs	222
Registration and Calendar	223
Extension	229
Summer Sessions	232
Research Office	234
Division of Undergraduate Studies	238
Academic Skills	239
Provost's Relationships with Chancellors and Deans	240

Appendix: Those Who Did the Work

Dean's of the Faculty and Provosts	253
Persons Who Reported to the Provosts	
Assistants to the Dean of the Faculty and to the Provosts	255
Assistant and Associate Provosts	255
Affirmative Action Officers	255
Assistant and Associate Affirmative Action Officers	256
Coordinators of Institutional Studies and Planning	256
Administrative Assistants	256
Managers of the Personnel Office	256
Data Processing Coordinators of Academic Personnel	256
Personnel Responsible for Preparing Trustee Reports and Writing Appointment Letters	256
Courses and Curricula	257
Course and Curricula Records	257
Secretarial and Personnel Staff Who Were Subject to the Personnel Act	257
Others	
Chancellors	259
College and School Deans	259
Other Units	
Academic Skills	260
Admissions	260
Adult Credit Programs and Summer School	260
Archives	261
Computing Center	261
Continuing Education	261
Cooperative Education	261
Fort Bragg	261
Institutional Research	261
International Programs	261
Libraries	261
Radiation Protection	261
Research	261
Student Affairs	262
Undergraduate Studies	262
University Planning and Analysis	262
University Studies (Multidisciplinary)	262
Faculty Senate Chairmen	262
Commonly Used Abbreviations	265

Introduction and Acknowledgments

In writing this history I have used files from the North Carolina State University's Archives. The files used most often were those from the Provost's Office, the Chancellor's Office and the minutes of the Faculty Senate. Since the files were not always as complete as I wished, I have searched in the files of other offices to try to find specific documents or correspondence. I have included some things as I remember them, and asked others how they handled matters and procedures.

The history begins with an appropriation from the North Carolina General Assembly in 1955. The General Assembly approved Deans of the Faculty positions for North Carolina State College (NC State), the Woman's College (now UNC-G) and for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH). John W. Shirley was appointed to the position at North Carolina State College by the Executive Committee of the University of North Carolina Board of Trustees at its October meeting that year. Prior to that time, duties to be assumed by the Dean of the Faculty had been handled by the Chancellor, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Business Manager, very often by the Vice President or Provost of the UNC System, and sometimes by no one. Most of the academic and personnel decisions were made at the school level, with salary approvals made through the system by the Chancellor, by the President, by the Executive Committee of the Trustees and finally by the State's Department of Administration. The duties for the position of Dean of the Faculty in the Trustees' report were described by President Gray: "The purpose of the Dean of the Faculty position is to strengthen and coordinate educational policies and to aid the Chancellor in academic planning for the future." Incidentally the position came with a secretary, and insofar as I could determine, no operating budget. At first, and even after I joined the Dean of the

Faculty's staff in 1967, the operating budget came from the Chancellor's Office budget and from whatever additional funds the Dean of the Faculty or the Provosts could get from the Chancellor, the Business Manager or the school deans. So the practice of begging for funds started early, and all Provosts have had to be extraordinarily talented in begging and very persuasive to get others to help fund ideas and projects.

In this history I shall cover functions, activities and relationships of the Provosts who served from 1955 to 1993. A few examples are curriculum, race, gender, salary increases, promotions, tenure and the offices that reported to the Provost, such as Admissions, Computing Center, Cooperative Education, Library et cetera. These units will not be covered as completely as the associated personnel and programs deserve, but fortunately in some cases a history of the unit has already been written, e.g. the Library (Littleton), or will be written, the Faculty Senate (Downs), and about the Integration of North Carolina State University (Clark). I am trying to persuade several others to write histories of their units.

At first I started writing this history in a rather straight and factual manner with little commentary. Then I decided to change the approach to include comments found in the files on various subjects and others of my own as I remembered the way things seemed at the time. This history ends on July 1, 1993, at the end of Frank Hart's tenure, and at the beginning of Phillip Stiles' tenure as Provost.

I wish to thank both Maurice Toler, archivist and Susan Nutter, Director of Libraries, for providing me with a phone, desk, supplies and access to a copier in the D. H. Hill Library. I would also like to thank Edward Hodges, library technical assistant, for providing me initially with a computer so that I could begin to learn to type. Toler and Hodges were always willing to help me find

the needed records in the files of the Archives. Mr. Hodges also wrote letters, handled my mail and telephone messages. They were a pleasure to work with. I thank Susan Nutter, John Ulmschneider, and several of the library's systems staff, Edward Rubes, Andrew Hall, Matt Smith, Rhonda Leary, Jay Cornish and Lisa Thaxton, for providing a Macintosh computer, access to the printer, and all types of assistance as I began to learn how to use that computer. Andy Hall said, "Here is the computer. Start using it. If you have problems just let us know." After I was shown how to turn the computer on and to use the help balloons, I proceeded. Once over the weekend the computer crashed, and this was when I had not saved all of the work that I had done on floppies. I learned fast. Hall recovered much that appeared to have been lost. Later on the computer would freeze and not completely start, or it would get to a certain point in its start up cycle and automatically restart. Matt Smith came to the rescue. The computer had a problem that he had not seen before. So it seems that I provided some new learning experiences for others, too! Since I began to write this report at the same time I was learning to use the computer, I could get into some real binds and Rubes, Hall, Smith, Thaxton or Hodges would come and get me untrapped. Sometimes I kept trying and even untrapped myself. Smith and Leary printed all of the earlier drafts, and they helped solve several problems that I had with the arrangement of the text. Cornish hooked me up to a new printer located in Archives, and I began to print from my computer. Later Caroline

Weaver, a clerk in special collections, and Eddie Hodges helped to solve mysteries after I was connected to the printer in Archives and my computer would freeze during a printing job. Everyone decided that the problems were not entirely with me, and that I needed a new computer. Thank goodness.

I called on a large number of people to read sections. This usually meant that the person presently worked, or had worked in that particular unit or activity. The people called on most often were Dr. Larry Clark and Dr. Murray Downs.

Gerry Winstead also read through the entire report and made editorial corrections. She also made many suggestions on improvements in the text, including how I could rewrite portions to make them more understandable. She was also very helpful with tenses and all those things which the wonderful secretaries did for so many years that I don't even recognize as errors when I make them. I only recognize errors when someone else makes them.

Dr. Rebecca Leonard did final edits of the book, for which I am grateful. She also assisted in the process of moving the manuscript to publication. Becky thought she was finished with my jobs, but I am glad she took on this final task.

As I have written this document, I have also accumulated a list of happenings, tales and things that were said that should not be included here. Another project is to get these tales recorded. They will include tales about faculty, administrators, staff, students and others. More to come!

CHAPTER ONE

DUTIES OF THE PROVOSTS AND THEIR STAFF

Functions

In Chancellor Carey H. Bostian's 1955 letter of appointment to John W. Shirley as the first Dean of the Faculty, the term of appointment was described as indefinite. He said, "but it is my hope that you will find the opportunities for promoting the academic affairs of the college so interesting and the results of your work so satisfying that you will wish to continue for a number of years." In 1967 the title of the position of Dean of the Faculty was changed to that of Provost. With each of the Deans and Provosts no term was set, each served at the pleasure of the Chancellor. The only exception was Franklin D. Hart who was appointed for a set term until the new Provost was selected and came to NC State (Phillip J. Stiles).

Bostian said in this letter, "I believe that you have a good understanding of how your responsibilities as Dean of the Faculty will begin on an advisory basis to the Administrative Council and the Chancellor and will gradually evolve to a position carrying full and direct responsibility for various activities." Areas which Bostian indicated as requiring the greatest need for Shirley's attention were: teaching schedules; use of space; curricula; cost of instruction; appointments; promotions; admission and academic standards; relations of sponsored research to academic programs; publications; student-faculty relations; and faculty welfare. Two administrative areas were also assigned to the Dean at this time. These were the Library and the Extension Division.

One of the first assignments delegated to Dean Shirley was to handle the existing personnel forms for new hires, salary increases, promotions, leaves of absence, and terms of contract. Then he was assigned the responsibility for establishing more effective academic personnel procedures. Also delegated was the authority to implement these

procedures within state, UNC and NCSC policies. These forms were revised by Shirley and later were substantially revised when I was an assistant provost. The promotion forms were revised again by Dean Debra Stewart and Vice Chancellor Frank Hart and by me in the late 1980s. Other lesser revisions have occurred from time to time. At first these forms were in sets of multiple copies, and when typed the last copies were very faint and hard to read. Next, all of the forms were in a format that could be entered into the computer and as many copies printed as needed. By 1993, all personnel forms were entered into computers by the departments and submitted electronically.

One of the functions that Shirley assumed from Bostian was the writing of letters of welcome to new faculty and EPA staff. This practice has been continued. We did stop sending out so much extra material about the city, including a map of the city, and activities available to faculty and staff in the College/University when the numbers of new faculty and EPA personnel increased so much in the early 1980s. We began to rely on the units on campus, such as the Faculty Club, the Department of Athletics, the Libraries and the Student Center to distribute their own materials at the annual New Faculty Dinner sponsored by the Chancellor and the Provost.

Deans of the Faculty and Provosts frequently appointed study committees and commissions. These were sometimes appointed jointly with or by the Chancellor. Frequently the study's recommendations were mailed to appropriate groups on campus then meetings were held to give faculty a chance to give their views on the recommendations. I began to hold a number of Provost's Forums for these discussions. At times the forums were on other subjects of academic interest and involved

speakers from both inside and outside the university. These have been too numerous to list, but I will mention a few. Topics included advising, the core curriculum, the quality of the undergraduate education at NCSU, sexual harassment, race relations, how overhead costs (indirect costs recovered from grants) are determined and how they are allocated, and academic computing. Others will be discussed under University Studies in Chapter Six.

Legislative and other agency requests for information were numerous. Most legislative requests came via the Legislative Research Division and the UNC administration. While we might generate and prepare a lot of information, we rarely knew what questions had been asked for which we were supplying information. There have been faculty workload studies, computer questionnaires, space utilization studies and so on. A few reports will be described in other sections. I do want to mention two reports here. These two reports were prepared in 1990. The first was a response to a Legislative inquiry concerning School of Education faculty. I was never told why we were preparing this information, but I think it may have involved faculty's relationships and experiences in the public schools. The requests to the Board of Governors' were for information about a professor, an associate professor and an assistant professor from each campus with teacher education programs. The list was for: 1) Job description or list of duties; 2) Initial letter of employment; 3) Letters of renewal and salary increases; 4) Letters of appointment with tenure; 5) Letters of promotion; 6) Contracts; 7) Code of tenure and campus and college standards for tenure appointment; 8) Campus and college procedures for tenure application and appointment decisions; and 9) Procedures and documentation of faculty review after tenure. For the second request we prepared a voluminous report on activities at NCSU which provided "Services to Local Education Agencies." Our list included several with state-wide application too. This report was sent to Dr. Dawson on May 15, 1990, by

Dean Joan Michael and included activities from all schools/colleges of NCSU not just those from the College of Education and Psychology. This document included even more activities and services than I knew we were performing. I recommend this report to all for reading (a copy can be found in the Provost's files of 1990 in the library archives).

As Provost I rarely met the members of Legislature except when they accepted tickets to football games and to the Chancellor's buffet, or to other public functions on our campus. The Provost also received tickets and attended these football functions on Saturdays. We did not receive similar treatment for basketball or for the other sporting events on campus. We did get invited to the bowl games, to the Atlantic Coast Conference basketball tournament and to the finals of the National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball playoffs. On rare occasions there was a call to be present along with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business if the Legislative Base Budget or Appropriations Committees were holding a hearing on our continuing budgets or on our change budget requests. I was there to respond if a legislator asked about an academic program. I did represent the UNC System once when a committee of the Legislature was holding a hearing on SPA employee's salary increases. I strongly supported a plan for merit pay and for step-salary increases because these employees had few increases in the past several years other than across-the-board raises. The staff who added knowledge and learned new techniques and skills and worked harder received almost the same salaries as those whose performance was minimal. They had all received across the board increases for so long that the new employees were getting almost the same salaries, except for longevity pay, as those who had several years of experience. The way most employees got ahead was to transfer to a new position or to leave the University, because upgrading of a present position with the current employee was

not easy except when the State Personnel Office reviewed all of those in a particular job category. My advice did not get enacted although I have learned that for the 1994 session the State Employee's Association was proposing again that both these issues be funded.

In 1960 Chancellor John T. Caldwell redefined the position of Dean of the Faculty as: "the principle staff assistant to the Chancellor; the responsible line officer under the Chancellor overseeing certain functions, and the officer to act for the Chancellor in the absence of the latter." Many of the functions will be described under the subject sections of this report. In this charge, the Chancellor said, "In the absence of the Chancellor, the Dean of the Faculty would act for him in all matters requiring approval or action of the Chancellor's Office and preside over scheduled meetings of the Administrative Council and the Liaison Committee." Each Dean and Provost has since performed these functions. In 1966 Caldwell wrote Kelly saying "I assume that we all understand that you're the 'bull of the woods' when I'm gone and you are here." In the area of faculty personnel, the Dean of the Faculty would "Review with the authority to recommend approval or rejection, or negotiate modifications of all recommendations for appointment, promotion, compensation, leaves of absence, special assignments, professional development, reassignment and separation of professional personnel in the divisions of the college, subject to normal power of review and approval exercisable by the Chancellor and higher officers." He also said that it was the responsibility of the Dean to forward only those recommendations that would promote the excellence of the College in its basic purposes. The Dean was told to maintain for the Chancellor a continuous review of all phases of the academic programs bearing upon the quality of the College's programs, its scope, and its budget. He was called upon to carry out investigations of academic and faculty matters requiring solution by the administration.

James Stewart, Dean of Student Affairs, raised questions of whether this review of personnel and budgets of the Division of Student Affairs was really intended. The Chancellor said that it was. The NCSC component of UNC-TV was assigned to the Provost, but it was later transferred to William Turner when he became Administrative Dean for Extension.

This clarification and redefinition of function in 1960 came at the request of Dean Shirley and included many of his suggestions. Some not addressed were the Dean's relations with the Consolidated University. Shirley said: "At the moment we have two administrative hierarchies, each trying to do the same job from different points of vantage. This multiple administration is not only confusing in itself, but leads to problems involving status, face saving, and credit for achievements. The major problem seems to be that the University (UNC) has attempted to engage in operations on the local campuses in many cases where it should have worked through local administrative channels." One suggestion made by Shirley but not resolved at this time was that the Graduate School was viewed by Dr. Donald Anderson and Dr. William Whyburn of the Consolidated University as their operating entity rather than being a review and a policy body. "As a result, this takes them into almost every facet of our activities as internal administrators. The University should be a planning, expediting body; the institutions should be given both the responsibility and authority for carrying out the plans and policies with a very minimum of interference as to how this should be done. Only in this way can we prevent confusion and conflicting administrative directives." In the matter of the Graduate School a memorandum would come shortly after Caldwell became Chancellor which would clarify that the positions of Dean of the Graduate School and Business Manager reported to the Chancellor of NCSC.

After I became Provost, the UNC System had become better at letting us know when they were appointing a person from

our campus to a system-wide committee or study group. In fact they usually asked us for nominees for these committees. However, on July 3, 1974, three days after I became Provost, Dr. Larry Champion, Head of the English Department, went to a system committee meeting at UNC-G and turned in an expense account to Dean Robert Tilman. Dean Tilman called me and said: "I thought that you were to let us know when one of our faculty was appointed to a UNC committee." I knew nothing of the appointment or of the committee and what it was to accomplish. We learned later from Champion that it was dealing with the general education requirement in the humanities. I never did see a report of the committee or a letter of appointment. We inquired and found, as we usually did, that each campus was supposed to pick up the expenses of their attendee.

Over the years this relationship with the central system continued to be somewhat frustrating from time to time. Who has the responsibility, for you will be held accountable, was a gripe of most of the persons who have held the Provost's position. At times the Chancellors complained even stronger. I probably shouldn't say this, but after substituting for the Chancellor at meetings of the system, both before and after the creation of the Board of Governors, I was glad that I was employed at NCSU instead of at UNC-CH because it seemed to me that the President and his staff became involved much more often in the internal campus affairs of the UNC-CH campus than at NC State.

In 1961 the Council on Teacher Education was formed on the NCSC campus and the Dean of the Faculty or Provost became and continues as an ex-officio member. This Council had been recommended in the Long Range Plan and was accepted by Chancellor Caldwell. The idea was to have those faculty from schools other than Education involved in the teaching of prospective teachers, so as to have a closer relationship with the School of Education. The other members of this Council included faculty from the School of Education, local school teachers, and administrative representatives

from the county and city schools and an employee from the State Department of Education. During Harry C. Kelly's term as Provost he began to write the letters of appointment to this Council. Of course, the Dean of Education ascertained the willingness of prospects to serve and provided drafts of the specific letters of appointment needed for different members. No one ever refused this appointment when I asked.

Functions and responsibilities of the office changed under Dean Harry Kelly. One responsibility added was University-wide computing activities. This at first included both the Computing Center and Administrative Data Processing. This latter function was transferred to the VC for Finance and Business under Chancellor Poulton. Affirmative Action, University Studies, and Fort Bragg, were also added. Programs in Extension, and the business operations of the Summer School and evening programs were transferred to University Extension when William Turner became Administrative Dean.

In 1967, Chancellor Caldwell proposed that the Dean of Faculty title be changed to Provost. He said that: "Although the title of Dean of the Faculty is well understood and well accepted on this campus and Dean Kelly's role is indeed well performed, the comparable position at UNC-CH and Duke University carries the title of Provost, and on the other two campuses of the Consolidated University the title of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is used. I have concluded, therefore, that the position here and the incumbent warrants this well established new title which more adequately portrays the functions of principle educational officer on a university campus." He also said that no changes in responsibility were contemplated at this time. I had just become Associate Dean of the Faculty and Kelly was in Japan. So neither he nor I knew of the contemplated change in title at the time it was proposed. Caldwell did say, "Dean Kelly is in Japan. If upon his return the day before the Executive Committee meets, he expresses a desire that the title be other than

Provost, I will inform you." A letter was written to Kelly with instructions to call upon his arrival in California. Kelly concurred with the change. I learned of the change after it was approved by the Trustees. My title changed from Associate Dean of the Faculty to Assistant Provost. On May 18, 1971, the title Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs was added to the title of the Provost's position. This full title continues today.

We made a number of studies for the Board of Higher Education. One that I thought was valuable was the report that I prepared for NCSU and submitted on March 14, 1968, on Inter-institutional Programs. It was a surprise to me at that time to learn of the large number and of the strength of many of these programs. This report is found in the 1971-72 Provost's files.

In 1972 the Chancellor wrote to UNC System President William Friday and said that Provost Kelly was the chief planning officer, and that the new position that brought Clauston Jenkins to the Provost's Office would be involved in that function. In reality, the planning was done sporadically, for Dr. Jenkins' time was spent primarily on the self-study for accreditation, in the generation of responses to questionnaires and preparing required reports. Most planning was done by the departments and schools. These were presented as they related to budgets when reviews of biennial budget requests were held. One UNC planning effort occurred in 1968 and included projections of enrollments in academic areas. This was done at all public colleges and universities and each reported to the Board of Higher Education. It was the difficulty that campuses had in completing this assignment that caused the BHE to get a position for a Coordinator for Institutional Studies and Planning at each public college in the State.

When Joab Thomas was Chancellor the BOG required that each campus prepare and present a long term plan to the BOG. Jack Rigney, Dean of International Programs headed that effort. Vice Chancellor of

Finance and Business George Worsley and I agreed that a very real deficiency in our efforts was in the lack of continuous and systematic long range planning. While I was Acting Chancellor in 1981-82, we reallocated funds from NCSU's appropriations to create a permanent position for planning. We did not fill it but left it vacant to find out whether the new Chancellor would want it located in his office or elsewhere. When Bruce R. Poulton came as Chancellor in 1982 he hired a former associate at New Hampshire, Karen Helm, and placed the planning function under the Chancellor's Office.

An additional function assigned to the Provost effective June 1, 1972, was to attend the first meeting of the newly formed Board of Trustees of NCSU and to attend all future meetings of that group. Dean Harry Kelly began to present the personnel actions to the Personnel Committee of the BOT. That responsibility of the provost continues today.

One constant concern and problem was to be certain that the Student Supply Stores had textbooks for our students on hand at the beginning of each semester. One complaint of the faculty was that the store cut back on the number of new texts. Some of the faculty then requested more books than would be needed. The store had additional problems with a few faculty who did not get their lists in on time for texts to be ordered. The Provost heard complaints from all three and especially from the students if books were not available. The problems were really with a few faculty, and the occasional time when the Campus Store's personnel made a mistake in ordering the proper number of textbooks. The Campus Store's Committee finally came up with a suggestion that worked most of the time. This was to have one person in each department responsible for getting in the textbook lists rather than having the Campus Store appear to harass each faculty member who taught a course. At periodic intervals the Campus Store was to send the Provost a listing of courses that had not gotten in textbook orders that had appeared in the Campus' listing of courses

to be taught the next semester. The Provost would send a copy of the list to the school dean and the department head. We soon got the Campus Store to send the list to the affected departments. Fortunately most apparently delinquent courses were those that did not require a text. Occasionally a faculty member did procrastinate too long, making it impossible to get the text here on time. Then there was the rare time when the Supply Store ordered too few texts or the texts were not available in sufficient numbers. All in all the system has become remarkably good.

Just before I retired in 1990, the accrediting agencies and the Legislature had begun to require assessment of programs. This had become a nationally popular exercise. Frequently those who proposed programs did not know how to measure quality or even what was important when they received a report. But with the use of computerized data analysis, they could begin to look at data. Besides, this had become the popular jargon. After all, everyone wants to have an effective educational program. Politicians in North Carolina saw this being done in other places, and they wanted to do it too. This process has, I believe, been far less reliable than subjective measures of quality, such as whether research got published in books and journals, and did the faculty compete well for grants and contracts if research was a function? For education and students, did the students get hired by the companies or appropriate agencies and did these companies come back the next year and the next for more graduates? Did better students get admitted to graduate or professional schools? For graduate students, did they get hired in their professions and by universities and colleges if they were going to work in academia? For extension did the clientele that they served prosper and take advantage of the knowledge disseminated?

In 1990 I received a memorandum from Vice President Raymond Dawson on the subject of Institutional Assessment Plans. The memorandum stated, "During the coming months each institution is required

to develop a plan that will meet the requirements of the new 'accountability' legislation. The legislation provides: that the board of Governors of the University of North Carolina shall require each institution to develop a plan that would exhibit how the institution will measure its effectiveness, especially in the areas of student learning and development, faculty development and quality and progress toward the institution's missions. Each plan shall include information concerning the institution's goals to improve and maintain its quality in these areas. The plans shall identify a number of assessment measures that shall be required on all campuses to insure system-wide assessment. These plans shall be developed and submitted to the General Assembly by January 15, 1991."

Immediately we began to develop common UNC-wide data elements that might be useful, and to begin to respond to those on our own campus. Karen Helm was very helpful in suggesting the data elements which were used. Of course the persons who wrote the legislation didn't know what they were asking for, or how much time and effort they were requiring us to spend on an effort that they probably would not read and might not comprehend if they did read it! It sounded very grand, but I knew that it would not assist us very much in our efforts and that it probably would not add even a tiny increase in the quality of our programs. It was such requirements as this that made me grateful for the fact that my retirement would come in 1990.

At the time that I became Provost, Chancellor John Caldwell told me that he had felt for some time that the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of Research should report to the Provost, but that he had to wait until Dean of the Graduate School, Walter Peterson and Provost Harry Kelly retired to do this. These two areas became the responsibility of the Provost in 1974. During Chancellor Thomas' tenure Radiation Protection and International Programs were added to the provost's duties. Early in Poulton's term and at Dean of Research

Henry Smith's retirement, the chief research officer's title was changed based on a recommendation from the "Mann Committee" from Administrative Dean to Vice Chancellor. This office then began to report to the Chancellor. The same Committee recommended that the Graduate Dean continue to report to the Provost. During Poulton's term the Admissions Office, Academic Skills, and Cooperative Education also became the responsibility of the Provost.

The Dean of the Graduate School also became a part of the Vice Chancellor for Research's responsibility under Chancellor Poulton, but remained under the Provost for academic matters and for management. After Larry K. Monteith became Chancellor the Institutional Research Office and later the Planning Office and its functions were assigned to the Provost. These offices were merged and it is now called, University Planning and Analysis. Other units added to the Provost's responsibility were the newly created Undergraduate Studies, and the Vice Chancellors for Research and Student Affairs. Extension now reports through the Vice Chancellor for Research. Units transferred by me were: University Studies to the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Radiation Protection to Research, and Archives to the Library.

Over the years a number of internal administrative matters have been delegated by the Chancellors to the Provost. In 1974 I stopped sending a list of those recommended for exceptions to the nepotism policy to the Chancellor for his approval. I began to formally approve these since I had already approved the appointment. In turn we also delegated a number of matters that were handled centrally to the schools and other units. My philosophy was, if I was rubber stamping an item why not let it be handled by the persons were most informed unless other regulations, codes or a legal issue required my approval. Examples of these are found in various sections of this report. It is so easy to fill the day with busy work that contributes nothing. We certainly

had more of that already than was needed. Unfortunately many feel that an item has to go to the top administrator for it to be handled well. Actually good management involves responsibility and accountability, and matters should be delegated as much as is possible to the lowest level rather than retained at the highest level. Provosts have all felt and said, that if it is not really necessary, don't add another batch of paper work. Yet we often do just that because of imposed regulations. Many feel that we will be more accountable if the Chancellor or the Provost or both sign the piece of paper and if that piece of paper is in the files. In such circumstances if the unit heads or the faculty members involved are not reliable, then the product of the effort will be unreliable. Indeed, as Jack Rigney, Dean of International Programs often said, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

In 1976 we were following a practice required by the Board of Governors that if one campus of the system was considering a faculty member from another campus in the system for a position, the Chancellor of the campus would notify the Chancellor of the second campus before May 1. If the matter was under consideration and no notification had occurred before May 1, then the Chancellor had to seek the other Chancellor's approval. This of course was not a matter that the Chancellor at NCSU could keep up with, so it was quickly transferred to the Provost to do the checking and to draft appropriate letters for the Chancellor's signature. The Provost also informed the campus after a short time. In a number of cases search committees and department heads soon forgot the administrative memorandum informing them of the required process. Also, the faculty members from other campuses often had applied for the position, and sometimes they did not want their colleagues to know of their application unless they were to be offered the position. I was fortunate that I did require the deans to contact me about the level of salary to be offered to a new employee or we would have been in non-compliance more often than we

were. It was not at all unusual for me to discover an unreported interview at the time that the offer was to be made to a faculty member at another campus. I found that most of the problems occurred on other campuses where the Chancellor and his office handled the matters, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs was not kept informed or was kept out of the information loop. I began to remind the deans of the policy about once a year at the Dean's Council or at the Administrative Council meetings, and I asked them to remind their department or unit heads. We were involved with very few cases where we had to request approval, and only in one case were we refused permission to consider the faculty members for appointment for that fall. In that case the department had slipped, and I learned after May 1, that they had the person under consideration and wanted to make an offer. The other campus refused because they said that they would not have time to recruit a replacement in that faculty member's specialty. We never refused. While the administration of the policy was cumbersome and took time, there were few circumstances when we had a faculty member leave for another campus in the system. We always figured that if a faculty member wanted to move to another campus in the system it was a good idea for them to go. I am certain that the policy was instituted to reduce raiding, but it was also intended to reduce the very late hires from member institutions. Most of our last minute faculty losses were to out-of-state institutions. Late hires did make it nearly impossible to find a replacement other than a temporary one who might not always be as satisfactory as one wished for the fall semester. I always wrote drafts for the Chancellor to send to his counterpart Chancellor. If he was out of town his staff always brought the letter in for me to sign for the Chancellor so that we could get it out of the way as soon as possible. We did not dislike the policy. It just made more work, and I was not certain that it was worth the effort. There were a dozen or so persons considered for every open position so there was a

potential for many to be considered who did not make it to the finalist lists and who were never reported.

All Provosts are called upon by reporters to answer questions. This is especially true in case the reporter can't get the Chancellor and he/she wants some official to give them a quotable statement. The higher the level of the position the better, even when the person knows nothing about the subject of the story. Reporters frequently approached one or more faculty members for their opinions. At times they too were in no position to answer the questions. While most faculty will not give an opinion on a subject when they are without any knowledge, there was at least one that could always be found who would speak on any subject. I think that this was done deliberately, for a story without controversy or without differing opinions by administrators and faculty would be a no-good story in the reporter's view. It was amazing how few times opinions of the Faculty Senate leadership was sought on such matters, for they among all of the faculty would be the most likely to be informed on most issues. For the TV reporter you tape for 15 minutes and on the program you comment for a half a sentence and the reporter tells in one minute what you said while you, with your mouth running, are seen in the background! Our Chancellors were not always as accessible to reporters as they might have been and frequently they would have preferred that the person get their story from Public Affairs or Information Services staff. For what the reporter considered to be a really big story, they did not want to use those professional writers as a source. Those offices would frequently have a story already written for the press, but the reporter wanted to do his/her own thing. I remember being called at home, at work, and even occasionally at out of town conferences to answer questions or to confirm the accuracy of what the reporter had already written. About one-half of the time the newspaper reporters seemed hostile to me. Lucy Coulbourne, Director of Information Services, once advised me, after I had

talked too much to a reporter, to never say anything except to answer as briefly as possible the specific question asked. The rule was never to volunteer additional information. I did follow this advice, however when the reporter obviously did not understand what he was asking, in spite of the fact that it was not the thing to do, I might try to explain the subject. I remember one time when a reporter did a story, after interviewing only one individual, saying that a student at NCSU said that our courses were "crips" and required no work. I looked at the student's record on the computer and found that he had flunked out of school. I wrote the Editor and said that the person interviewed was not a student at our University. The Editor wrote back and said that the reporter had rechecked with the student and had confirmed that the person was enrolled. I checked again and found that was not true, and responded again to the Editor. Someone from the paper then checked with the teacher of the supposedly easy class that was mentioned, and the teacher said that the person was not and had never been enrolled in that class. Some days later a retraction did appear and I received a letter of apology from the Editor.

I also recall a statement that I made to a reporter for the *Technician* one night who wanted to know if the snow, then falling, would cause classes to be canceled. I said, "We never close the University because of snow." The next day with 12 inches on the ground, I found that I was almost the only person who made it to campus. I had to come to work even though the University was closed after my remarks. Yes, the reporter did call my office and was surprised to find me there. The Business Office had arranged with a group working on snow removal at the airport to remove the snow, but the snow lasted so long and was so heavy at the airport that the snow removers couldn't come. So we were also closed the next day. The students had a lot of fun and they kidded me a lot about that. In the future I learned to say we "almost never" close!

The Provosts frequently were not knowledgeable about the details related to the reporters inquiries, so we would try to get them to talk to a person who was knowledgeable. I remember another day when we had a small amount of snow (but we were not closed) and a reporter called in desperation to get answers to a few questions. I explained that I was only vaguely aware of the subject and suggested persons to call and even gave home numbers. None of the persons were accessible (they were probably stuck in the snow on the way to work), so I did try to help because the person said that they had a mid-morning deadline. I did have at least one real reporter friend after that. Another time a TV reporter came and did an interview with me about a new educational report. I thought that he was talking about another report that had been recently issued, so we talked on camera for about 30 minutes. It was only later that I learned through the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that another group had issued a report on a similar but different title. This was an out-of-town TV reporter and a colleague from another university told me later that he had heard my discourse and that the discussion was one of the best on current academic issues in higher education that he had ever heard! The interview was shown for about 20 minutes on the TV station, and I never got to see the program. Obviously in this case the reporter did not know what the report was about either. News must have been scarce that day.

Trustee reports were prepared by the Provosts for personnel and academic programs. Most of the items included in the preparation of reports on personnel are discussed in Chapter Three. The Provost prepared those items needed for the implementation of new degrees, dropped degrees, and for the establishment of new schools or other administrative units. Some of these will be discussed in Chapters Two and Five. Usually the associate provost responsible for undergraduate curricula and the Graduate Dean would make an appropriate but abbreviated digest from the materials submitted

by the proposing units and prepare this report for the Provost to submit to the Trustees' Committee on Personnel and Programs, as it came to be called during Poulton's tenure. Personnel matters submitted to the Board of Trustees and to the Board of Governors were prepared by the Personnel Office of the Provost. Proposals for new degrees and new schools or colleges were prepared by the submitting unit in the format required. After review and recommendation by the Courses and Curricula Committee for undergraduate programs and the Graduate School for graduate programs, they came to the Provost, along with the required number of copies for submission to the Board of Governors. After review and approval the cover letters were prepared for the Chancellor's signature. The Chancellor, after review and approval, sent the materials and the appropriate number of copies to the staff of the Board of Governors. Of course, new programs had been followed by both the Provost and Chancellor even before their submission to the school curriculum committees. A program to be dropped was accepted quickly by the on-campus reviewers and approved by the NCSU Trustees. The UNC President always concurred, and he reported to the BOG. After the creation of the Board of Governors in 1972, guidelines for the submission of new degrees and programs were spelled out in detail and we all knew what the system wanted much better than ever before. This made it easier to get a new program approved, for it included those elements that the reviewers expected, wanted and needed.

Provosts have had to look into and determine the validity of many complaints by students and their parents and by politicians who wanted responses to complaints by their constituents. I describe a couple of these in Chapter Three. I usually asked the persons complaining to give me a specific course or faculty member to investigate, for I did not like to look into general charges when I really knew that the complaint dealt with one individual. Usually when a parent

called they wanted a response directly. In some cases we had to tell them that the issue involved revealing a matter in the student's record and that they would have to get the information from their child or get their child's permission before we could give them the information. That response never went over well with them or a politician. They rarely understood the Buckley Amendment and its restrictions. When a politician, a trustee, and frequently the President of UNC or one of his associates called, they wanted us to investigate the complaint, and to respond to them so that they, in turn, could respond to the complainer.

Under Chancellor Monteith, the Provost has more Chancellor responsibility than ever before. Responsibilities are more similar to those under Thomas and more like his plans for the Provost's Office. At the time that I retired, the Faculty Senate reported on April 20, 1990, on academic leadership and what they would like it to be under the new Provost. Their recommendations meshed closely with Monteith's view of the administrative functions and responsibilities for the position. In fact, the Senate committee discussed views on campus broadly and sought both the Chancellor's and my views. Chancellor Monteith began to implement these as soon as he was selected as Chancellor and before I retired. He continued to make these changes while Frank Hart was Provost and when Phil Stiles arrived, many were completed. Because of the importance of the changes made I will quote directly the contents of the "*Report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Leadership.*"

The committee discussions have revealed one overriding concern: The academic focus at NCSU should be clarified by a restructuring of the position of the Provost. This Provost should be a strong leader at the pinnacle of the academic structure of the university.

Many support the idea that the position will take the structure of the personality of the individual holding the Provost's job. Different structures

and styles of administration may be effective when coupled with the attributes of the office holder.

The committee feels that the Provost should lead all academic programs including all undergraduate and graduate education, as well as research. Certain aspects of student affairs, lifelong education, and public service might also be considered for his oversight.

The committee suggests that after University leadership is defined by the choice of Chancellor, the second most important appointment is that of the Provost. We recognize that the position of Provost may be filled and operational prior to the new Chancellor elect's ability to implement many, if any, changes in the University's administration. Therefore, we feel that in the interim the University administration should seek to find the best academic administrator available for the Provost position, independent of possible restructuring of the Provost's duties.

The committee was impressed with the complex administrative structure of North Carolina State University of which few faculty are intimately aware. We recognize that simplistic recommendations to streamline the administration are naive, but because our structure has grown rapidly we do call, however, for an examination of the structure necessary to administer the University. This will be a major effort and should no doubt be a major concern to the new Chancellor and the new Provost.

This committee further recommends that the faculty governance be the basis for ongoing future study.

One thing that the Provosts have wanted as a responsibility but did not obtain, was resources for a Center for Instructional Development. In Harry Kelly's first year at NCSU a change budget request was made. It did not get funded although Caldwell gave it a high priority among the requests and made a pitch for it. Kelly did not continue to make this request but did talk about the

need. In the first budget request that I prepared as Provost I placed this item as a high priority. This recommendation was based in part on a report by C. J. Dolce, A. S. Knowles and N. N. Winstead on "Centralized Audio-Visual Approaches" at N. C. State University in January 27, 1970. Among our recommendations was that new buildings constructed in the future have adequate electrical conduits and other structural features so that they could handle dial-access audio-visual communications.

In 1974 I appointed a committee to study audio-visual media on campus. The purposes were:

1. To survey the current resources and future needs for audio-visual media at NCSU.
2. To recommend appropriate University policies and procedures concerning audio-visual media: procurement, dissemination, services, maintenance and production.
3. You should attempt to define which functions should be the responsibilities of the schools and which should be handled on a University-wide basis.
4. If you should conclude that some functions should be administered on a University-wide basis, your recommendations should include a plan to accomplish your recommendations with estimated costs.

This report set the stage for continued development of media programs in each of the schools. The report confirmed our need for funding the change budget request which was submitted in 1974. It also led to the TV and audio maintenance repair positions which were assigned for University-wide maintenance in University Studies. During Chancellor Poulton's tenure and after I transferred University Studies to CHASS in 1986, this service known as University Closed Circuit TV was transferred along with the media unit in CHASS to Public Relations. This now falls under the

Director of Electronic Media in Institutional Advancement. Dr. Thomas would have given me a very small amount of funds (around \$20, 000) when the appropriations were received, but I did not feel that I would be able to hire a person and start the program with so few funds. I later learned that you take any amount of funds you can get and maybe later you will have enough to develop the project. Instead I proposed giving the funds to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences for their budding new endeavor in Humanities Extension. This was one of the wisest budget recommendations that I ever made. Today look at the wonderful accomplishments of this program.

In the intervening years I saw that many of the schools wanted to expand what they were doing in teaching improvement although they used different approaches. This was the best way at this time to get efforts started or expanded in instructional improvement, so I supported all requests for funds for the schools. All were interested in the use of TV in learning. These efforts have led to our capacity to deliver off-campus instruction which in the future is likely to become an even more important part of NCSU's educational efforts. The schools that developed this area the most were: Agriculture and Life Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences, Engineering, Textiles, and Education. The program in SHASS did a lot of public service types of activities and programs for the University too. After the SHASS program began to report to the Vice Chancellor for Public Service it continued to televise classes which are taught on Cable TV.

I also started the mini-grants for instructional improvement and for the use of computers in the classrooms. These were important in encouraging innovation and led to improvements. Instructional mini-grants are discussed later in this chapter under Assistant and Associate Provost's Responsibilities. Late in my tenure as Provost I placed a new version of the instructional development project back into the Change Budget requests. The

Faculty Senate strongly supported this proposal. What happens to this request will be revealed in the next edition of the Provost's Office history.

One function performed by Kelly, Hart and me was to serve on the committee that considered requests for the allocation of funds to schools or other units from indirect costs. This activity was managed by the Dean or VC for Research after a determination of the funds available was made by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business. The committee received and reviewed requests from the units. Although we had a predetermined amount calculated for the funds based on the earnings of overhead from grants and contracts in each unit, we reviewed all requests to make certain that they fell within guidelines. We encouraged proposals that would take advantage of matching funds in grants. This worked very well. We usually gave the funds to schools in the priority set by the dean, but not always. We always received more requests than there were funds available. We also tried to have a small pool of funds that we would make available for needs of the University and to help those schools that may not have earned many overhead funds from grants in their schools. This usually meant trying to make certain that some opportunities in SHASS, Design, and Education were funded in some years.

The University receives a number of notices of potential faculty awards of various types for which faculty could be nominated. The process, beginning with Chancellor Caldwell, was for the Dean of the Faculty to appoint the nomination committee, or as was the case most often, the award could be made only to persons from specific fields. Then the Provost asked the appropriate dean or deans to make a recommendation. In other cases there was potential for a University-wide nominee. I requested nominations from the schools and then reviewed the nominees, if there was more than one, at the Deans' Council. Before the Deans' Council came into being, we would review them with an appropriate small committee

or just review them with the Chancellor. The schools had the responsibility of preparing the nominating materials in a form suitable for the Chancellor to submit along with a draft of a suitable covering letter. Most of the time these covering letters had to be very technical and neither the Chancellor nor I had the expertise to write them, but most awards required a nomination from the Chancellor. During Chancellor Poulton's term his staff would usually send out the notices and handle the collection of the nominees. Then they usually asked me to take them to the Council of Deans for review and selection of the campus' nominee. In the case of the UNC O. Max Gardener Award, we had a standing committee that reviewed nominees and Mr. Hardy Berry, Director of Information Services and later Assistant Vice Chancellor for Communication and University Relations, usually prepared the proposal for the award with the assistance of the nominating department. We were remarkably successful in getting this award after Mr. Berry began to prepare the materials for the nomination.

Large numbers of requests for positions from people who wanted a faculty or an administrative job came to the University without a specific departmental address or for any known vacancy. In times when jobs were hard to get, the numbers were greatest. At first the Dean of the Faculty or later the Provost responded to each letter saying that the letter had been sent to the appropriate department or unit. The response usually was that we had received the letter and that when an opening became available we would enter this letter in the applicant pool. This was well intentioned but in many cases an opening became available months or even years later and the earlier request was forgotten. In time we stopped responding, but continued to send the letters (except for those clearly unqualified for a position) to the appropriate unit with a request that they respond. For those clearly unqualified we responded that we had no appropriate position available. This became especially true in the early 1970s.

Later we were advised by the attorneys that we could be subject to being sued if we placed letters in a file and indicated that they would be referred to if a vacancy occurred, and we forgot the letters in the file. This could also be true if we considered the person unsuitable and the applicant felt that they should have been considered. When there was no vacancy we began to write back saying that no position was available, with the admonition that if a position became available in the field, it would be advertised in media appropriate to the field. We advised all units without a vacancy to do the same thing. In many cases there were those that had no appropriate unit on our campus to send the application to, or I knew that there was no vacancy in the field, so we returned the resume.

Another chore which I disliked was to receive mail from some agency or company that came to large numbers of the faculty without a departmental address. In some cases this bulk mail might even be useful to some of the faculty. Since I had been here so long and dealt with faculty names so much, I could recognize the departments for most faculty. For this reason I usually went through this mail before or after working hours and wrote in the name of the department, and the staff finished the job by looking up the few remaining names in the directory. The reason that I did this was to save the staff time, for this could take them many hours, which they did not have to spend, and I could handle a hundred or so letters in a few minutes.

The thing that I complained about most was for the offices on campus who considered themselves to be understaffed to send all the mail, such as the parking permit requests or the parking decals after they were allocated, to the Vice Chancellor or to the school dean to which the staff reported. This meant that we got those for the Libraries' staff, the Computer Center's staff, the Graduate School's staff, and for all of the persons who worked in the other units that reported to the Provost. My office had two persons so we had to get someone from each

of the other units to come over and sort out the names belonging to them. It paid, as several units recognized, to come last, for then the sorting was much quicker and easier. The sad thing was that in the later years the P.O. Box number was computerized and was written on the envelope and the numbers of envelopes that we received filled at least two large boxes. I suppose that several thousand was too much for the campus mail, but I never understood why they all had to be distributed at the same time. Someone had done something to send those in these batches so why not do the job in smaller units?

Another function that I performed was the making of the coffee each morning. I liked to come to work around 7 o'clock and wanted coffee early so I made it. I think that most of the women who came to Holladay Hall to work were very surprised that I did this, for everywhere else this was "woman's work." The reason really was that as an early person I could get a lot of desk work out of the way before I began to receive telephone calls and visitors to the office.

To illustrate the activities of the Provost during a year, I am including a summary of the activities of the Provost during the 1976-77 year which was submitted to Chancellor Thomas for possible use in his annual report. I have not included the activities of those offices and units that reported to the Provost for they sent their own annual report summary to the Chancellor too.

These included significant areas resolved during the past year:

- Repeating courses policy (studied but no change was made),
- changes in the procedures and criteria for selection of outstanding teachers and alumni professors (these were also selected each year with the Provost approving the list of the former and chairing a committee to select those from a list of nominees in the latter);
- revision of the re-examination policy,

- academic evaluation policy (replacing the Final Examination Policies);
- academic misconduct (a modification was made in the judicial process to create a separate misconduct statute. This was done in consultation with the Student and the Faculty Senates and the suspension and retention policy was revised with additional study to be made during the Summer of 1977)
- A Faculty Salary Study was completed by an *ad hoc* committee.

Other things accomplished included:

- the fifteen-minute interval between classes,
- the establishment of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee on Faculty Salaries,
- the establishment of appointment terms for the faculty who are lecturers, demonstrators and laboratory supervisors.

Undergraduate Course and Committee actions approved included:

- 123 new courses,
- 113 revised courses,
- 61 reviewed courses,
- 44 dropped courses,
- plus one new and eight revised courses in the Agricultural Institute.

Curricula revisions included:

- Architecture,
- Landscape Architecture,
- Product Design,
- Visual Design,
- Engineering Operations,
- General Option in Psychology,
- Landscape Horticulture,
- Wood Science and Technology.

The following BA programs were revised:

- English,
- English Teacher Education Option,
- Writing-Editing Option,
- French Language and Literature,
- French Teacher Education Option,
- History,
- Social Studies Teacher Education Options,
- Multidisciplinary Major in Liberal Arts, Philosophy, Political Science, Criminal Justice Options, Spanish Language and Literature, the Spanish Teacher Education Option and Speech Communication.

Final approval was obtained through the BOG on the following degree programs:

- dropping the Speech Communication Teacher Education Option,
- changing the designation of the department and degrees in Politics to Political Science,
- merger of two undergraduate curricula, the B.S. in Recreation and Parks Administration, and the B.S. in Natural Resource Management to a single degree the B.S. in Recreation Resources Administration,
- BA in Chemistry,
- B.S. in Social Work,
- name change of the Department of Textile Technology to the Department of Textile Materials and Management,
- change the B.S. in Textile Technology to three degrees, the B.S. in Textiles, B.S. in Textile Management and a B.S. in Textile Science.

Requests had been submitted to the BOG for a BA degree in Comparative Literature (which was not approved) and to discontinue the B.S. in Engineering Science and Mechanics. A revised Affirmative Action

Plan under Executive Order 11246 was submitted to HEW in Atlanta in September, 1976. The revised plan covered another three year period, from July 1, 1976, to June 30, 1979. The projected three-year goals called for a net increase of 29 black and 49 female faculty members, a net increase of 10 black and 3 female non-faculty members, and a net increase of 163 black and 135 female SPA employees. An Affirmative Action Plan for the Handicapped was prepared in compliance with the Department of Labor regulations implementing Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Vietnam Veteran's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974. A race relations seminar was held for the Equal Opportunity Committee members in the fall at the Betsy Jeff Penn 4-H Center in Reidsville, N. C. on November 18-19, 1976. The purpose of the seminar was to examine, in full dimension the University's problems related to race and gender. A planning proposal was submitted to the National Science Foundation for consideration of funding of a regional Minority Center for Graduate Education in Science and Engineering. Interviews conducted by personnel from the Provost's Office numbered 310 persons, including 12 blacks, 46 females, and 11 other minorities. There were 369 EPA appointments including 1 vice chancellor, 2 associate deans, 2 assistant deans, 4 department heads, 2 named professors, 3 professors, 11 associate professors 63 assistant professors, 204 miscellaneous titles including instructors, and professionals, and 77 temporary persons. There were 304 reappointments, 63 changes of status, 86 promotions including 30 to professor, 32 to associate professor, 15 to assistant professor, and 9 miscellaneous promotions. There were 49 Off-Campus Scholarly assignments and leaves, 266 resignations, 22 retirements, and 6 deaths (of retired faculty). Dr. L. M. Clark, was selected by ACE for an Internship in Academic Administration for 1977-78. It goes on to list the committees that we served on and to list our travel. This was the year that I went as a part of the delegation to establish a coopera-

tive arrangement between Mansura University in Egypt and NCSU. Jack Rigney and I had to write the agreement before we left Egypt. Clark attended the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries at Atlanta, Ga. The remaining travel was the usual. Simpson served as Secretary for the Dean of Engineering Search Committee, a position that he was to assume until he retired, on all VC and Dean Search Committees.

We all have to learn how to utilize our staff and to keep them informed so that they can fulfill their obligations. I learned that I could not do it all, and I could not even keep up with everything that they all did. So there had to be a balance of delegation with the staff member knowing when to discuss an issue with me and when to proceed on their own. If I had required all of them to keep me totally informed, I would have had no time to work myself. We did not have enough staff for me to have that luxury. I also found, as did Kelly, that the staff needed to know what other members were doing. We began to have staff meetings about once a week so that we could all share in problems and progress and advise each other. Each week I had a different group in. Most persons met with me twice a month. For example, we would deal with student issues and include an Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs in that meeting. We had one meeting a month when all of the staff came. Downs, Clark and later Witherspoon came to each meeting. We skipped the fifth week in a month. Hart did not need as many meetings so he reduced the number. I tried to keep the business to matters that involved or would be of concern to the members of each group. An individual came to see me when we needed to discuss issues that only involved that office or that person. Communication is a delicate thing. When is it too much and when is it too little? I came to believe that too much was better than too little. I found it necessary to have some meetings for informational purposes with the SPA staff. These were not held on a regular basis.

I preferred to handle mail only once as much as possible. Kelly and I were blessed with exceptional Administrative Assistants, Elsie Stephens and Gloria Johnson, and Hart with Rachel Dupree. They could send most mail that we should not have received to where it should have gone, and routine mail frequently had a reply already typed, or when there were questions to be answered, the background from the files accompanied the correspondence. This procedure saved a lot of time and I was able to keep up with my correspondence pretty well. When a response required further study or was sent to others that might take some time to resolve, I usually responded so the person would know that the matter was being studied or looked into. I know how much most people hate it if they think that they are getting a run-around. Sometimes they were, but I liked to know that they were and why.

A function frequently performed by the Provost is to substitute for the Chancellor. This occurs very often and usually you know well in advance if there is to be any obligation or speaking at an event. When an organization wants a speaker it seems that most often they want the Chancellor. Sometimes they really do want the Provost and you get invited as a first instead of as a second choice. The most frequent groups to call on the Provost as a first choice were student organizations. There were also times that I was asked to substitute for the Chancellor at the last minute. Sometimes the Chancellor would ask me to fill in for him and would suggest a few things that he wanted to convey to the group. Most of the time, it was the sponsoring group who called and said that they needed someone from the central administration and the Chancellor couldn't come. Would I? The nearest to the last minute case for me was at an event with a large audience at the McKimmon Center I was one of the many administrators who had been invited to mix with the audience during dinner. While I was in the buffet line someone came and said that the Chancellor had called at the last minute and couldn't

come. When I got to the head table, instead of my sitting in the midst of the dignitaries there, I was seated next to the podium. I asked, "Is there something expected of me?" I was told yes, the Chancellor was supposed to speak and we assumed that you would. I asked on what topic, and was told anything that I thought suitable for the audience would be satisfactory. I did know what groups made up the audience. My next question was, how long? I was told, about 15 minutes. This was not an impossible task, so during dinner I jotted down a number of items to discuss, mostly about NCSU, that I thought might be of interest to this group. I took out my watch to be certain that I covered no more than 15 minutes. The talk seemed to be much appreciated and except for two or three persons I don't think others knew quite how impromptu that talk was. When I became Provost, I wanted to be very accurate, precise and to say exactly what I wished. So I read my talks. I soon found that this, for me, resulted in a speech that read better than it sounded. I soon learned that I would give so many welcomes and short talks that it was best to know who the audience was and to jot down a few subjects that would be appropriate. I frequently asked others and especially the person who asked me to speak, to provide me with some information to use in the talk which would be of interest to that audience. I leaned to take the watch out and to try to make certain that I did not talk overtime. I seemed to have given more talks than Dr. Kelly gave, but I may not have been very observant.

Besides giving talks in the absence of the Chancellor, the Provost was considered as the substitute for the Chancellor and was second in command of the University when the Chancellor was not available. Different Chancellors, when on vacation, used different procedures for contacting them. We usually knew pretty well which things the Chancellors wished to be contacted about and which we would be expected to resolve in the absence of the Chancellor. Even so, there were a number of times that Shirley,

Kelly, Hart, and I had to make decisions that we would have preferred that the Chancellor make, but the Chancellor could not be contacted at that time and a decision couldn't wait. I recall one time when both Chancellor Caldwell and Dr. Kelly were overseas and we had, what for me, was a crisis. In the early 1970s a young man, a student from the School of Design, was working and had worked for most of the summer in the Physical Plant. The Director saw him and fired him on the spot. He had long hair, a beard, was bare-footed, and was dressed as sloppily as a student could dress in the early 1970s. The student was determined and he eventually worked his way up the administrative ladder and found me to complain to. He had found no one else who could or would overturn the Director's decision to fire him. As Assistant Provost I was now the top dog in the show. Frankly, he had achieved his desire to look absolutely disreputable and different from all but a very small cadre of students who were on the fringe in their attire. He looked that way and had made no attempt to look presentable when he came to see me. I investigated the case and found from his immediate supervisor that the student had done superlative work all summer, so I said that the Director couldn't fire the student employee. He was to continue at work until the time set initially for the end of this employment, and he did.

The Provosts have never had just one number one priority. The thing that we wanted most was a successful and great education for each and every student. Things such as a faculty of high quality, and all those items from the budget which make it necessary to obtain and retain them were always number one. So were the computers, networking and computing availability and accessibility. The library and its holdings, access to holdings by students and faculty, the associated computerization and accessibility to data bases, and the library's services were number one, too. Affirmative action for both race and gender were our number

one priorities. The undergraduate curricula and the graduate programs, along with those associated components of excellence in teaching, research, and extension, including equipment, supplies, supporting personnel and advising were number one. Learning by students, and their obtaining a quality education, and the associated resources, such as access to computers, necessary tutoring and improved classrooms so as to facilitate learning, were number one. New positions were always needed and were a number one. Improved retention and graduation rates were number one. We all worked on issues involving space, including classroom utilization and its wisest use. Faculty evaluations and our attempts to truly make the reward structure reflect these evaluations were very important. We all looked at the systems for promotion and tenure and worried about whether we were really rewarding excellence and that there was no, or at least only a little, bias in these and in the salary increase processes. When bias was detected we tried to correct it. We also worked on our relationships with other administrators and tried to organize our time so that we could deal with these issues and still have some time so that individuals who had problems could come by for a cup of tea or coffee and talk to us. This list could be much longer. We could never just want one thing as a number one priority. We had to keep a huge array of vital matters and issues balanced and going at the same time. We took advantage of any opportunity at the moment, knowing that another opportunity would come next month or next year for another priority. Sometimes it didn't come for several years, especially in those years when the state recalled substantial resources from our budgets or reduced the budget permanently to meet a State budget shortfall. So the next year might be two or three years away, but it would come. To be a Provost you have to be an opportunist and an optimist and to keep at it. You will lose some, but you will win most of the time if you give yourself the time needed to win. But you have to know what you want to

achieve. What we were looking for from our academic programs was not a list of needs, but a plan from the units which would and could take advantage of opportunities and dreams. Such programs always got our attention. For our number one objective was not to tell faculty or departments what to do or how to do it. The goals and dreams and aspirations of the faculty, staff and students, those were the most important and really the number one priorities.

The Faculty Senate always passes a very nice resolution of appreciation for each of the Deans of the Faculty or Provosts on their retirement or on their leaving the Provost's Office. This is a very nice gesture and it meant a lot to each of us and was very much appreciated as we left. The Trustees did this too, and we received a certificate from the President and the Board of Governors on retirement, but the resolution from the Senate was the one that we prized the most for we were really in the trenches with them.

Responsibilities of Assistant and Associate Provosts, Assistants to, and Coordinators

Kenneth Topfer, who worked for a brief time as Assistant to Dean Shirley, was hired to do studies and reports which increasingly were becoming required by the Board of Higher Education, the University of North Carolina and others. I have not been able to find out where he came from, but he did come from off-campus. The only information that I found was in a letter on July 28, 1960, from Chancellor Caldwell to President Friday. It stated that Topfer would serve both the Dean of the Faculty and the Chancellor in analytical studies involving space, teaching loads, faculty assignments, movement of students et cetera, that had to do with making intelligent budget and planning decisions.

Mr. William H. Simpson was the second Assistant to the Dean and later Assistant to the Provost. He was appointed by Chancellor Caldwell after Dean Shirley left NCSC and before Dean Kelly arrived at NCSC. Dean Kelly would come down to Raleigh about once a week and contacted Mr.

Simpson by phone frequently as he was phasing out of his job at NSF. The Chancellor felt that Dean Kelly would need assistance from someone who knew the campus well. Mr. Simpson moved from the position of Director of Placement in the School of Engineering. Under these arrangements Mr. Simpson transacted most of Dean Kelly's early duties. Duties which Mr. Simpson performed over the years included the following: space studies needed for the allocation of space; the signing of space assignment forms for the Dean (later assumed by Dr. Murray Downs); and oversight of Archives functions and needs. At one time he held responsibility for Courses and Curricula records and was the Provost's liaison with the Courses and Curriculum Committee (Winstead replaced him in this function, and later Downs replaced Winstead); and the Faculty Hospitality Committee. He served as Secretary of the Committee on Committees from its formation until he retired. For a brief time Mr. Simpson served as Affirmative Action Officer between Dr. Clouston Jenkins who had been appointed as Equal Opportunity Officer, and Dr. Larry Clark. Mr. Simpson was appointed to numerous *ad hoc* committees as the Provost's liaison (these included a large number of search committees for administrative officers such as deans, vice chancellors, assistant provosts, the United Way Campaign and many others). After I came to the Provost's Office as an Assistant Provost, Mr. Simpson was also made, on a half-time basis, an Assistant to the Chancellor. He latter replaced Mrs. Helen Mann and became Secretary of the University and held this position until he retired in 1990. Mr. Simpson was a person of great character and had splendid interpersonal skills. He was the perfect person to make calls for the Provost or the Chancellor to determine campus opinion, the feelings of selected faculty, administrators or committee members regarding an issue or a candidate. Another function was to host or to work out housing accommodations and schedules, and to meet and greet very distin-

guished speakers or guests of the University. After Mr. Simpson became Secretary of the University, his service and duties to the Provost's Office decreased. In 1989 Chancellor Poulton assigned him to full-time duties with the Chancellor. Many of Mr. Simpson's other duties are discussed in other sections of this history.

In 1967 I joined Dr. Kelly's staff as Assistant Provost. Many of the functions that I performed will be described in some detail in other sections of this report, but I will mention some them here. Functions assigned to me were: Fort Bragg; the libraries; courses and curricula records; and liaison for the Provost with the Courses and Curriculum Committee. I provided oversight for the EPA Personnel office and reviewed each of the actions proposed by the school deans and made recommendations for action to the Provost. Dr. Clark assumed this function in 1989 but helped in this area after 1974. I represented the university for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and prepared reports for and was the university delegate to meetings of this organization. Dr. Downs assumed this function in 1974. I was a member of the Cooperating Raleigh Colleges Board of Directors, and I represented NCSU as a delegate at meetings of the North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities, and the N. C. Association of Academic Deans. I also represented NCSU in matters that dealt with the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia.

I also provided liaison with the Graduate School since that Dean did not report to the Provost at this time. It had been usual for Dr. Kelly not to know when a new graduate degree program was in a proposal stage until he learned that it had been submitted to the UNC General Administration. I provided counsel to any dean or deans who were in Dr. Kelly's dog house and helped them get needed actions approved. The only dean who never made it to the dog house was Dean A. C. Menius. I handled almost all requests for information and along with Mr. Simpson did reports or drafted reports. We

made numerous studies as required or needed until Dr. Jenkins was hired and then he began to perform these functions. I did planning and prepared Change Budget Requests for the Office or for University-wide academic affairs needs. When I became Provost many of these were prepared by Downs or Clark. With the help of the staff, I revised or devised forms for the office and wrote a large number of drafts of letters for the Provost.

I learned in reading the files, that when I was nominated by the Chancellor for the Ellis L. Phillips Internship, Dr. Kelly preferred another nominee for he had been looking at that individual for the position of Assistant Dean of the Faculty for which I was eventually hired. I came to the position from that of Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences, Assistant Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, Grants Officer for School of Agricultural and Life Sciences, and Professor of Plant Pathology.

Dr. Clauston Jenkins joined the Provost's staff as the Coordinator of Institutional Planning and Studies in 1970. This position was provided by the Board of Higher Education to enable campuses to respond to request for studies and data that they, the University system, federal governmental agencies, and the Legislature were beginning to require. The BHE was required by the Legislature to provide State-wide planning for higher education. Except for the UNC institutions, all of the other public colleges (ECU, WCU, NC A&T et cetera) at that time reported to the BHE. For example all new degrees on any campus including those of the UNC institutions, had to be approved by that agency. Most of the other requests for data, surveys, forms from federal agencies, planning and other items of these types were now handled by Jenkins or else he served as coordinator to see that the proper components of the University completed the forms and provided the required information. Dr. Jenkins started a number of internal studies which were to become useful in providing the Provosts with necessary background for decisions. He was a

graduate of English and a very good writer. One of Dr. Jenkins' most useful functions was report and draft letter writing for the Provost. He also became our first Equal Employment Opportunity Officer. Dr. Jenkins came to the Provost's Office from the University of Wisconsin where he was a faculty member in the English Department and was also on the staff of the general administration of the University of Wisconsin System.

We had three self studies for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools after the creation of the Dean of the Faculty position and before 1993. While these were University-wide in scope and involved large numbers of administrators and faculty, the Provost's Office was always heavily involved. This usually meant at least a year and a half of work in advance of the accreditation visit. For the accreditation in 1963, Mr. Simpson was the Provost Office's representative, in 1973 it was Dr. Jenkins who became the staff person for the Self-Study for that accreditation. I was an associate of his and attended the orientation meeting in Atlanta with him and I did some work on the self study, but Jenkins did most of the hard work and there was a lot of it. For the accreditation in 1984, Dr. Downs was the Provost's representative and worked diligently on the project. Karen Helm was also very much involved as the Director of Planning for NCSU. For the 1984 visit the Chancellor's Office was more involved in the overall development of the plan than prior Chancellors had been.

Dr. Marvin Gehle followed Dr. Jenkins when he left to go to Law School at UNC. Dr. Gehle came to us from the Department of Poultry Science at NCSU. Gehle was selected by Dr. Kelly to replace Jenkins. No committee was appointed, and we were not informed by Dr. Kelly and did not know that Dr. Gehle was under consideration for the appointment until Dr. Gehle was hired. Dr. Gehle did most of the functions performed by Dr. Jenkins except that he was less involved in draft letter writing. Dr. Gehle's greatest strength and his greatest contribu-

tions were that he was a whiz with computers and could write computer programs. He enabled us to begin to have programs that could be used to get the computer to draw together data so that the amount of time needed to prepare a specific report was lessened. This was fortunate because Administrative Data Processing did not have an adequate staff to handle many of the Provost's needs in this area. His talent was also needed because the number of reports were increasing exponentially. It seemed that with the advent of the computer, all agencies wanted us to provide more and more data and reports so that they could generate more and more data and reports. It almost drove us crazy, for many of the things that we compiled seemed to be nonsense in explaining what went on at NCSU and questions frequently were not asked in such a way that they meshed with our data or with our administrative structure. So Dr. Gehle was essential to our survival and his efforts enabled us to meet the ever increasing demand from various off-campus agencies, the BHE, the UNC System, other State and federal agencies, a variety of accreditation bodies and others. Many of Dr. Gehle's programs continued to be used by Administrative Data Processing and Institutional Research for several years until other languages and programs became more effective. He left us to go to work in industry, and this position was then transferred to Institutional Research, which was then under Student Affairs, to continue to provide these functions for the Provost.

The next group of Assistant or Associate Provosts were Dr. Leroy Martin, Dr. Henry Schaffer and Dr. William Willis. Each of these were in charge of academic computing and in some cases administrative computing. Their functions will be covered in Chapter Six under the section on the Computing Center. Each has served as the Provost's representative on the Welfare and Benefit's Committee, and a variety of other ad hoc committees.

Dr. Murray Downs joined the Provost's staff in 1974 from the History Department

where he was a Professor. Dr. Downs' primary responsibilities were for maintaining course and curricula records, coordinating the review and approval of undergraduate academic programs and assisting the Faculty Senate and Council of Associate Deans in the development and implementation of undergraduate academic policy. Dr. Downs maintained the list of courses designated for Laboratory and Computer Fees and resolved complaints and difficulties in this arena. He also represented the Provost in matters involving teaching effectiveness and evaluation. He oversaw the allocation of the mini-grants for the improvement of teaching in undergraduate courses and for innovative experiments to bring computers into the improvement of undergraduate classroom instruction. He received proposals for processing and forwarded these two types of proposals to the Teaching Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee who reviewed and recommended recipients. Funds were allocated by the Provost after budgets were developed and approved by Dr. Downs.

Downs also was responsible for coordinating the publication of the *Undergraduate Catalog*, the *Advisers' Handbook* and the *Handbook for Teachers*. He was at first responsible for the development of these two handbooks and then assisted, which means he provided the leadership, in their annual revisions. Professor A. S. Knowles prepared the *Faculty Handbook* which was published in 1971. Downs had chief responsibility to rewrite and to revise the *Faculty Handbook* and in consultation with the Faculty Senate to keep it up-to-date. Prior to Down's assumption of this function, Mr. Simpson was responsible for the *Faculty Handbook*.

Dr. Downs provided liaison with the University Government Committee, the Registration Records and Calendar Committee, the University Teaching Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee, the Merit Awards Program, the University Honors Council, and the Study Abroad Office. He chaired the Coordinating Committee for Undergraduate Advising and an ad hoc committee to study the appropriate roles of

coaches, academic support personnel, and faculty in monitoring, advising, and motivating student athletes.

In 1976-77 either Dr. Downs or I, or in our absence Simpson or Clark, were still approving the late drops for all undergraduate students. It was at this time that I decided to delegate this responsibility to the associate deans for academic affairs in each school, for we rarely did more than rubber stamp their requests for approval, and for the students it was another step and hassle of getting something approved. A little later there were complaints of unevenness in the late drop approvals. It was stated that certain schools were very tight on late drops and that others were granting them easily. It was at this time that Dr. Downs and the Council of Associate Deans looked at what each was doing in this area and discussed the rationales that each was using. We never got uniformity of action, but at least there was better understanding of what was really going on instead of just listening to the rumor mill, which wasn't very accurate. He provided liaison with two sequential university committees appointed to study and revise our general education requirements. After the second committee made its report he helped the campus to develop new general education requirements and to get them into each unit's curricula. The committee was appointed during my tenure; however, the committee made its report while Hart was Provost.

Dr. Downs should be appreciated for all of his efforts to enhance the quality of undergraduate education, for he did so very much on a day by day basis in his many years of contribution and unselfish service. He, more than any other single University administrator, was responsible for our undergraduate program. Among his other contributions, I am proud of his leading the transition of Academic Skills to the Division of Undergraduate Studies. He became the Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies in 1990 in addition to his other duties. Dr. Downs continued as a member of the Provost's staff as of July 1, 1993.

Downs also drafted and wrote many new policies and revisions of policies for the Provost and the Chancellor, and he handled a variety of odd and end jobs. His responsibilities will be described in more detail in several other chapters.

Dr. Lawrence M. Clark came to NCSU from Florida State University on July 1, 1974 where he was Professor of Mathematics and Mathematics Education. The most important function of Dr. Clark's was to be NCSU's Affirmative Action Officer. In this role he also responded to governmental questionnaires and handled investigations at NCSU related to discrimination based on race, gender, handicap and age. He helped the administrators and the faculty to understand issues relating to race and helped more than any other individual to change the climate at NCSU to a less racist one. He, along with Gus Witherspoon and all of our African-American faculty and EPA staff have helped our campus to be far more supportive of African-American students, faculty and staff. When Dr. Clark came to NCSU we began to meet with leaders in the Raleigh Black Community. At that time we were considered to be a very red-necked and racist institution. These Black citizens in the community began to advise and help us to learn better ways to meet our affirmative action objectives. He was responsible for the creation of the Chancellor's African-American Community Leaders Advisory Committee. Over the years, and especially at first, these wonderful citizens advised us and helped us make changes and include activities so that NCSU could become a place where previously denied populations would have a chance to succeed and where they could succeed. We haven't reached our goal as well as we would have liked, but we have come a long way. I remember when one prominent person said that no child of his would ever attend NCSU, but later one did, and he did extraordinarily well here. Dr. Clark was a primary source of help in our efforts to recruit and retain African-American faculty. Although he was not called an ombudsman, both faculty and students came

to him to talk about their problems, and he often helped them to resolve their problems. As of 1993, he continues on the Provost's staff. Much more will be discussed about Dr. Clark's roles in the following chapters and especially in Chapter Four.

During the fiscal year of 1981-1982 I served as Acting Chancellor. During this time I continued to handle a few of the Provost's functions, such as promotions, tenure and salary increases. I assigned several functions to both Clark and Downs, so that whoever was in could handle most of the matters which required the Provost's signature. Downs handled all of the recommendations that came from the Faculty Senate and most of the academic proposals, and Clark handled most of the personnel matters. I assigned the responsibility to Associate Provost Martin, Vice Provost and Dean Henry Smith, Vice Provost and Dean Vivian Stannett, and director I. T. Littleton for final approvals for their units except for matters concerning themselves. I continued to sign the forms which involved them and policy proposals. Mrs. Gloria Johnson continued to serve as my Administrative Assistant in the Chancellor's Office.

Dr. Augustus Witherspoon came to the Provost's Office in 1989 from the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Botany. I had begun to realize the need for additional help in the area of undergraduate affairs dealing with the academic performance and problems of our African-American students. This was in addition to that which Dr. Clark could provide, for he had so many other responsibilities. I came to recognize that we needed this position more than I had thought when I substituted for Chancellor Poulton at a grievance hearing that our African-American students held one evening in the Stewart Theater of the Student Center. I did not know what to expect, and had anticipated that I was going to answer questions of what the Chancellor and Provost were doing to try to enhance the academic success of African-American students. The questions started out with: Did you know? Or why did

you let? It seemed to me that the students had put together all their complaints here at NCSU and directed them to me for a response. Some complaints dealt with those that I had been working hardest on to solve. Others dealt with matters that were occurring or had occurred in one or more departments or classrooms that I had never heard before. Some even were things that had happened at other universities. One thing that upset the students was that the data they had on black faculty was in error and I corrected their data. Someone in Institutional Research had given them data but had omitted all black faculty who had any administrative responsibilities, including assistant department heads and a number of other professors who had some part-time administrative duties. I recall a young man accusing me of fabricating the numbers for my own staff had given him other figures which he thought were correct. We had worked hard on the recruitment and hiring of black faculty and while I would have liked to have had more success, I felt that we were doing better than any other predominantly white institution that I knew. There were a number of other issues raised that night which emphasized the need for an Associate Provost whose responsibilities dealt with a greater interface with African-American students. When the opportunity came and we were able to get the funds we did create this facilitator position. While not all of Witherspoon's duties dealt with African-American issues, most did. Any assignment might be given to this position on an *ad hoc* basis. In time the position's responsibilities came to include helping Dr. Clark and Dr. Downs in the interview process of all associate professors and in reviewing and making recommendations for faculty promotion and tenure. Dr. Witherspoon worked with Dr. Downs in the planning for the college dean reviews. As the facilitator of African-American Affairs, responsibilities included the University Recruitment and Retention Programs, the programmatic activities of the African-American Cultural Center, a liaison role with African-American faculty and staff

organizations and advisor to academic African-American student organizations. He also served as a facilitator to bring greater sharing and exchange of ideas and successes among the Coordinators of African-American Studies' positions in each of the Schools and Colleges. He began to acquire information of successful activities at other universities and shared them with these coordinators. This position serves as an ex-officio officer for the Chancellor's Advisory Council and the Chancellor's African-American Community Leaders Advisory Committee.

Witherspoon developed a course for all African-American freshmen where the objectives were similar to those developed for the freshman course in Undergraduate Studies. Another major effort was to see the African-American Cultural Center come into being. He worked on this effort for many years before he joined my staff. As Associate Provost he planned the development of the academic component of the program of this center. Other functions will be covered in the Chapter Four. He continued in the position in 1993.

Dr. Rebecca Leonard came to us in 1990 as Assistant Provost from the Department of Communication where she was an Associate Professor. She had worked on several projects for the Provost on race and gender on a part-time basis over the years. Her first responsibility was to organize a freshman course intended to try to help more students survive, to get off to a better start, to learn where to get help and to ensure that they got help before they were lost. Her responsibilities as Director of the First Year Experience Program were to develop the course, to get the teachers and to manage the course and the program so as to assist first year students to make a successful transition to NCSU. About 10% of the freshman class entered the program during its first year. While only a small segment of the students were served, the retention of these freshmen and their grade point averages improved at least a little. The success of the effort will, of course, be told if our retention rates and in time our graduation

rates improve with the use of this course, and its subsequent revisions. It began to be revised even as it was taught the first time. (Graduation rates also will be influenced by the reduction in hours required for graduation which occurred in the revision of curricula in 1994.) During this time Dr. Leonard also held the title of Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Studies.

As Dr. Leonard's responsibilities phased out of work with freshmen, Dr. Hart began to add responsibilities in other areas. She assisted the Provost with special projects, such as processing information, data collection and drafting reports. Like all the other Assistant and Associate Provosts she drafted policy proposals, position statements, many of the Provost's responses and advised the Provost regarding policies and procedures. She helped by organizing and monitoring processes. She was the Provost's representative to the NCSU Quality Steering Team and helped develop the training program for Continuous Quality Improvement, including basic orientation training and training for CQI trainers and facilitators. She also conducted training sessions.

A responsibility which I had contemplated adding to the many others, was that of Coordinator of Gender Concerns. We had Dr. Leonard's agenda too full, but I understand that responsibility was finally added in 1994.

Personnel Office

One of the first assignments of the Dean of the Faculty was to establish personnel policies and procedures and to maintain records of appointments, promotions, salaries, contracts, terminations et cetera. It was in 1961, late in Shirley's tenure at NCSC, that a full-time SPA employee was hired to handle the implementation of these functions. S. A. Chick was the first to begin to establish order and to develop a system out of very limited records. Recently a faculty member who started teaching at NCSC before World War II retired and was surprised to learn that these records did not include his first four years of service at

NCSU. Fortunately that was not a serious problem for the N. C. Retirement System had his correct record of years employed. Not much progress was made in organizing the personnel files until Mary Strickland was hired in 1965. At that time, Mrs. Strickland was the only full-time person assigned to these purposes. By the time that Mrs. Strickland retired in 1989, the number of persons working in the office had grown considerably along with a similar expansion of functions performed. Others who have had major responsibilities include: Linda Snyder, Karin Wolfe, Beverly Cable, Gail Finch and Tara Britt. Each has made significant contributions to the development of the personnel records system. With an increase in reporting requirements came computerization and extensive detail in the records of all persons hired. Initially computer assistance was provided by Dr. Gehle and Administrative Data Processing for programs and systems. Later we hired some undergraduate students on a part-time basis who knew how to formulate and implement computer programs. At first Mrs. Strickland handled our relationship with student programmers and with those in Administrative Data Processing. Then we added Mrs. Snyder to make statistical studies, to interface with and to provide liaison with the programmers and systems personnel and to insure that we could generate on the computer the required and the desired reports. We soon reached the stage that Administrative Data Processing could no longer provide many of our programming needs. We then added Gail Finch to the staff for this purpose and after she left us, Todd Driver joined us to perform these functions. Although we had employed many male students in the Personnel Office, Driver was the first full-time male to be hired in the office. Along with computerization came increases in staff and an extensive expansion in the detail of the records of each faculty member and of the other EPA employees. Some of these reports provided information needed by the Chancellor, the Provost, the schools, the departments, the Faculty Senate, or by

other administrative units. Much of the material was necessary to provide information that could be retrieved for reports required by the BOG, State agencies or various offices of the federal government. An example of these were the HEGIS reports of the federal government which made it necessary to classify faculty using a nationally standardized group of occupations. These did not mesh with our departmental or college/school structure. While these were probably useful to someone for national reports on manpower, we had to maintain an administrative unit classification for use on our campus. An example of a classification was plant physiologists. We employed them in at least six departments in two different schools. Our interest was in which administrative units they functioned, and not that they had a doctorate in Plant Physiology.

A Personnel Payroll and Position Control system was implemented. We now began to code and to process not only the personnel forms but also to enter the records in the computer system. Some additional records that we now could maintain and obtain more easily included off-campus scholarly assignments, leaves, and salary histories by person, rank, race, gender with departmental, school/college, and University averages. With the advent of the computer the employment history of each EPA employee could be maintained and retrieved without cumbersome hand-kept records. Composite or groupings of information could be retrieved for reports.

This office did the AAUP salary study until the BOG staff began to maintain computerized records on the EPA employees of each campus, and then the Personnel Office and Institutional Research had to verify the accuracy of the generated report. The BOG's records necessitated some additional standardization of records for each of the 16 campuses. Later, after the transfer of the Institutional Studies and Planning position to Institutional Research, almost all of the federal reports were prepared there.

The keeping of computerized records on each individual enabled the office to handle a variety of functions more easily and quickly. These included both salary increases and promotions. An example was the calculation for salary allocations to units under the requirements and guidelines imposed by the Chancellor, the Provost, the BOG and the Legislature. To insure compliance with these guidelines, the staff reviewed the salary recommendations from the schools for each faculty member and added appropriate notes such as the number of times that the faculty member had been selected as an Outstanding Teacher. They also checked the total sums of the salaries recommended to make certain that the schools had awarded increases only in the amounts previously allocated under each of the budget codes for increase funds could not be transferred from the instructional budget code. They prepared the promotion and data summary sheets and checked the personnel data on the promotion and tenure recommendations to insure accuracy. These records were then used to inform and consult with the Chancellor on matters of interest to him. It was also used to provide information so that the Associate and Assistant Provosts, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Vice Chancellor for Extension could participate in the promotion's reviews. The information was then used in the hearings and reviews by the Provost with each dean on salary increase, promotion, tenure and non-reappointment recommendations.

This office also prepares the Trustee Reports on Personnel and the reports on Personnel that were sent by the Chancellor to the Board of Governors via the UNC administrators. All letters of appointment, tenure, and non-reappointment sent by the Chancellor were prepared for the Chancellor's signature. The general letters that was used as form letters for different types of appointments had been developed by this staff for review and approval by the Provost and the University Attorney. Those who have been responsible for these activi-

ties have included Helen Mann, when the Chancellor's Office handled the letters, Mary Strickland, Linda Spencer, and Rebekah Ingle.

The personnel in this Office have been the major resource for information on University Policies and Procedures concerning faculty, other EPA employees and their salaries. They were called upon by the entire campus to provide such information. While the Provost or the Associate Provost who oversees the Personnel Office also answer questions, the campus has come to depend primarily on the personnel in this Office. They have also been called upon to provide individual personnel information as required by State Statute, to be accessible upon request by persons who are citizens of the State. While the Office reports to the Provost, it provided oversight of the Office after I became Assistant Provost, and Dr. Clark performed this function under Hart and Stiles.

Computer files are also maintained by this office for all graduate students who hold teaching or research assistantships including term of appointment and the sources and the amount of stipend. The person responsible approved all appointments except those that exceeded stipend guidelines, those that appeared questionable, or those that violated policies. The persons with this responsibility have resolved most of these difficulties. A few could not be resolved by the staff, and those were referred to the Provost or to Dr. Clark for resolution. I recall a few cases where the graduate student appeared on appointments and payrolls from two or even three units so as to be employed over 100% of the time, or the appointment exceeded limits that were set for a graduate assistant who was carrying a one-half time graduate course load. Of course these were corrected prior to implementation.

At first this group prepared the personnel information for the Payroll Office and kept personnel data in manual records for many years. Later they coded this information, but it was entered into the

computer records by others in Administrative Data Processing. Do you remember the key punch cards and tapes? Today these employees enter the information on each faculty member, other EPA employees, and graduate students, along with the appropriation budget codes needed for payrolls directly into the computer. They also enter all other personnel information and maintain or write the computer programs needed to retrieve the information as necessary for reports.

One frequent complaint was that it took too long to get someone appointed. Rarely was the delay caused by the personnel office. More often it was related to the personnel forms being submitted too late to be included in that month's payroll, or at times submitted forms did not mesh with the approval dates for Trustee or BOG approval. In 1962 there was a complaint from Dean Lampke. He said that it took several months to get a particular professor appointed. It had taken from January 10 until February 7 for internal administrative approvals. The greatest delay was that the form for appointment took two weeks to get signed by the Dean of the Graduate School. Final approval by the Trustees took an additional three weeks. At this time approvals of appointments and their signatures were required of the Graduate Dean, who checked to be certain that all new appointments of associate professor and professor were members of the graduate faculty, the Business Manager, whose staff checked to make certain that there were funds in the appointing unit's budget, the Chancellor and the Dean of the Faculty. The Dean of the Graduate School, The Dean of the Faculty and the Chancellor had all interviewed the prospective faculty member. We later dropped the signatures of the Graduate Dean and the Chancellor for internal campus processing and required only the Provost's and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business's signatures.

When NCSU got our own Trustees, it increased the approvals required for all appointments with tenure, terms of appoint-

ment of more than a year and for certain salary levels as specified by the Trustees' Personnel Committee. We were asked by the Personnel Committee to save items for retroactive approvals rather than to have extra meetings of the Personnel Committee or to send the Personnel Committee so many reports by mail for their approval. It was usually necessary to have their approval before an item could be sent to the Board of Governors; however, all salary increases for continuing employees during the year usually required the approval of the President's staff and some by the BOG. Only appointments conferring tenure, appointments of senior administrators, or salaries of new appointees exceeding the salary maxima for a particular rank, required BOG approval.

The BOG did not like to receive or make retroactive approvals. The Personnel Office began to send out calendars of meetings of both the Trustees and of the BOG to all deans, directors, vice chancellors, and department heads so as to avoid delays in personnel actions. This helped, but it did not solve all of the delay problems. Especially troublesome were those actions received after the deadline for submission to the BOG. We could always, and frequently did take supplements to our NCSU Trustees. Approvals for January caused us a serious problem for salary increases of continuing employees and for the appointment of tenured personnel. The BOG did not meet from early November until the second Friday in January. A number of appointments and salary increases were usually proposed for January 1. These frequently got to us too late for the November meeting. The result was that the salary increase or the appointment could not be implemented until the afternoon after the BOG's morning meeting. Our NCSU Trustees' Personnel Committee usually had four meetings, including one by mail in late June to handle actions to become effective on July 1. Additional appointments for the fall semester could always be taken to them retroactively at their September meeting.

Units sometimes sent in papers too late to get them included in the payroll for that month, and wanted us to pay by manual checks. We of course were always willing to try to do this, for it was never the employee's fault that the papers arrived too late. Each transaction took a lot of time and the State Auditor began to complain about the large number of such transactions. Certain administrative units seemed to have excessive numbers of manual payroll requests and to have some almost every month. In fact, almost all came from these few units. Mr. Worsley and I simply had to inform these units that we would not continue to process their manual requests. Since this was considered a sin by the auditors and was an expensive matter, we had to reduce the numbers of manual checks and had to stop using this method except for real emergencies.

The staff kept all of these actions in balance with an inadequate number of personnel, and sometimes almost accomplished miracles by only occasionally working overtime to get the salary increases or appointments entered on time to meet deadlines. This has been a great group of staff to work with and the entire campus is indebted to their Herculean efforts.

Deans' Council

The school/college deans have always exerted a great deal of power and influence at NCSU. While Shirley and Kelly were Deans of the Faculty, deans were the majority on and dominated the Administrative Council. Chancellors and Provosts have always called the deans together to discuss issues of importance or in an emergency, when needed. After Chancellor Thomas came, the deans expressed concern that they did not have the opportunity to meet without all of the members of the Administrative Council being present. By this time the Administrative Council had grown until it was quite large so that the deans no longer constituted a majority of its members. They wanted a regularly scheduled time when they could discuss matters of concern to all of them and to their schools more privately

with the Chancellor and the Provost. We began to have regular meetings with the deans at scheduled intervals. Schedules were announced at least a semester and sometimes a year in advance. In time this came to follow the Administrative Council meetings, for the deans found this to be the best time for their schedules. We usually met over lunch. After Chancellor Poulton came we began to meet for lunch in the Chancellor's residence and the Vice Chancellor for Research became a regular member.

The Provost presided over this Deans' Council and developed the agenda. The Chancellor and the Provost always had some items which they added to the agenda, but most agenda items were those requested by the deans. Items were sometimes requested by others who had matters that they wanted the deans to hear and consider. These others would then be scheduled and invited to present an issue or to participate in the discussion when appropriate. This was especially useful when we had a major study, which the deans might read in advance and then question the chairman of the study. Matters of concern or issues that deans wished to discuss would be given to me to schedule, and in a case of an emergency we could add an item at the last moment; however, we all liked to have the matter, if complicated, in writing well in advance of the meeting so that we could get together pertinent facts, or the deans could discuss in advance the matter with others and determine how the matter would affect them. We frequently started a discussion on an item and put it back on the agenda for a later meeting.

We did not keep minutes and rarely took votes, but a lot of decisions were made or consensus was reached. All policy matters involving academic issues passed by the Faculty Senate would be sent to the deans in advance and placed on the agenda after the deans had time to seek input from their department heads and faculty. Similarly, issues sent by BOG, salary increase restrictions and schedules, schedules for other personnel matters et cetera were discussed.

We later realized that the deans would likely profit from discussions of accomplishments that were occurring in the various schools. It was surprising how little one dean might know about the activities and programs in another school. So a dean's presentation became the first agenda item at each meeting. These reports were scheduled months in advance, and this came to be one of the best components of our meetings.

The Chancellors always insisted that the deans be present. After several meetings with one or more deans absent, Chancellor Poulton told the deans they were expected to attend and that if they couldn't come they could not send a substitute. This helped attendance a little, but there was no way all of the deans could make it all of the time. This turned out to be a disadvantage for it prevented that school's input on some issues and caused me to have to try to catch the absent deans to get them up to date and to gain his/her perspective on the matters discussed. We then came to require a substitute when a dean could not be present. When Monteith became Interim Chancellor these meetings moved to the Alumni Building .

During Hart's term as Provost the title was changed to the University Academic Policy Council and its membership was expanded and included each of the vice chancellors. This change was effective April 28, 1992. Its responsibilities were to advise the Chancellor and Provost on academic, research and extension issues and policy. The Provost continued to chair the council and set the agenda.

Policy recommendations from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School or the Vice Chancellor for Research and Extension will routinely come before the Council for review. The Chancellor may request that the Provost place on the agenda other matters and policy recommendations from the other Vice Chancellors or recommendations from the Faculty Senate. Other members of the council may also place

a matter on the agenda for consideration by the Council.

The Council will meet to consider major issues and policy at least once each month during the academic year and with advance notice during the summer. When meetings discuss major issues and policy, the agenda will be announced at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting and sufficient information will be provided at that time to permit advance consideration of the topics.

Council may form advisory committees that report to the Council.

Apart from the Council, the Deans of each College (no substitutes) and the Provost will normally meet for informal discussion once each month. These meetings would be chaired on a rotating basis, by a Dean.

Members of this Council include the Provost (Chair), Chancellor, (ex officio), Dean of each School/College, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business, Vice Chancellor for Research and Extension, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement, and University Counsel (ex officio, on invitation).

Cooperating Raleigh Colleges

Cooperating Raleigh Colleges began in 1967 as a cooperative arrangement with Meredith College. In 1968 President Bruce Heilman of Meredith College talked to Chancellor Caldwell about the concept of extending this to all of the Raleigh Colleges that offered work leading to or transferable toward baccalaureate degrees. In 1968 the program began with Meredith College, North Carolina State University, Peace College, Shaw University, St. Augustine's College, and St. Mary's College as members. At first the idea was to allow students from the campuses to register on another campus for a limited number of courses that were not taught on the home campus. We already had some arrangements with Shaw University and with St. Augustine's College making

some courses available to their students in limited areas too. An arrangement was made so that students could register for courses on another campus at the same time that they registered, using a special form, on their home campus without having to go to the other campus to register. The registrars did the paper work needed to enroll the students in the appropriate classes. If classes, such as piano at Meredith or computing classes at NCSU had special fees, the students had to pay these, but the home institutions would transfer the appropriate tuition to the institution that delivered the course so that the students did not have to pay extra tuition. Tuition was collected at the home institution and NCSU was reimbursed for those attending classes at NCSU as appropriate for in-state or out-of-state residence. A flat charge per course was made at the other institutions. Student services would be provided by the home institutions.

Each campus paid annual dues to cover the operational costs of the program of CRC including the director's salary. Office space has been provided by the hosting institution. For most of this time that has been Meredith College and for a period when Dr. J. P. Freeman was director by St. Augustine's. When the group was just beginning, the Board of Higher Education allocated funds to NCSU to go towards the costs of this inter-institutional program. Fiscal services have been provided by Meredith College at no charge to CRC.

In the initial organizational meeting NCSU had two delegates, Chancellor Caldwell and me. It had been decided by Caldwell and Kelly that I would be the chief person on the NCSU campus to provide the necessary liaison and effort to make NCSU as helpful as possible, and that I was to be the contact person for the other campuses. The Chancellor and I both became members of the Board of Directors, but he attended meetings only occasionally. When I became Provost I decided that I would continue to be the NCSU working representative rather than to delegate this to one of

my associates. As a result, I became Vice President of CRC three times, once to fill an unexpired term, and President twice. When Monteith assumed the Chancellorship at NCSU he became an active participant in CRC affairs, and in the spring of 1993 he became Vice President, the first time that a NCSU Chancellor has held office in CRC.

Soon this cooperation grew to include use of the libraries on each campus by those students enrolled in courses. The home library assumed the responsibility to get books back if they were not returned by the students on time. While faculty use of the libraries had been occurring for years, the CRC arrangement reminded faculty of the opportunity to avail themselves of resources on the other campuses. A number of other arrangements came in time. For example, if there was a need for a whole class rather than for a few students, faculty would teach an entire course on the other campus. In some cases faculty pay was handled as released time so that the person was paid by the home institution, but appropriate funds were transferred to the home institution. In some others the borrowed faculty, with approval, assumed the teaching role on the other campus on an overload basis and the borrowing institution paid the faculty member directly. This was a useful activity for us, especially when we needed a course but did not need a full-time faculty member in that field, or we needed just one additional section. I had hoped that this practice would come to be used more; however, it seemed that after a few years the popularity of the course was such that we then needed to have a full-time faculty member.

It was truly amazing how many courses there were that were taught only on one of the six campuses. This was very helpful, for we had some students who took the equivalent of a minor at other colleges. Examples at Meredith were home economics and the courses needed for certification in early childhood education. Several of the campuses taught more instrumental music courses than NCSU. Shaw and Saint August-

ine enriched our course availability especially in Black Studies. In time these came to be called African-American courses. Although we began to offer Swahili, few students from other campuses took these language courses. A number of students from the other campuses took advanced science courses at NCSU. We developed cooperative Engineering programs with both St. Augustine's and Shaw, and had a collaborative program in Psychology with St. Augustine's. Most student exchanges for NCSU occurred between NCSU and Meredith. One of the major problems in student exchange was parking on the other campus, and especially on the NCSU campus. Both Shaw and St. Augustine's provided transportation for their students.

A number of other activities came into being. A very successful one was the collaborative efforts of the CRC teachers of writing with the public schools teachers of English and writing. Another fruitful collaboration was among the Psychology faculty. In later years the campuses were collaborators in getting a channel on cable television that provided time for CRC's institutions televised courses and for announcing activities of the various campuses. The academic affairs associate deans at NCSU from the Schools of ALS, Education, SHASS, and PAMS met regularly with the academic Vice Presidents of the Cooperating Colleges to resolve academic matters and to keep abreast with what was going on. Associate Provost Downs met with this group.

I have not tried to cover all the many activities of this organization. CRC has published annual reports that are available and give much more detail about the activities and accomplishments of this Consortium. It certainly has been of far more value to the participating institutions than the dues which have been paid by its members. Directors of CRC have all been adjunct faculty at NCSU. They were John Yarborough, Austin Connors, J. P. Freeman and Rosemary Gates.

Other Organizations

Dean Shirley participated in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) as did each of his successors. I do not recall any of us becoming the Chairman for the NASULGC academic group, but we all served on a variety of committees. This was NCSU's major national group and it was attended by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellors, the CALS administrators and the Dean of Veterinary Medicine. Another organization which Dr. Shirley, Dr. Kelly and I participated in was the NASULGC Southern Regional meetings. This was a small unit and the only participants from a Land Grant College in the South were the Chancellor, the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School. This organization died a slow death primarily because the Chancellors and Presidents (who were to serve as presidents of this group) began to come only when they were elected as president. The provosts or vice presidents served the organization as vice president and program chairman, and the deans of the graduate schools as secretary-treasurer. Dr. Kelly and I both served as VP and Program Chairman while it was a thriving group.

Shirley was active in the Academic Deans of North Carolina and while President of that organization he provided leadership in getting the group to become affiliated with the North Carolina College Conference. This relationship continued and I became President of the Academic Deans of N. C. later. Dean Shirley was elected to serve as President of the N. C. College Conference but had to resign before his term began when he accepted the position of Vice President at the University of Delaware. When he was elected as Chairman of the North Carolina Conference of Colleges he proposed that this organization merge with the Negro College Conference of North Carolina. This merger did take place but after Shirley had left for Delaware. In 1967 when I joined the Provost's staff I began to represent NCSU as Hart did while he was Provost, in both of these organiza-

tions. I later became Vice President and President of the N. C. Association of Colleges and Universities (NCACU), the organization had a name change. I served on the Board of Directors for a number of years. The two organization met with the Academic Deans meeting in the morning prior to the meeting of the NCACU that afternoon. The State organization for higher education did not take much time except when you were an officer. The office that was most demanding was that of the Vice President, for that person had to coordinate the development of the next year's program. The second most difficult job was that of chairman for local arrangements, and I did that job when the group met in Raleigh.

In 1958 Shirley served as a consultant to NSF on a program for State Academies of Science. Dean Kelly maintained a close relationship with NSF and also continued to be very active through NSF with Japanese science and scientists. The Japanese scientists gave Dr. Kelly credit for saving science in that country when Dr. Kelly was Science Advisor under General MacArthur in the occupational forces following World War II. Few foreigners have been as appreciated as Dr. Kelly was by the Japanese scientists. He was awarded one of the highest honors for Japanese scholars and scientists when he was awarded the Order of Sacred Treasure. I believe this is as distinguished an award as a foreigner can receive from Japan. In 1969 the U. S. Department of State presented Dr. Kelly a Certificate of Merit for his work in international relations. I believe that these two awards are those of which Dr. Kelly would be most proud.

Dr. Kelly was very active in, and helped to organize, an informal organization of the Deans of the Eastern States. Shirley was also very active representing the University of Delaware in this group of chief academic officers. This organization included both private and public colleges and universities in the states that touched the Atlantic. We continued to go or send a Provost's representative to most of these meetings. The host was responsible for developing the

program, and most presentations were by members.

Soon after the demise of the Southern NASULGC, the provosts and academic VPs of the one or two major research public universities in each of the Southeastern states began to meet. From N. C. this meant UNC-CH and NCSU. The programs of this organization gave me more help than those of any other organization whose meetings I attended. All of the member institutions had many concerns and issues in common and the programs were very informal and unstructured. We had no officers and the program was arranged by the academic officer of the host institution, but it involved the attendees. The members usually did the presentations on current issues of concern to the academic types present. One requirement was that the presentations be short and that time be allocated for lengthy discussions. Southeastern in this case included Texas and Arkansas, Kentucky, West Virginia and Maryland, and all the states in between.

The Provost attended the American Council on Education from time to time. I attended once under Thomas and twice under Poulton. Our closest relationship with ACE was through the Administrative Internship Program. NCSU sent several into the program and hosted several. Our involvement in this ACE program is discussed in Chapter Three.

Provosts did not have very large travel budgets. In fact they and the VC for Finance and Business usually were at home on the campus much more than the other vice chancellors and the school deans. While a couple of regional and national meetings are necessary to keep up with what is going on in academic higher education and to meet others in the field so that you can share solutions to problems, they can become repetitious in their programs. It seemed to me that these organizations also had a tendency to proliferate committees and that soon these all required travel for meetings too. These subcommittees could, more than the annual organization's meetings, lead to an excess of travel. It would

have been very easy to serve on too many committees. It seemed that it was the ambition of many associates to get to become presidents or chairmen of as many organizations and committees as possible. I am certain that it looked good on a resume' for those seeking another position. We also sent our staff to attend some of the meetings because they needed to keep up and to have contacts too. One of the first budget lines frozen by the state was the travel line. This reduced travel to a lot of out-of state meetings during my tenure.

I always thought that it was very necessary to participate in the affairs of the UNC System and in the State educational organizations for in these you could learn and at times be helpful. The UNC System's meetings were not excessively demanding of the Provosts for they held only two regular meetings a year. We met with the VP or other members of the BOG staff individually, or with a group from NCSU, more often about matters that affected NCSU. One of the informal groups that I found helpful was the occasional sessions that the Provosts or Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs from UNC-CH, UNC-G, ECU, UNC-W, and NCSU had to discuss issues that we were facing or resolving on our own campuses. We usually met for lunch at the NCSU Faculty Club.

While I was Acting Chancellor I had a chance to serve on the Board of Directors of both the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) and on the Board of the Triangle Universi-

ties Consortium for Advanced Studies (TUCASI). When Chancellor Poulton first came I was appointed to the working group of representatives from the campuses of Duke, UNC Chapel Hill, and NCSU on both boards. This was enormously helpful to me in understanding their programs and in referring matters to the appropriate places on our campus thereby helping to accomplish our shared goals and objectives. Chancellor Poulton then decided that the Dean of Engineering and the VC for Research would be NCSU's representatives on RTI, but I continued to be on TUCASI. When Monteith became Acting Chancellor he appointed me as his replacement on the RTI Board and I continued on RTI until I retired. Hart, as Provost, continued to be on RTI and continued on the board of TUCASI; however, the Dean of the Graduate School replaced me on the working group of TUCASI.

In 1984 the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics was placed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The Legislature, in placing this responsibility under the BOG, also wrote into the statute that the chief academic officers of NCSU, NCA&T State University, Duke and UNC-CH would serve as members of the Board of Trustees of that school. I served from that time until 1990. Hart served until 1993, and now Stiles represents NCSU.

CHAPTER TWO

ACADEMIC MATTERS AND DEGREES

Advising

On February 9, 1960, the Faculty Senate undertook a study "of the underlying purposes and objectives of the system of academic advising, and of the extent to which the present system of academic advising is meeting these objectives." The Student Affairs Committee of the Senate, with additional representatives from schools not represented on that committee, undertook the study. The report of this committee is found in the May 10, 1960, Senate minutes. This report said that the adviser should be more than a scheduler and that the student must feel that he or she can discuss any or all problems with their adviser. Personal problems that are too difficult for the adviser to handle should be referred to the Counseling Service. It was pointed out that there was a lack of administrative appreciation of the time involved, a lack of administrative interest in good advising, and the sheer numbers of students assigned may be basic to the problem. Among the many recommendations was a system of preregistration, which did get adopted. A general academic program for students who did not choose a major upon admission to the schools was also suggested. A General College was proposed by the committee, but this was changed by the Senate to a general program in each school. This came into being very much later for all colleges while Poulton was Chancellor in response to his study of a General College. It was also proposed to extend the drop date for courses to five weeks after the beginning of the semester. "Advising should be recognized as a part of the work load and should be recognized as important by the administration." This was accepted by the administration. It was also suggested that some graduate students might be used as advisers. I don't know that this was ever done in a formal way, but a few

TAs were used as advisers. This was a comprehensive study and while some parts were implemented, others were not. While some suggestions helped with procedures, it did not solve the advising problems and it had little impact, for most of the faculty did not really believe that advising was important enough to give it equal standing in their activities. The department heads who were the key administrators thought like their faculty so that this function did not get recognized at salary increase time. Central administrators continued to worry and were very willing to make it a more important part of the reward structure.

On June 12, 1961, Chancellor Caldwell sent a memorandum to deans of schools on the improvement of faculty advising. This four-page memo had five sections.

1. The Importance of Advising. In this section the Chancellor said that advising should be recognized as having importance equivalent to that of teaching and research. Kelly, Hart and I agreed with this statement and we each preached that sermon while we were Provosts.
2. Adviser, Student Contact. This emphasized that there should be several contacts with the freshman student during the first semester. Many advisers still do not follow this practice. He said that the number of advisees per faculty member should be limited to 25. This maximum number was not implemented in most units and would not be implemented in departments with large numbers of majors. Several departments adopted the practice of having all majors advised by one or two or at least very few faculty instead of having all of the faculty in the department advising their student

majors. These departments made advising essentially a full time job for these advisers, but most continued to teach at least one course per semester.

3. Resources of the Adviser. Mention was made of the *Advisers' Handbook* which was prepared at that time by Student Affairs.
4. Adviser Functions and Responsibilities. Caldwell said that the adviser should establish himself as a faculty friend, or at least one who is willing to be a friend. He stated, "Further, he must feel definite responsibility for making sure that his charges at least have the information which will help them avoid various pitfalls in the College academic situation. For example, the unpromising student should have his course load reduced early before he gets into trouble. Students in difficulty should be encouraged to repeat courses when they are needed for solid footing in a program of studies."
5. Briefing sessions by departments or schools should be held on advising problems. This was sage advice, but this policy never really got used by most of the departments and schools so that the sage advice never really got to the faculty. As time went on, it was forgotten, except by those really good advisers. Some schools and especially SALS, did have conferences on advising frequently and invited the campus community to attend. One major workshop held by SALS was in 1966 was the subject: "The Proper Role of Faculty in Student Advising."

In 1972 the Senate also had another major study of advising. This report was submitted to the Chancellor on February 6, 1973. The Senate recommended that coordinators of advising be established in each department. This person would assign, train and supervise advisers in the unit. The coordinator would assist students who wished to transfer to that department or to another department. This was especially

designed to help the phantom majors (students who were enrolled in one major, wished to be in another major, but whose record was not good enough to transfer) who frequently were not eligible to transfer to the program of their choice. Students who were unhappy with their adviser could request a new adviser through this individual. The Senate recommended: "(1) The advisee first consults with a new adviser of his choice to determine whether or not the adviser would accept him as an advisee; (2) The new adviser recommends the change in writing to the department head or other officials responsible for advising assignments." This was adopted and solved a very serious problem, for the practice in many departments had been to keep the same adviser in the major until graduation. In some cases students and advisers had serious conflicts. This also assured an orderly transfer of student records to the new adviser. It was suggested that in the second or third semester before graduation, the student should be given written notice of the graduation requirements satisfied and those still lacking. One recommendation that was adopted read as follows:

The student has the primary responsibility for planning his or her program and meeting graduation requirements. This in no way relieves the advisers of their responsibility to keep current with curriculum and course developments and to counsel students on advisable course programs. Advisers are expected to take the time to explore thoroughly various alternatives that are open to students and to advise them of the consequences of various actions. While an adviser does not have the authority to block an advisee's preregistration or Drop/Add forms by refusing to sign the forms, the adviser does have an obligation to indicate approval or disapproval of the action taken on the appropriate forms.

Most of the Faculty Senate's recommendations were adopted and implemented after much debate among the school deans,

the associate deans and the Faculty Senate. These recommendations have been very helpful and continue so today. After the automated degree audit was developed by Registration and Records, the information including what requirements were completed and which were lacking was given to the students as a part of the grade reports at the end of each semester. The computer did help and the automated degree audit worked very well for those programs which had an interested faculty member who kept this device up-to-date. It soon became useless in those units where no one in the department assumed the responsibility to keep the automated degree audit current for their degree programs.

After I became Provost and through the efforts of Dr. Downs, we established the Coordinating Committee for Undergraduate Advising in 1975. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs represented each school and the committee had representatives from units in Student Affairs. This has been a very useful group and it has helped us to avoid many problems. Dr. Downs called the group together and handled the agenda.

In the Faculty Senate minutes of October 21, 1986, there is a reminder that all senators should attend the Provost's Forum. This was to hear and to discuss the Report of the Commission on Advising, chaired by Ed Glazener. "John Riddle will moderate discussion following a three-part report: (1) short-term strategies; (2) long-term strategies; and (3) strategies for evaluating effective advising." This Commission provided the most extensive study of advising at NCSU that I have found in the files. Chancellor Poulton wrote: "The Commission on Advising is to be congratulated for having completed an excellent report that surveys the views of the various constituents involved in the advising process, that examines current and desirable practices, and that identifies a variety of strategies for making improvements. I recognize and sincerely appreciate the time and wisdom contributed by each Commission member to improving one of the most significant elements of our undergraduate

program. I will be discussing the Commission's report and recommendations with the Dean's Council during the next several weeks and will be better prepared to respond to the details of the report at a later date." He went on to describe how and to whom the report would be distributed.

On October 7, 1987, Chancellor Poulton wrote to the School Deans and stated:

Upon the recommendation of the Commission on Advising and after consultation with the Provost and the Council of Deans, I request that you work with your department heads and faculties to establish guidelines for undergraduate academic advising in your school subject to the following stipulations:

1. Submit to the Provost before the end of the 1987-88 academic year a school-wide plan for undergraduate academic advising.
2. Include as a part of the plan provisions for the following:
 - a. Regular training sessions for advisors,
 - b. Departmental or school advising booklets for students,
 - c. Schedules and procedures that allow adequate access by advisees to advisors,
 - d. Departmental or school users guides to automated degree audits for their use as an advising tool,
 - e. Mechanisms for advisees to use as input into the evaluation of the effectiveness of advising in order that effective advising can be recognized and rewarded,
 - f. Annual review of departmental advising procedures and advising assignments in order that the advising process at the departmental level can be made more effective.
3. Provide the Provost at the end of the 1988-89 academic year and annually thereafter an assessment and progress report on the implementation of the school-wide plan for

undergraduate academic advising.

The University Administration concurs with the Commission on Advising regarding the vital role of advising in the total educational experience of the undergraduate students at NCSU.

Therefore I call upon the school deans, the academic department heads, and the faculty advisers to study the report of the Commission and to take the steps outlined above and any others that can improve the effectiveness of academic advising and enhance the educational experience of our undergraduates.

At the end of the 1987-88 academic year I did not have school plans from all of the schools, and at the end of the 1988-89 year I did not have all of the assessment and progress reports called for. At this time there seemed to be less interest and there were other University matters of great importance, including severe budget reductions, which took so much of my attention and that of the school deans. The resignation of Chancellor Poulton, and my announced and pending retirement in 1990 may have made the efforts of lesser importance to many on campus. The most important recommendation of the Commission was that each school have a carefully thought-out plan for undergraduate advising and that these plans be systematically reviewed and revised as appropriate. While each school developed a plan, the School of Design was the last to report, which was just before I retired in 1990. We had to ask a few schools for their reports more than once. Others had theirs in and made the earlier associated reports as scheduled. The Deans and I were all caught up in the fever of the budget crunch cuts and other matters, and my staff was inundated with added functions and activities of that time too, so the plans really were not reviewed as carefully by us as they should have been and were not revised by units systematically. I think that they continued to fall through the cracks under Hart, too.

There were a number of other very important recommendations in the 1989 report on academic advising. These in-

cluded telephonic registration, which was subsequently implemented. With this development the recommendations for preregistration and Change Day became unnecessary. Dr. Downs and the Associate Deans of the Schools worked to develop school-level user guides for the Automated Degree Audit programs and they worked continuously with the staff of Registration and Records to identify problems and make improvements in the system. They were unable to use the degree audit forms as a means to notify students of new academic regulations, to enforce course-load limits and to carry the names of all advisers. The *Official Bulletin* was used to announce all notices regarding advising matters as recommended, but although these matters were sent to the *Technician* each set of editors had their own criteria regarding the worthiness for publishing such announcements. So some were published and even more were not. A number of schools and departments did develop the school-wide or departmental advising handbooks. Not all did. Another important recommendation that did not get implemented widely was the one called Front-Loading of Advising. This was a very important proposed strategy of the Commission. It was recommended that in departments where the advising loads were particularly heavy (more than 30 per adviser), schools should allocate positions and/or funds to hire full time advisers for students in the lower division. Advanced graduate students could also be used for this purpose. These special advisers could be available at freshman orientation and during Summer School when some advisers were not on campus and were unavailable to students. Full-time advisers would insure consistency and accuracy in advising, as in the University Undesignated Program, in the University Transition Program and in several departments. The emphasis on excellent freshman advising has been expanded to those freshmen enrolled in the Undergraduate Studies Freshmen Experience course. I indicated to all in the academic community that advising was a part of instruction and that the in-

structional position lines that hired other faculty members could be used for this purpose. I understand that a very few programs did hire full time staff or assigned staff on a full time basis to this function, but not many did.

In December of 1988, the Chancellor and I met with all of the department heads and the associate deans for academic affairs and in the absence of the department head, the departmental coordinator of advising. We presented to them a proposal from the student leadership. Their recommendations were:

- 1) More requirements should be set for advisers. Upon hiring a new faculty member who has the potential to be an adviser, the importance of their role should be strongly emphasized.
- 2) Each department should carry the responsibility of outlining their advising system, making sure that advisers adhere to this policy and continually emphasizing the importance of this facet of their job.
- 3) The administration should also continually emphasize the role of advising on campus. It needs to be clear to an adviser that their performance in this capacity will be a factor in consideration for pay raises, tenure et cetera.
- 4) Students need to be better informed of their responsibilities and of procedures for complaints or praise regarding their advisers.
- 5) A system of student evaluations for advisers should be implemented campus-wide. (This had been suggested earlier and was being done in some departments.)
- 6) Establishing a central advising center on campus is a system that should be considered. This center would not take advising away from the faculty. Instead, it would allow students who are uncertain about their major to talk with an informed and unbiased person.

- 7) A campus-wide peer advising system should be implemented. If coordinated correctly, this will allow for students to get advice from upperclassmen so that they will be better prepared when meeting with advisors.

In 1988, Dr. Rebecca Leonard and Dr. William Grant were engaged by the Provost's Office to spearhead an effort during the 1988-89 academic year aimed at improving undergraduate advising on campus. They were to spend about one-third time each on the project. The end product of this effort was to be the development of an advising workshop which would be offered through colleges and departments to all faculty members who were or were likely to become advisers. One important feature of such a workshop was to be a component dealing with advising African-American students. They started by meeting with the associate deans for academic affairs in the various colleges for the purpose of explaining their project and getting a feel for the advising systems within the colleges. Additional meetings were held with other pertinent groups, including the Coordinating Committee for Undergraduate Advising, the African-American Coordinators group, and the African-American Student Affairs staff. With the aid of the staff in the Academic Skills Program they also conducted an ERIC search for the most recent research on academic advising which yielded numerous journal articles of interest. Plans were made to conduct a telephone survey of students with respect to their views of the nature and quality of advising on campus. One of the reasons for this effort so soon after the commission report was that so many said they needed help in training and providing information to improve advisers in their schools. The idea was that Leonard and Grant would train a few persons and these would then train other advisers. On May 1, 1990, Dr. Leonard and Dr. Grant reported that they had presented the workshop "Effective Advising: Making a Difference" in

each of the Colleges, except in the School of Design, which did not invite them. The workshop was presented to all of the current advisers in all the other colleges except CALS and CHASS where it was presented to the coordinators of advising who were to present it to the advisers in the departments. They said, "We think that the most valuable part of each training was the interaction which took place among the workshop participants. Each college has received a copy of the videotape and the instructions on how to conduct the workshop so that they may involve additional advisers if they wish. We enjoyed participating in this project and hope that our contribution has increased the awareness among faculty of the importance of effective advising, and has clarified the role that the University and each college may have in improving the quality of advising for students at North Carolina State University." The tapes had comments about the importance of advising from Chancellor Monteith and me. These workshops got the process started, and the first round of secondary workshops were held. But as in so many other cases the interest in getting the training and workshop down to all of the new advisers has continued in a very limited way. There were articles and letters in the *Technician* that said here we are on another study and that nothing in advising gets improved. This assertion, while not entirely true, does indicate that the advising of individual students was very erratic and continued to be poor in some instances. The advice was available but simply was not always used or continuously disseminated adequately to the advisers. Of course almost all of this information was available to all advisers in the current issue of the *Adviser's Handbook*.

At its meeting on April 10, 1990, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution on undergraduate advising. It reads as follows:

Whereas NCSU professes to the importance of quality undergraduate advising, and

Whereas The Faculty Senate is concerned that the current faculty

incentives and rewards systems can give little consideration to the quality of undergraduate advising, and

Whereas Advising is a key component of academic success on this campus, and

Whereas Many undergraduate students experience academic and other difficulties whose negative effects could be lessened if advising were stronger, and

Whereas Such difficulties contribute to a less-than-satisfactory freshman-year experience for some freshmen, and are a factor in causing unsatisfactory graduation rates, and

Whereas The final report of the NCSU Commission on Advising (12/19/86) as well as the position paper attached to the present resolution, provide additional background information and rationale for this resolution: therefore

Resolved That the Faculty Senate commends the Chancellor, Provost, and college deans for their recent efforts to promote effective undergraduate advising, and that it urges them to continue and to strengthen these efforts, with strong, public emphasis on the importance of advising and with appropriate allocation of resources, and

Further Resolved That good advising in the freshman year be made a very high priority, and

Finally Resolved That serious study be made of the faculty rewards system, to the end that the department heads will evaluate advising fairly and will properly reward responsible advising.

This resolution and its background supporting paper can be found on pages 277-279 of the Faculty Senate Minutes of 1989-90.

As is evident, there is great interest in and support for excellent undergraduate advising. Everyone says it is important. Then why doesn't it work better? I believe that the

answers can be found in the studies and reports and recommendations already made at NCSU. We have done many things to aid advisers and to improve the advising system. I don't know how poor advising would be if we had not done those things. The issue is not that there are no good advisers, for there are many dedicated and very good advisers in every department and in every school/college at NCSU. There are also advisers who are poor and others who don't really place it in a high priority among their duties. Few units reward it properly.

Good advising seems to have about as many definitions as there are advisers. It ranges from simply a perception that it involves only scheduling, to neglecting scheduling so as to make the student responsible for their own schedules. For most students good advising involves both mentoring and scheduling. Advisers should know the advisees well enough to help them select free electives which will enrich their education and prepare them for lifelong learning, and to help them select restricted electives which will enable the students to build a background that will be most helpful in their careers. At times I believe that advising, with all of the perceived problems of that day, was best under Dean Shirley. At that time we did not have many departments with huge numbers of students per adviser. Enrollment growth has been very uneven by field since 1960 and faculty seem to prefer to advise their own departmental majors or at least students who will major in their schools/colleges. Even so, advising has been a very uneven skill and students can get a good or a poor adviser in any field, except for those with only a few major students or with only one or two super advisers for all of these majors. Not all of the departmental major advisers are great, but the departments with few majors will not tolerate very long a poor adviser, for they want more, not fewer students. It is in these departments, too that there is most often a faculty member (sometimes two or more in larger programs) who has gained experience and may advise all of the majors. These always have

appropriately reduced teaching loads. As time went on we had, in many programs, more students than the faculty felt that they could handle or wanted, yet they all continued to advise students. It seemed to me that advising was probably best, with some exceptions, in those areas where there were too few students. Their attitude was we had better try to keep the students that we have if we are to continue to be employed. Advising seemed especially important in Textiles, Forest Resources, and in Agriculture. As a faculty member in a department without a major I wanted contact with students, and became a very good adviser. I know because Dr. Glazener would not let advisers get new freshmen to advise if they were not good advisers. He was in the fortunate circumstance of having a large number of professors funded from organized research or extension who wanted student contact and who taught few or no classes. Too, in those departments in schools where there were large numbers of students, the concept of research was becoming an increasingly important component of responsibility and was rewarded more and more for promotion and tenure, and advising became of lesser importance in the rewards given.

After I joined Dr. Kelly in the Provost's Office, we recognized that the advising function was viewed as a less important function than before. To try to counteract this we described advising as an important component of the teaching function and made it important enough so that the preparers of promotion forms had to address the quality of advising. As Provost I even turned down a few promotions that suggested that the faculty member was a poor adviser. Of course most descriptions on the forms sounded as if the advisers were at least satisfactory. Also, to emphasize the importance of advising, we made numbers of majors an important component of the formula which I used as a guideline for allocation or retention of vacant faculty positions. These efforts may have helped some but not very much, for the faculty in a department have to consider a function to

be very important or it will not be reflected adequately in the reward and promotion recommendations.

Departments devised a number of ways to handle advising. A number of departments developed a few faculty whose total or major responsibility was the advising of undergraduate majors. A small sample of these great advisers in departments with very large numbers of majors would include Hatch in Computer Science, Blessis in Civil Engineering, Seely in Chemical Engineering, Easter in Electrical Engineering, and Harkema, Grant and Miller in Pre-Medicine and Zoology. In most departments with large numbers of majors, there was a tendency to divide the numbers of majors up so that everyone had approximately the same number of advisees. This was called leveling the workload, being fair or treating everyone the same. Many of these faculty were great advisers, but there were always a number who disliked the function and who treated this as a necessary evil that they had to do. I remember one engineering student who was having problems and who came to see me as Provost. As a junior he said that he didn't even know who was his faculty adviser. He thought he didn't have one. I called the departmental secretary to find out who was handling his advising. She said that she was his adviser and was advising a number of other students in that department too. She was doing the scheduling in a wonderful way and probably better than many faculty could; however, she had too much other work to do and the professional mentoring part was neglected, and this was what this student needed. In an education department a secretary did both excellent mentoring and advising. This secretary came to complain to me about her work load and the need for more secretarial help in her department. In both of these cases students had little contact with faculty, except in the classroom, and I believe that advising contact with faculty is necessary. Today I wish that I had given the departments an additional secretary so that these wonderful

caring people would have had the time to advise, and I believe that they would have been excellent. Of course I would have taken a faculty position away from the departments at the same time. I did continue to make certain that the deans were reminded that we were allocating faculty positions for the purpose of advising as well as for other functions.

Except for the three Colleges of ALS, Forestry and Textiles, where freshmen advising seemed to almost always be good, the major was generally advised in a much better way than were the new freshmen, especially if the freshman did not know what field they wished for a major. I talked with my colleagues in other universities and found systems which hired full time advisers and others who had faculty who advised a few freshmen students for an extra supplement to their earnings. In the later case it seemed that the desire to earn a small amount of income was the driving force, and in the former it seemed that some of the advisers had difficulty, or did not take the time to know all of the programs of the university and did not know the options among the great variety of courses, especially among sciences and math options, that students should select. For in no system do the students going into the humanities and those going into the sciences and applied sciences take the same course sequences in math and the sciences. None of these systems seemed to work as well as the dedicated faculty member who wished to advise students. All probably worked better than the faculty member who was forced to advise students or who only did it because it was required. Our approach was to try to get this function treated by the faculty, the department heads, and the deans as on par in value with research and classroom teaching. It never worked, for the faculty simply did not really believe that they got positions for this function or that it really was as important for promotion, tenure and salary increases.

Advisers also lost some clout and contact with advisees when we changed the practice of requiring the adviser's signature on changes made on Change Day. Students were on their own to enter their own classes into the registration procedure. This had to be done for the other system was archaic, cumbersome and couldn't handle the numbers of changes for the students to be registered. However, this enabled students to make more mistakes. Although each department had to have a representative at the coliseum to help students, there was no way that they could be familiar with all of the individual student's needs. If this change had not been made we would have to add more than two days for Change Day. Today even with telephonic registration, the assistance of the adviser is sometimes not accepted by the student. We began to have more students signing up for classes without proper prerequisites or lacking the proper preparation from high school.

From looking at the 20 or more classes with the largest numbers of freshmen who flunked, we learned a number of things. For example, in certain humanities and social sciences classes, freshmen who had not completed composition would likely fail. For Chemistry 101 you needed to be ready to take calculus, not because that level of math was used in freshman chemistry, but at this level you had enough experience to be able to handle word problems. Psychology seemed for most students to need sophomore level maturity. In a number of classes, required attendance seemed necessary for freshmen. During the first semester there should be few if any freshmen in those 20 to 30 classes that flunk the most freshmen. A mechanism is needed to ensure that students don't get into classes until the required prerequisites are mastered. PAMS began a process to bump students from those classes in that school if the students did not have the proper prerequisites. I believe if this process were followed everywhere that the success of freshmen would be enhanced. The reasons why freshmen don't succeed in certain other classes have not

been determined. Perhaps in some there may have been the wrong teacher in the class. There are teachers who have difficulty teaching inexperienced students and at the same time they may be excellent in teaching upper level undergraduates. I recall one time that the Department of Chemistry decided that all faculty should, from time to time, teach the introductory sections. One year the regular upper-class teachers who had never taught the freshmen were assigned to teach Chemistry 101. In theory this may be a good idea, but in practice it was a disaster. At midterm about two-thirds of the students received pink slips showing that they were at the D or NC levels. That experiment got changed quickly. No one outside of the department knew about this change until those pink slips arrived. That caused a campus uproar not only from the students, but also from all of the faculty in departments whose students were taking Chemistry 101. I had calls from all of the school deans except Design and Liberal Arts. Dean Menius called to say that I should not get upset for the problem was already resolved. Other Departments such as History have all of their faculty teaching at both the 200 course level and the upper levels. It seems to work well here for most classes, but there are a few teachers in that department and some other departments who aren't very effective teachers of freshman. Yet on an overall basis these same departments provide many of our best freshman teachers. I know that we looked at the credentials of the freshmen and of the sophomores in a few humanities classes that flunked a large number of freshmen. In almost every case we found that the sophomores passed, but the freshmen failed. Their credentials upon entering NCSU as freshmen were the same. I think that this difference was due largely to the increased ability of the sophomores to read and write. These sophomores had passed English 111 and English 112. So I believe that composition is needed as a prerequisite for some humanities and social science courses and even for sections of courses taught by certain faculty.

There was certainly something that the sophomore had gained during their first year at NCSU that enabled them to handle these courses satisfactorily.

Another very important component is scheduling courses. As all good advisers know, it is important to avoid certain mixes of courses. Too many killer courses at once can do in all but the very best students. This is also true for the student taking too many hours or too many courses. One serious problem we found among students who failed a course was the desire to make up for the lost time by taking an extra course the next semester when they really should have reduced the number of courses taken by at least one.

Of course there is much better advising of graduate students, for there is a clear reward. The faculty member usually adds to his publication list through work of graduate students in the adviser's projects. It is sort of like having a high level technician who, by the time they finish, also thinks and plans and does almost as well as the faculty member. It also adds to the adviser's list of publications through the common practice of the adviser's being a junior co-author upon the publication of the thesis. As a result graduate students are almost fought over when the crop is scarce. The major problem is that there is a great temptation for faculty to keep the graduate student in the indentured status longer than is necessary.

I still believe that Dr. Glazener's practice of not giving advisees to poor advisers is the proper strategy. There needs to be some mechanism to make certain that the number of advisees is reasonable for those faculty who also teach regular loads and participate in scholarly activity. The awards given by many schools that came after the Glazener Commission report were nice, but they could not compensate for the lack of reward at the salary increase and promotion times. For that is what is really viewed as important to faculty. As Caldwell said, "this will require the faculty to view advising as the equivalent in value of teaching and research."

Maybe the new approach by Stiles will find a way to make this function truly effective for many more students. His stated goals are to increase persistence, increase retention and the graduation rates, have a higher degree of completion of courses and movement towards graduation, and to enhance academic self-image and motivation through improved advising.

Courses and Curricula

The first all University Courses and Curricula Committee was appointed by Dean Shirley and met at the lunch hour on Friday, March 16, 1956. The tradition of meeting at the lunch hour has persisted until today. The first committee consisted of a faculty member (selected by the school dean) from each school and a member of the Faculty Senate. Duties included:

1. The committee is to make recommendations to the Dean for transmittal to the Chancellor.
2. All course and curricula changes proposed by all schools will be presented to the Committee for study and recommendations.
3. The Committee will attempt to formalize currently-accepted curricular policies as the basis for making their decisions.
4. Where curricular policies are missing or where controversy arises in the Committee, the policy matter will be referred to the Senate for recommendations on policy. Such policies will be approved by the administration, and then become a guide to the Curriculum Committee.

At the time that Shirley became Dean, the minimum requirement for a degree was 138 semester hours. Entrance deficiencies and other freshman courses were to be taken before other courses could be scheduled. Twenty four hours in the humanities and the social sciences were to be included

in all curricula and technical courses such as accounting would not count as satisfying these requirements. There was a pre-freshman English course. If a student made a B or better, then they were placed out of the first and second semesters of composition. Freshmen and sophomores could get eight hours of credit towards graduation for Military Science and Tactics courses and if these courses were taken for four years, then 12 hours could count towards graduation. Four hours of Physical Education were required, but Hygiene counted towards the Physical Education requirement.

When Shirley first became Dean of the Faculty he encouraged the development of honors programs. When the first survey came in, although Textiles and Forestry responded positively, there really were no honors programs on campus. By 1971 there were very strong honors programs in SALS, Engineering, Forest Resources and PAMS. These activities had died down somewhat in Textiles. Most of the programs included special sections of courses, honors courses, special topics courses, special projects and seminars, and participation in research by undergraduate students. Provosts continued to encourage the development and nourishment of honors programs. Long before I retired all of the schools came to have them except Design. Over the years the honors programs flourished and floundered with varied interest in and participation by students. It seemed that each school needed to have an interested faculty member or some other person responsible for such programs who pushed them and constantly made the students aware of them for these programs to be successful. A notation of participation in honors programs has been included in the graduation programs since the early sixties. Students were also recognized in their departmental or school graduation exercises and asked to stand at the general exercises.

On April 11, 1957, the University Courses and Curriculum Committee (henceforth called CCC) came up with a form for course proposals. The memo from Shirley

stated: "In order to facilitate its consideration of new courses or changes in courses already approved, the CCC requests that all recommendations be submitted in uniform fashion. Nine copies were requested for each action." The memo also stated that should additional information be desired the request would be made of the school committee through the school representative on the CCC. The form has been modified many times as the complexity of our programs has increased, and the number of members of the committee has grown, thus the required number of copies of the form has also increased. Over the years the membership came to be selected by the Committee on Committees and to include an additional member from University Studies and from each of the schools with large undergraduate enrollments. Members were expected to provide liaison with their school's curriculum committee. By this time curriculum committees now existed in all of the schools.

A form called the "Permanent Record of Courses" was developed by the General Administration in 1956 which required submission to that office. Information needed was: course number, section number, course title, instructor, rank, credit hours, contact hours by lecture and lab, number of students, number of student credits, days class meets, hours class meets, building and room class meets and seating capacity of room. Oh, it would have been nice to have had a computer in those days. When I joined Provost Kelly in 1967 we were no longer submitting this information to the UNC system.

I also noted for the first time a request for a degree called Liberal Science. There was correspondence about it with the UNC General Administration, but I could find no correspondence saying that the degree was approved or disapproved at that time. It was to be offered by the School of General Studies and would consist of 120 hours with 60 hours in the sciences, mathematics, and allied fields, 30 hours of basic training in the humanities and social sciences and 30 hours

of concentration in a non-technological area. Specimen curricula included, Economics and Technology (Electrical Engineering), Economics and Technology (Physics), Humanities and Engineering (Mechanical), and Humanities and Science (Physics). The request was sent by UNC's Provost Whyburn to a committee of representatives from the three campuses of the UNC System. This was called the All-University Committee on New Programs. It would not be long before undergraduate degree programs would not go through such a committee; however, graduate degrees continued to be reviewed by a similar committee. Of course all degree proposals would go to the Trustees and to the Board of Higher Education for approval. The curriculum was developed by faculty at NCSU, but the committee was not identified other than from the School of General Studies. It was evident that someone from Math (Cell) and Physics (not clear) was also at work here. There was much interest in getting degrees in the disciplines represented by the School of General Studies as was evident from several reports to the Visiting Committee of the Trustees in the late fifties and early sixties. This was a very strong interest of Shirley's and he spent much effort on obtaining these degrees.

The first new course requests turned down by the Dean of the Faculty were approved by the Chancellor when the Dean of the School of Agriculture appealed to the Chancellor. They were approved by the Chancellor for one year only and were to be resubmitted to the Courses and Curriculum Committee.

In 1958 Shirley wrote to Caldwell saying:

The report of the Course and Curriculum Committee, which has just come to me appears to put us all in a very nice dilemma. If the College Course and Curriculum Committee thinks it is impossible to have uniform standards except by developing a uniformly high-quality faculty, and if the Faculty Senate feels that we cannot have any uniform academic requirements for member-

ship in the faculty at various ranks, and if both agree that no amount of administrative review can contribute anything in these vital areas—then we are truly whipped before we start.

If these are true (and they may well be), we should face up to the fact that because of the diverse nature of its responsibility, State College can never be anything more than a friendly collection of completely autonomous departments, and we should certainly do away with all schools and all our administrative officials coming between the Chancellor and the Department Heads.

If you think this is coming, I should like to be on record as recommending that we institute a Department of the History of Science, to which I can be assigned to go back to teaching anything and everything I desire in any way that I want to.

The duties of the Course and Curriculum Committee described earlier have continued for many years. In time recommendations were forwarded to the Chancellor for approval only when there was a new policy, a new degree proposed, a degree was to be dropped, or a name change was recommended for a degree. Items of policy came to be studied, and proposals were made on academic policy by this committee. Proposals to make changes in policy were referred to the Faculty Senate and to the Administrative Council or by the Provost to each of the school deans or associate deans for academic affairs. During Chancellor Poulton's tenure they were referred to the Council of Deans and to the Council of Associate Deans for Academic Affairs. Matters of procedure always came to be referred to the Council of Associate Deans after this Council was established. Prior to that time they were referred to the deans. It is the associate deans who oversee the operation of academic matters in each school/college and who can best devise operational strategies and avoid traps, pitfalls, cumbersome and even unworkable solutions. We had a number of such proposals over the years.

Anything which changed the current methods of computerization were referred to the appropriate group in Student Affairs (most often Registration and Records) and to Administrative Computing Services (also called Administrative Data Processing). This latter was necessary to determine if we could do the task within our data base, or could we establish the necessary data base, and how long would it take to revise existing programs or to write the programs if they did not already exist.

On July 27, 1960, approval was obtained to drop the word Engineering from the degree in Physics. This was a major breakthrough for us, for prior to this time degrees in the sciences and mathematics here had to be labeled with an applied adjective. Soon Chemistry would drop the Agricultural and Mathematics, the Engineering prefixes too.

In a letter to President Friday of February 2, 1960, Chancellor Caldwell said we would put to rest at this time our request for degrees in Liberal Arts. There was some encouragement from President Friday for such degrees at a later time. Caldwell agreed at this time, however, not to get the faculty "in heat". On March 20, 1962, Caldwell forwarded a request from Cahill to President Friday for a B.S. in Liberal Arts. This called for B.S. degrees in Economics, English, History, Political Science and Sociology. The B.S. degree was approved by the Board of Higher Education on May 22, 1962. The Chairman of that Board said he was disappointed that the College didn't go further and request the Bachelor of Arts degree. That was a surprise, for we had wanted to do so for years but had been held back because of the BOT of UNC's desire to avoid duplication with UNC at Chapel Hill. On June 28, 1962, President Friday recommended to the Board of Trustees that "At State College, the extension of our undergraduate program to include a limited expansion with an Arts degree to accommodate the commuter demand." On February 1, 1963, Friday wrote Caldwell that the Board of Trustees had reversed itself and that we could have the BA degree. In 1963

Caldwell wrote in a letter to Shirley at Delaware that the Board of Trustees has adopted the Pearsall Committee report which included that the curriculum at State College be broadened to include duplicating work for the Bachelor of Arts degree. In June the request for specific degrees was approved by the BOT, and on September 10, 1963, Caldwell wrote Cahill that the Board of Higher Education approved the degrees as well as the name change from the School of General Studies to the School of Liberal Arts (SLA). Degrees were in English, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. In 1964 new BA degrees were approved for Geology (in PSAM) and Philosophy, and a B.S. degree in Philosophy was approved at the same time.

In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell raised the issue of a common first year at NCSC. Caldwell felt that a freshman needed a year in which to select a major. Dean Kamphoefner wrote back and indicated this was needed for only the slow, retarded and mediocre students. He also said that this subject comes up over and over here with the conclusion that the idea is not workable here. Caldwell responded, "So, it would be entirely erroneous, and I do not accept for one minute the assumption that my desire is to serve in this respect only the slow student. Nothing could be farther from the truth, and I do not wish to discuss it on those terms." Needless to say the schools were not in favor. The idea of a (freshman college) common first year continued to come up at intervals for many years and several times during Kelly's and my terms. The schools were always opposed in general. Humanities and Social Sciences were generally in favor. Later during Monteith's term as Dean, Engineering became in favor of an undergraduate college; however in 1960 they were much against the idea. This subject was also discussed in this Chapter under Advising.

Caldwell was concerned about whether we had too many courses. He said in a memorandum to Shirley and Peterson in 1961, "A careful reading of our most recent general catalog reveals that our course

offerings at State College continue to grow in number and proliferate at an alarming rate." Shirley and Peterson wrote to the Deans and asked that they, "Prune our individual course offerings to eliminate all obsolescent or unnecessary courses and to re-evaluate strengths and weaknesses of our current curricula." There was also appointed a special committee to make recommendations on a review of courses. In 1962 the committee wrote to all departments and asked them to review their courses. They quoted a paragraph of Caldwell's in their memo. He said:

It appears to me that we could probably reduce our total offerings from one quarter to one-half without impairing the quality of our educational effort. Certainly we should eliminate all courses for which recent enrollments have been small or nonexistent and should not continue to carry courses on the books unless they are both needed and active. But these criteria are of less importance than those of instructional merit. I have no doubt that as our instruction properly moves away from the narrow, transient and superficial to what is fundamental and lasting, we will strengthen the whole character of the College.

The Department of Economics responded and I quote a part that I liked best. "It should be observed that there is a curious assumption implicit in the argument that there may be a proliferation of courses: that all knowledge—now and in the future—is known; that, therefore, there can be only so many courses in each discipline. This kind of thinking is in no small degree the reflection of a point of view that is inherited from the early nineteenth century, when classical physics and classical economics were believed by many to have achieved completeness." Arguments like this make administrators feel that they belong among the antiques, and they really put you on the defensive. The numbers of courses continued to grow at this time, for our enrollments were growing and we were rapidly adding

new faculty with different specialties. At this time we were also adding a number of new graduate and undergraduate degree programs. One of the things that did come out of this was our course numbering system. The 100–299 courses were to be for beginning undergraduates; 300–499 for advanced undergraduates; 500–599 for graduate students and advanced undergraduates; and 600–699 were courses for graduate students only. For identification tutorial courses, seminars and special topics were to be numbered _90 to _99. In 1965 when the ROTC program became optional, all curricula were required to reduce the number of hours for graduation by four.

In 1961 the Chancellor appointed a committee consisting of Dean Shirley, as Chairman, with Dr. R. C. Bullock, Chairman of the Faculty Senate's Educational Policy Committee, Professor Dame Hamby, Chairman of the Courses and Curriculum Committee, and Mr. Fred Linsey, Chairman of the Student Government Committee on Academic Affairs. This committee was instructed "toward a clarification of and definition of the institutional policy on courses and curricula." A number of hearings were held, but I did not see a final report.

In 1963 the School of Engineering proposed its first degree which would not be designed for accreditation. This was Engineering Operations. The degree was approved and was later dropped in the 1980s because of small enrollments and the college did not want to continue to provide a non-accredited program. Over the years the program had become almost identical to the B.S. in Industrial Engineering.

On April 20, 1964, Provost Kelly approved the awarding of dual degrees. He said, "Multiple degrees may be granted, if requested, provided the requirements for each degree are met." This became a valuable addition, and as the years proceeded dual and even triple degrees have been earned more and more frequently.

In a memorandum of December 16, 1964, Dr. Kelly discussed unauthorized contact hours. He said "I don't believe it

profitable to ask how these discrepancies developed for they probably go back a number of years. I believe it is clear, though, that it is essential to scheduling, cataloging and determining student loads that some control over the contact hours is required." Guidelines for determination of course credit ratings and appropriate contact hours were established on April 1, 1965. They were as follows:

- 1) One credit hour should approximate to a student input of 3 hours for the average student.
- 2) One contact hour lecture or recitation is interpreted to incorporate presentation of subject matter, theory and/or principles beyond prerequisites for the particular course and would involve 2 hours of student preparation. This constitutes the equivalent of 1 credit hour.
- 3) Laboratory hours were to be for two or three hours of contact for one hour of credit. If the laboratory was for two hours then there should be one hour of external preparation or activity. Three hour laboratories would require no external activity.

Differentiated lecture and laboratory contact hours were to be noted in the catalog listings. It was noted that the catalog and the schedule of courses for registration would no longer accept hours which differed from those on the approved listing of courses.

The Courses and Curriculum Committee also reviewed and recommended for approval all undergraduate courses and curricula, all minors, honors programs and non-degree certificate programs. We also had course numbers in the 290-490 course number series that may be used as experimental courses. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs made certain that such courses came before the committee after they were taught twice to assure that they were dropped or reviewed and got into the record as approved courses.

Several additional matters came to be referred to this committee over the years. At a CCC meeting on April 4, 1959, there was a recommendation to the Dean to approve a long list of courses to be added or to be dropped. The committee also raised several objections about the curriculum of the School of Design. These included: the absence of the College requirement of 12 hours of free electives (a requirement still included in all curricula); the large number of credits required each semester when the College and the CCC were encouraging a reduction in required credit hours; and the committee viewed with alarm the tendency to include the teaching of courses in the School of Design whose content were essentially those of the areas taught by the humanities and social sciences disciplines. The concern of course duplication among departments and schools and the existence of courses whose contents are the responsibility of different departments and schools, continue to be areas of responsibility of this committee. This is an important and sensitive matter for course duplication can waste resources. At the same time most courses utilize knowledge from the basic disciplines. For example, it is impossible to teach molecular biology without using chemistry or to teach engineering without using math. So this committee helps to resolve potential conflicts in these areas.

It is evident in the degree proposals of this period that there was always a strong group of faculty who were interested in expanding NCSC's degree offerings and who pushed for most degrees that were proposed. New degree proposals were also reviewed by the appropriate school committees as well as the CCC. On August 2, 1966, procedures for new degree proposals were described. The affected faculty in a department would prepare a proposal which would go to the department head, then to the school dean who would present the proposal to the school curriculum committee. Then the proposal would be sent to the Dean of the Faculty who would send the proposal to the CCC. If approval was to be granted on

campus then the Dean of the Faculty would prepare or have prepared the proposal for the Chancellor to send to the President who would take it to the Board of Trustees and then to the BHE. The Chancellor would frequently meet with the Executive Committee of the Trustees to describe the new proposal. The Executive Committee essentially made almost all of the decisions of the BOT at this time. The procedure changed somewhat after the Board of Governors came in to being for the University System then prepared a more precise format for the presentation of new degree proposals. On our campus after approval of the Provost and Chancellor, and after Chancellor Poulton came, the Provost took executive briefs of the proposals to the Personnel and Programs Committee of the NCSU Trustees. He then made certain that the proposals were in the proper format and contained all of the proper information for the Chancellor to send to the President and in the appropriate number of copies. Dr. Downs did this for undergraduate proposals and the Dean of the Graduate School for graduate degree proposals. A copy always went to the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the BOG. This assured that a proposal would not be lost in the system for that person handled matters of degrees for the BOG. In all cases we would have had appropriate discussion with those preparing the proposals and would have had informal conversations with the Vice President. This usually resulted in our having few proposals turned down. In some cases we did not send forward proposals which would not be welcomed at that time by the BOG. At others times we cautioned the faculty not to send us a proposal at that time for it would not be approved at the central level. This saved a lot of time but did not always avoid frustrations.

On May 16, 1968, the Provost developed an extensive set of guidelines for developing and revising undergraduate courses and curricula. These were covered in an eight page memorandum that will not be repeated here. In 1970 Provost Kelly

reinforced his intent to have a faculty courses and curriculum committee in each school. It was noted in that year that a couple of schools still had such committees made up entirely of administrators.

Provost Kelly had been much concerned with and had encouraged the introduction of more Black courses into our offerings. Several faculty in the History Department sent to Dean Cahill a signed letter of protest for him to send to Dr. Kelly allegedly because unnamed persons in the administration were interfering into the matters which were under the control of the faculty. This is described in more detail in Chapter IV under Issues Related to Race. Of course we later also tried to get women's courses developed. At first these came more readily than the Black courses. Shortly after I became Provost, Caldwell and I had a discussion about the paucity of our offerings of non-western courses. After reflection he writes to Dean Tilman and me:

I have a profound feeling we need to step up our offerings in literature more aggressively beyond American and English. It might be better not to tie the move to the possible forbidding umbrella of 'foreign languages'. Indeed, maybe we could sacrifice some of our offerings in English and American literature in that larger and, therefore, flexible faculty of the English Department. But these options may encounter departmental jealousies. I'm writing this to you two hoping you can look at the possibilities without prematurely stirring up the population. The burden of it is: lets offer more non-English language literature! Who and how become toughies.

We did work with Dean Tilman and later Dean Toole on the idea of more non-western courses including literature, and a number were developed in both of these departments and in all of the other departments of humanities and social sciences. We also did not stir up the population!

Another concern from Shirley's tenure until today has been the matter of too many

hours required for graduation for a four year curriculum. I found in the catalogs of 1960 that many curricula had 140 or more hours required for graduation. Some required as many as 160 hours. To reduce the hours required became an issue under Kelly. He accomplished much on this front and got the numbers down to the high 120s and low 130s in all of the curricula except those with a summer practicum. The School of Liberal Arts required only 124 hours except for those students who also sought teacher certification. Under my term as Provost we had to try very hard not to let the numbers increase and were generally successful. In a few cases, for accreditation reasons, an additional course was added especially in one or two engineering curricula. We tried to hold the line during my years, but there was some slippage. In January of 1978, we made another effort to keep the number of hours required in a curriculum down. At this time we required that graduation credit for English 111 be counted as a requirement in all curricula. At that time it did not count in the School of Engineering's curricula so we had to let them all add three hours to each degree program. We added that "no school or department is authorized to increase the number of required hours in any curriculum over the present maximum of 130 without a specific justification of the need to do so and with careful review by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee and this office." The problem of keeping curricula current without adding additional courses is difficult. At times it seems that revision of a course adds more to the course without deleting a similar quantity of covered subject matter and there is a request soon to add another course. I was convinced, based on the mix and difficulty of the courses in the curricula, that most of the so called four-year curricula at NCSU were really four and one-half to five-year curricula. This is evidenced by the small proportion of our students who graduate in four years. This has been a concern of all Chancellors and Provosts. It has also been a concern of the BOG and its staff. More

recently it has become a concern even of the Legislature. At one time we had an *ad hoc* committee chaired by Dean Monteith who headed up a committee to study graduation rates at NCSU. It was what we called the "Graduate Quicker Committee." At Chancellor Poulton's request this committee did not make a formal report in 1987 although we did discuss its findings widely. Its findings were:

1. The percentage of the cohort which graduates in five years has not changed significantly in the last twenty years.
2. The percentage of the cohort which graduates in four years has steadily declined over the past twelve years, and remained relatively stable for the last four cohorts.
3. The increase in enrollment in the co-op programs over the last twelve years is a significant factor in the decline of four-year graduation rates.
4. Credit hour requirements for the baccalaureate degrees have not changed significantly in the last ten years.
5. For continuing students phantom majors are truly phantom, hence, not a contributing factor to extending the time to graduate.
6. The transfers from one degree program to another within the first two semesters is not a contributing factor in the time required to complete degree requirements.
7. transfer within NCSU after two semesters can be a contributing factor in the time required to complete degree requirements.
8. Poor freshman performance (D or NC in two or more courses) is a contributing factor for approximately one-third of the students enrolled in Engineering, PAMS,

Design, Forestry, and Textiles who do not graduate in four years.

9. Reduced load after the freshman year is a contributing factor. Poor freshman performance for many students appears to motivate them to take a reduced load.
10. Freshman performance of students in Engineering and PAMS contributes to their withdrawal or suspension.

One of the things this committee found was that many students who fail to graduate entered NCSU with the same records that those who eventually did graduate. They also found that many students who leave us leave for reasons other than the lack of academic success. We have a number of non-flunk-out drop-outs. Many leave us and transfer to other institutions. The chief and most important finding was that students who get disenchanted with NCSU or who get behind academically early in their first semester leave NCSU. To wait until midterm of the first semester to find out about a particular freshman, in either of the two previous situations, is too late. The committee also recommended that we institute attendance requirements in 100 and 200 level courses. This committee and the subsequent discussions led to the creation too of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies position and program which was intended to devise strategies and activities to prevent or to lessen this serious problem.

So our primary concern at first tended to turn to reasons, not only why so many of our students don't graduate in four years, but also why they don't graduate from NCSU. This had always been a far more important subject and one of far more worry and concern to me than the four year graduation rate. We have come to understand a number of reasons why students don't graduate in four years. The first is that we have almost no four-year curricula although we call all of our baccalaureate degrees four-year degrees. Other reasons include the creation of the optional minor and the

increasing number of students who seek a minor. Another factor is the increasing number of students who seek dual degrees. Both of these factors cause students to stay in school longer, but they prepare them better for their first job and their subsequent careers. At the time that I was Provost we had a very large number of students involved in Cooperative Education (co-op) programs. At one time we had more or almost as many students involved in co-op programs as the combined enrollments in the co-op of the other public institutions in North Carolina. We have a number of programs with internship requirements in addition to those expected of all students in teacher education. These usually come after a student has taken certain courses in the major. We have a very large number of students who work and who work a large number of hours per week. A major reason is that we have a very large number of adult students or other students, who for one or more or for all of their semesters, enroll on a part-time basis. I knew some students who went part-time except for their last year. They may have finished ten years after taking their first course at NCSU. The students working at jobs full-time have no intention of trying to graduate in four years and do not intend to be full-time students. This is the largest unserved group of the population in our area of the State who wish and need an education at the baccalaureate level. Our requirements and expectations of high levels of performance in the first level courses of math, sciences, humanities, social sciences and composition cause us to enroll many students in compensatory courses. We have found that students not yet prepared to take calculus are not ready to enroll and rarely succeed in chemistry. This was not a matter of the level of math required to solve problems in chemistry, but it was a matter of the ability to solve word problems. We have a number of students who have done well after taking a non-credit reading course. We found that if a student appeared to be on the borderline for admission, that it was wise to have that student begin by taking a

smaller load. This is also true of a student who had to repeat courses because of failure or who needed to go to tutoring programs or review sessions frequently. Another factor was that many of the full time students registered for a full load, but by the end of the drop-add period many of the students were enrolled for fewer hours than the average needed in their curriculum to finish in a four year period. Another problem was that a large number of students, (in one semester of 1982 there were 800), who registered for composition, chemistry, math or other freshmen courses, who did not have the proper prerequisites. We began to devise strategies to avoid this. It was not possible to avoid this problem entirely for we did not have prerequisites built into our computerized course and registration system. PAMS, English and the Academic Skills programs all devised strategies to control this problem for students in their freshman courses. Students who registered for courses without the proper prerequisites were destined for failure. Sometimes they seemed to do it intentionally for prerequisites were known by all students. I believe they did this at times because they had taken the course in high school and believed they did not need to take the prerequisite course at NCSU.

In 1965 Provost Kelly wrote a policy on minimum class size. It reads:

Normally, the minimum class size for an undergraduate class on our campus is ten students; for a graduate class, five students. This policy applies during the summer sessions as well as for all classes during the academic year. If there are compelling reasons to hold classes for a smaller number of students, written requests should be initiated by the department head for approval by the dean of the respective school and the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of the Graduate School.

After I became Provost our summer school budget was not adequate so we could not afford to teach so many small classes. We had to increase the numbers of enrolled students from 5 to 10 for graduate students

and from 10 to 12 for undergraduate students in the summer sessions.

We began to encourage all departments to have special topics, research and seminar courses at the undergraduate as well as at the graduate levels, for these included the independent study and the research opportunities for undergraduates. In these we did not expect the enrollment to be at the five and ten student levels. They could be for only one or two students. In 1977 there was a legislative inquiry concerning the number of classes with small enrollments or of classes with fewer than ten students. We sent our report to Dr. Dawson of UNC because he was compiling the report for the 16 campuses. Omitting the 290, 490, 590 and 690 series of courses we reported that we taught 2732 course sections during the Spring Semester of 1977. Of these, 125 undergraduate and 137 graduate courses had ten or fewer students. It added in my report: "We hope that the persons who are to receive the data which you are compiling are made aware of its complexity and of the many problems involved in its interpretation." In our report, which consisted of 11 pages double spaced, we had to show the department, the course number, the section number, and we had to give a reason why each class was taught. This was a much more difficult task than it would be today because the computer could do all the work except to give reasons. I never heard anything from the report so I always assumed that it satisfied the curiosity of some legislator, and very likely one who might not want to give you the resources needed to provide for quality education but one who had no qualms about taking up hours of time that could have been spent on projects of at least some educational value.

In 1971 and 1972 the Chancellor continued to ask the Provost to reduce the number of new courses approved. Caldwell wanted us to say that we would not approve any new courses unless one was dropped, and later Chancellor Poulton made the same request. We were also concerned about adequate revision of our courses and cur-

ricula. When we did a study, it showed that there were courses and curricula that had not gone before the committee in many years, and significant revisions of courses were supposed to come before the committee. We based that assumption on the fact that after many years all faculty should have made significant revisions in their courses. We came up with the requirement of curricula and course reviews at periodic intervals. I had hoped that this would result in dropping a number of courses that were in the records. It did not. The number of courses in the record has been a concern of every chief academic officer here at NCSU. We always seemed to add a large number of new courses and to drop only a few. We thought of another way that was endorsed by CCC and the Administrative Board of the Graduate School to reduce courses. This was to require that all courses not taught within a four year period be dropped from the records. Exceptions could be made with adequate justification. This caused a significant deletion of courses from the records on the first cycle and a lesser number of dropped courses in later years. Cycles were oriented with the publication of the catalogs. Even in the first cycle which included all those courses not taught in four or more years we added more new courses than we dropped.

The UNC system also instituted a systematic review of all degree programs. They took a look at all degree programs in a specific field at each of the campuses offering degrees in that field. Today the system is still involved in these reviews, however, not all degree programs have been reviewed yet. One of the plans was for a periodic review, but we all learned that if reviews are thorough it takes substantially more time than was originally envisioned. Causal reviews take a lot of time too and are generally wasted effort. These reviews are usually coordinated through the Provost's and the Graduate Dean's Offices. Occasionally it seemed that our units and the BOG reviewers sometimes forgot. It did insist that the

Provost get a copy of all materials used in responses in undergraduate programs. The Graduate School Dean did this too. If there were both undergraduate degree programs and graduate programs in the field, both were reviewed simultaneously. I wished to have the privilege of being present at any discussions between members of our campus and the staff of the general administration who were conducting the review. This worked most of the time, but not all of the time. In 1988 the UNC System took a hard look at the requirements for teacher education certification and the associated degrees programs on all campuses. They took a hard stand on the number of hours that could be required for a BA or a B.S. degree in these areas. While each campus could come up with a plan for requirements they must meet the limitation on hour requirements. On our campus we had very few problems except in Agricultural Education, Technical Education and other similar areas where there was not a defined major in an academic discipline.

After the program for systematic review of curricula leading to degrees or tracks that were the equivalent to degrees began, there was a great concern about the programs with small enrollments. These had to be justified if they were to be retained. It became very easy to drop a degree program and we dropped several that had few undergraduates majors and in other cases we merged degrees (for example Soils and Crop Science to Agronomy). These requests were handled quickly by the system and an approval could be received by return mail from the BOG staff. These were then only reported by the staff to the BOG. Every one was anxious to see some degrees dropped, but the dropped curricula occurred slowly in comparison to the proposals for new degrees. We had few degree proposals at the undergraduate level that were not approved. I am certain that this in part was because we clearly understood our mission and understood what the view of the BOG staff was of our mission. For this reason it was very

difficult to get new degrees that were under-enrolled at other campuses approved for our campus. They were even more difficult if they were in humanities or social sciences. Some members of the BOG felt that we should not offer degrees except in the professional and science fields. They sometimes expressed their concerns to the press, and seemed to disagree with the decision in the sixties, when the campuses at Wilmington, Charlotte and Asheville were added and all campuses would have degrees in the basic disciplines, in computer science and in business. So it was a great surprise to me to learn that, while Hart was Provost and we had submitted a new long range plan to the BOG, a degree in Religious Studies had been approved for NCSU. We had a superlative faculty who persisted in pushing, and we had developed and taught almost all of the courses needed for a major. These courses were popular with students and enrollment was good in them, even as elective courses for students in other majors.

In 1978 we approved a certificate program in Political Science which may have been a model for the minors developed later. We began to have certificate programs for students not interested in pursuing degrees in a field. These were almost always for adults who were working full time who wished to gain new expertise to improve skills in their present jobs or who wished to gain sufficient new knowledge to enable them to change fields. Most already had an undergraduate or even a graduate degree. Several such certificate programs were developed by departments by putting together a specified group of courses which would give the student a professional competency. Some of the most popular were in political science and public administration where governmental employees were the primary student clientele, and in computer science where the students came from all fields. They were somewhat like a minor for non-degree students who did not want or need a degree. They gave the student some visible evidence to show their employers or

prospective employers that they had completed a specific educational program.

In 1978 an associate and friend of Chancellor Thomas, Iredell Jenkins, from the University of Alabama came to NCSU for a year. He studied the curricula at NCSU and looked at the courses which could be used in the various schools to satisfy general education requirements. His study was entitled: "Is there something missing in the education of students at NCSU?" He made a number of reports, talks, and led a discussion at a Provost's Forum. His basic findings were that a student from NCSU could obtain an excellent education from the perspective of the major and general education. He also found that it was possible to graduate in most of the curricula with a very poor general education with respect to the humanities and social science requirements. Some curricula required only so many hours in the humanities and so many in the social sciences. His feeling was that we gave the student too much choice in many curricula and that we allowed too much flexibility in these general education requirements. Our math and science requirements in the general education requirements were considered to meet the basic needs for an educated person and were better than those required at most other universities. We had the first major Provost's Forum on the Core Curriculum on November 21, 1979. One of the things done by Dr. Downs and the CCC at about this time was to examine the courses that could meet social science and humanities requirements in the schools and to make certain that the electives in the humanities and social sciences did not include professional and skill courses. This was a big improvement. Later in 1984 Dean Toole and I appointed a special committee in SHASS and asked them to come up with recommendations of courses in their fields that they thought would be those best for an educated person. We asked them to solicit views of SHASS faculty, the University faculty, and other interested parties as to the appropriate roles and functions of the

Humanities and Social Science disciplines on the NCSU campus with regard to general education at the University, undergraduate major programs, graduate programs, faculty research and professional development and extension. We also asked them to give us recommendations on the advancement and further development of SHASS at NCSU. In an early preliminary report, it was said that the Commission was established because the Visiting Team from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had expressed concerns about the quality of SHASS. This was not a recommendation of the Visiting Team and it wasn't even mentioned in any way in the report. On January 17, 1985, Poulton sent out a memorandum on campus to correct this view. The accreditation team pointed out, as we knew and had discussed with them, that some faculty had mixed views of the role of SHASS at NCSU. Some faculty had expressed their concerns about the growth of SHASS in faculty, students and degrees. This growth was primarily in the Business and Accounting degree programs. Others did not feel that we should offer degrees in the humanities and social science fields. The SHASS study was a good and necessary first step, for it began a lengthy look at undergraduate education at NCSU by the Provost's Office, but it did not resolve problems. This group held a Provost's Forum to report their findings. We then appointed a special committee of faculty representing all schools, the Senate, and the Courses and Curriculum Committee to advise us about our general education requirements. After two years of work they made a report, however there was a bare majority of the members who agreed with the committee's final recommendations. Naturally we had a minority report too. This group's report and findings were discussed with the faculty at another Provost's Forum. This committee did make significant contributions, but their recommendations were not acceptable to the faculty in most of the schools. We then appointed a Commission on General Education requirements. I attended many of the meetings of the com-

mission over the first two year period, however, they were far from reaching a consensus when I retired. After about four or five years of hearings, debate, compromise, and a tremendous number of hours and a tremendous amount of work, they made recommendations which were accepted in large measure during Hart's tenure as Provost. These are now in the process of being implemented. Some will require new resources and will be implemented as resources become available. Of particular importance this committee is now a standing committee. Dr. Downs said, "I truly believe that curriculum reform was the most important thing that I was responsible for in all of my years in the Provost's office. As far as I can tell, it is still working."

The Council on Undergraduate Education receives all proposals for changes in the general education requirements and evaluates their subsequent effectiveness. The CCC has the responsibility of seeing that the approved changes are implemented.

In 1989 we had 96 Baccalaureate programs (22 BA, 67 B.S., and 7 Bachelor of degrees), 8 Professional degree programs (Engineering and DVM), 107 Masters programs (6 MA, 60 MS, 41 Master of degrees), and 48 other Doctoral programs (6 Education Doctorates, 42 Ph. D.). We also had 1661 undergraduate courses on the books, 32 DVM courses and 1658 other graduate courses.

Upon recommendation of the Academics Committee of the Student Senate, the University Courses and Curriculum Committee recommended guidelines for the development of undergraduate minors. Those guidelines became policy in December, 1985. The guidelines include: "a minor shall be optional for any student; a student's minor shall not be in the same discipline as the major; a typical minor requires at least 15 credit hours of departmental or interdepartmental course work; successful completion of a minor will be recognized on a student's transcript." As of 1989 some 55 minors had been approved. Many of these were departmental, some were interdepart-

mental such as linguistics and journalism. In addition there were a number of interdisciplinary minors, such as African-American studies, art studies, environmental science, international studies and women's studies. Two of the first minors approved were computer programming and business management. This was not a surprise because students in all majors sought courses from those two areas and the concerned faculty wanted to direct students into those courses which would be of greatest benefit to them. These have the most student minors too. This was a significant development in the education of our students, and is but one of several ways that student suggestions have contributed to the improvement of education at NCSU.

The Associate Provost coordinates credit hours generated by cross-listed courses for the affected departments and maintains a listing of all undergraduate courses that governs the schedule of courses for the CCC. Changes in undergraduate general education requirements go to the CCC. Over the years courses proposed to be used to meet General Education requirements are reviewed, recommended and sent to the Provost by this committee.

This University Courses and Curriculum Committee has always been one with a very large workload. The alternate years when the *Undergraduate Catalog* is to be published brings the greatest quantity of business before the committee. Of all the committees at NCSU, I considered this to be the most important one. Its accomplishments have been of great help to the Provosts and have enabled them to carry out their responsibilities. The CCC members at NCSU have all helped to provide the vital faculty role that is so important for quality in our educational enterprise.

Graduate School

In 1974 when I became Provost the Chancellor assigned responsibility for the Graduate School to the Provost. Prior to that time it reported directly to the Chancellor. I will not include Graduate School matters

prior to 1974 in this section except for those which involved the Provost. Chancellor Caldwell indicated that he felt this change in relationship was essential to the functioning of academic programs, however, he waited until the retirement of both Provost Kelly and Dean Walter Peterson before making the change. Dr. James Peeler (Associate Dean of the Graduate School who became Acting Dean of the Graduate School on Dean Peterson's retirement), and I had worked very closely for many years to accomplish functions of coordination. The change in line of authority went very smoothly. The title was also changed by Caldwell to Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. The addition of Vice Provost to the title was not for prestige or a sign of rank, but it was so those on campus would see the new relationship to the Provost.

Soon after his arrival at NCSC in 1960, Chancellor Caldwell indicated, "The Dean of the Graduate School in the exercise of his responsibilities with respect to instruction and research must defer to the primary responsibility of the Dean of the Faculty for faculty development, faculty assignment, budget and space." I believe that Caldwell used Peterson as a confidant and probably relied more on Peterson's advice than on anyone else's. This may have been another reason why Kelly and Peterson did not work together as well as was desired.

I will mention a few items related to the Graduate School that involved the Dean of the Faculty in the early years and a small but incomplete group of items of interest to the graduate education at NCSC.

Prior to 1948 there were individuals who earned their Ph. D. degrees at NCSU, but they were awarded from UNC-CH. In 1948 NCSC awarded its first doctoral degrees since before the consolidation of the UNC System. In 1955 the title of the person responsible for graduate work on our campus was changed from Associate Dean, which reported to the UNC administration, to Dean of the Graduate School, which still reported to the UNC administration. On March 12, 1957, a letter was received stating

that there was one Graduate School in the Consolidated University which reported to the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research at the UNC offices in Chapel Hill. On February 12, 1958, this matter was clarified further to indicate that the Dean would clear with the Chancellor all matters involving graduate study that "are local in nature". The Dean was also to consult with the Chancellor on matters of University graduate policy. Then the Graduate Dean was to deal directly with the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research "in order to expedite the business of our All-University Graduate School". At this time all proposed graduate degree programs were sent to a committee appointed by the VP and which represented all three campuses. This practice continues today with the committee representatives coming from all campuses of the UNC system with graduate programs. Beginning in 1959 there were a number of new doctoral degrees recommended and approved. The process of approval was very similar to those described for undergraduate degrees discussed earlier, except that proposals prior to 1974 went to the Dean of the Graduate School and then to the Administrative Board of the Graduate School. When we were a part of the All-University Graduate School, the Dean of the Graduate School sent the proposals after consultation with the Chancellor, directly to the VP at UNC. It was soon after Caldwell came that the process changed and the Graduate Dean submitted all requests through Caldwell. Of course after approval by the President and the BOT, the proposals had to be approved by the Board of Higher Education. After 1974 all degree proposals and policies were forwarded to the Provost for concurrence before they went to the Chancellor in a similar way to that described earlier for undergraduate degree proposals. So that process will not be repeated here.

In 1957 a note to files indicated that the Dean of the Faculty was to be notified when a graduate course was to be dropped. By the time I became Assistant Provost this practice was discontinued because the Provost no

longer kept a duplicate record of the listing of graduate courses. When I became Assistant Provost in 1967 I requested and received a copy of the minutes of the Graduate Board because information on new courses and degrees were recorded there. I have no idea why these minutes had not been requested earlier. In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell, as did Bostian, continued occasionally to send proposals for graduate degrees to UNC without sending a copy to the Dean of the Faculty. When I joined the Provost's staff in 1967, I kept up with these matters and kept Provost Kelly informed so we did know what was happening in graduate work and policies. However, prior to 1974, sometimes we received copies of correspondence of the Chancellor requesting graduate degrees and sometimes we did not. I do not recall ever hearing Dr. Kelly say that he had complained to the Chancellor about not receiving copies.

I know that we had graduate assistants for many years and before World War II, but the first mention that I found of Graduate Research Assistantships was in a memo from the Dean of the Graduate School to the Chancellor. The Dean of the Faculty received a copy. James Bethel, Acting Dean of the Graduate School, established the precedent that all graduate assistantship appointments would go through the Graduate School. They also would go by the Business Office and by the Office of Dean of the Faculty. This same memorandum of December 29, 1958, stated that all graduate appointments would also be processed and approved by the Graduate School. It was at this time that all requests for associate and full professor appointments or promotions to the rank of associate professor were to be accompanied by a "Request for Appointment to Graduate Faculty" form which went to the Dean of the Graduate School. Most of these practices continue today. The exception is that some faculty members are not required to have membership in the graduate faculty. We stopped requiring this for everyone after I became Provost for there were many areas that did not have graduate

courses or graduate degree programs. Many extension faculty also did not participate in graduate programs. Requests for membership in the Graduate Faculty are now sent directly to the Graduate School at any time and do not accompany the promotion materials, but the Dean of the Graduate School continues to review and make recommendations on all promotions and tenure proposals sent from the schools/colleges.

We have always believed that we could not get some graduate programs at NCSC/ NCSU because of objections by academic units at Chapel Hill. There was a proposal for a master's program in Management Science in 1958. It was clear from correspondence that this degree proposal was objected to by the School of Business Administration at UNC on the grounds that it was "contrary to the principle of consolidation". In 1962 there was a clarification that six hours of off-campus extension courses could apply towards a master's degree. It was of interest to me to note that none of the correspondence from the Extension Division to the Graduate Dean, to the Chancellor, or to the VP of UNC, and in the reverse direction showed copies to Dean Kelly although the Extension Division reported to him!

It was in 1965 that I found the first setting of graduate stipends for assistantship holders by the Dean of the Faculty. He said: "As a step toward increasing the attractiveness of our teaching assistantships and thereby increasing the quality of our undergraduate teaching, the new stipend range will be \$2,700- \$3,600 for half-time assistants." There was no mention of research assistantship stipend levels. I found no copy of this memo to Dean Peterson. During the later years of Kelly's tenure we began to ask the Graduate Dean about every two years to study the level of the Graduate Assistants' (Research and Teaching) stipend levels. This request might occur more frequently if anyone in the schools/colleges felt that the levels were too low for them to be competitive. The Graduate School did this study by reviewing with the schools and departments their needs and looking at national stipend

levels offered by competing universities. The Graduate School Dean made a recommendation to the Provost. When Dr. Kelly was Provost these stipends were set at varying levels based on years of experience as a graduate assistant. The first department to request that we permit a change was Chemistry. It was emphasized that they could not compete for better graduate students at the lower levels and that they wished to use a single rate that would enable them to compete for new graduate students nationally. It was then that we began to set maximum and eventually minimum stipend levels. To avoid having to make so many exceptions to the maximum rate, we began to let units approve stipends at rates of 10% over the maximum for currently enrolled exceptional assistants and for exceptional new prospects. Some schools set much lower maximum stipends for all assistants. As a result stipends paid by schools and even by departments soon became very different. This flexibility seemed to work well for the different units. While it did not increase the total funds available, it did let units determine whether they needed to pay higher levels to be competitive. I still believe the level was also determined, especially in a few departments, by the need for TAs. The departments or schools were certainly better able to make these determinations of what the stipend should be, within the resources available, than were the Provost and the Graduate Dean. We also set the stipend levels for interns and residents in the Veterinary College. In this case there was a desire to have pay levels set on the basis of years of experience. We upgraded this scale almost every year to enable the Vet College to remain competitive with other Colleges of Veterinary Medicine.

In 1972 the Legislature established the practice of "Tuition Remission." Prior to this time all graduate assistantship holders appointed for a service of one-fourth or more paid in-state tuition rates. This new approach provided a precise dollar value that could be used to reduce the out-of state rates to in-state rates of tuition for out-of-

state graduate students. Since we were growing rapidly in our graduate programs, we had to ask the Legislature each year through BOG for an increase in our tuition remission funds. This factor caused units to be very conservative (more than they needed to be) in their recruitment efforts, and most units felt that they lost outstanding students. Also established at this time were stringent residency requirements for out-of-State students who were independent and who wished to become North Carolina residents. The departments and schools had to "encourage strongly" graduate students to become residents to make Tuition Remission funds available for new out-of-state students. I believe that this matter was a result of the politicians wanting to reduce out-of-state enrollments because of the activities of a number of out-of state students at UNC-CH during the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The Legislators also said that it was to stop paying for the costs of educating out-of-state students.

There were a few other collaborative efforts between the Graduate Dean and the Provost. In 1972, assistantships which were to be continued for a graduate student whose GPA fell under 3.0 had to be approved by the Provost. I asked Dr. Peeler later why we were continuing this practice. He indicated that it was started to discourage departments from making such requests unless there were really very extenuating circumstances, and it was believed that if the Provost had to approve the action fewer requests would be made. He wished for the practice to be continued. I never recall the Provost's turning a request down when the department, the school and the Graduate School recommended approval. We discontinued this approval after Dr. Debra Stewart became Dean of the Graduate School. I don't believe that the numbers of exceptions requested increased.

Three Graduate Deans have reported to the Provosts. These were Vivian T. Stannett, Jasper D. Memory and Debra W. Stewart. Shortly after Stannett became Dean, I requested that he develop a mechanism for

the review of existing graduate programs at NCSU. This did not come into being during his tenure, but a procedure was developed and implemented under Memory. The Chancellor and I had agreed that Stannett could spend approximately one-half of his time on his research because he had a number of grants, post-doctorates and graduate students. We also agreed that he would remain as Dean for only one five-year term so that he could return to full time faculty status well before he would retire. It was during his tenure that we were able to add Augustus Witherspoon to the staff on a one-half time basis. Although he assisted Stannett and Peeler on a number of projects, his major responsibility was to help the University's graduate programs in the recruitment of African-American graduate students. He was also to undertake studies that might indicate to us how we could help these students succeed academically and how to make certain that their studies culminated in the degrees sought. We soon learned that the retention and success of these students did not differ significantly from those of other graduate students, however, the recruitment was much more difficult. Dr. Witherspoon developed one of the nations most successful networks with contacts at the predominately black colleges and universities and at the major universities and colleges that had significant numbers of African-American undergraduate students enrolled. When he joined the Provost's staff he was replaced by Dr. Thoyd Melton who continues to use and enhance this network.

When Dean Stannett returned to the faculty Dr. Peeler again served as Interim Dean of the Graduate School. After Memory was selected, Dr. Peeler decided to return to teaching in the Department of Economics and Business. Raymond Fornes from Physics and Debra Stewart from Political Science and Public Administration were selected as Assistant Deans of the Graduate School. Both were part-time.

Others who have served as Assistant or Associate Deans of the Graduate School are, D. A. Emery from Crop Science,

E. M. Crawford from Sociology and Anthropology, M. F. King from English and R. S. Sowell from Biological and Agricultural Engineering.

After the Graduate School began to report to the Provost and on-campus reviews were in place, the BOG also started a system of program reviews. Those that involved graduate programs involved primarily the Graduate Dean but the Provost was also included in all of the on-campus meetings and received all the documentation for review. Many more NCSU reviews than BOG reviews of graduate programs have been conducted.

While the Provosts received minutes of the Administrative Board of the Graduate School's meetings, they did not become involved in most matters except those that involved a policy change or for the adding or dropping of graduate degree programs. Policy matters were always discussed at the Deans' Council meetings after review of the written policy proposals by the other school/college deans. When necessary they were also approved by the Chancellor. The Provost reported newly proposed or dropped programs but rarely policy changes to the NCSU Trustees' Personnel and Programs Committee. The Graduate School Deans always prepared the material which had to be forwarded to the UNC System in the appropriate format and with the needed number of copies. These were sent to the Provosts for review of the final documentation with the draft memoranda to be used later by the Chancellor. In almost all cases either the Graduate Dean or I would have discussions with the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the UNC System as the proposals were being developed. In a few cases we did learn that a particular proposal would not be received favorably. So several problems were avoided without creating a fuss. I always was kept abreast of the development of proposals and any problems that I recognized were ironed out before or during the Administrative Board of the Graduate School's review and study of the proposals. Upon my formal recommendation

and the Chancellor's concurrence the Chancellor's Office forwarded the proposed programs to the BOG staff with the appropriate number of copies. This was also the practice followed by Stewart and Hart.

In 1985, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools passed a resolution on the educational background and requirements of those who taught undergraduate students at colleges and universities. These regulations were revised in 1986, however, we had to implement the new regulations. "Each institution employing graduate teaching assistants must provide a published set of guidelines for institution-wide graduate assistantship administration, including appointment criteria, remuneration, rights and responsibilities, evaluation and reappointment." These were established by a memorandum of June 17, 1987, to School Deans and Associate Deans from Dean Stewart and me. This really caused us very little problem except in the Departments of English and Computer Science. The only requirement that caused us a problem was that the TA must have completed 18 graduate semester hours in their teaching field or hold the master's degree in that field. We used a number of TAs to teach composition and computer languages and only offered a master's degrees in those fields at that time. We were able to have many of those who did not have 18 hours of graduate course work in the field teach the remedial courses in composition. We already had hired a large number of persons with master's degrees who were lecturers to teach composition. In Computer Science we had used exceptional undergraduates and those working on a master's degree to teach introductory computer languages. We found that for these courses we could hardly afford to hire Ph.D. holders, and the students were superior teachers. These issues were argued at a number of meetings and we did adjust and adapt. There was such a shortage of the so-called qualified in Computer Science that all colleges had to do as we did and the Southern Association accepted this practice as a reasonable rationale for using teachers

with less than the specified requirements. Today we offer the Ph.D. in Computer Science and have no difficulty in meeting the standards set forth. Those institutions who depended on TAs to teach their freshmen and sophomores had a much more difficult adjustment problem.

Another issue that constantly arose was the number of TAs that taught undergraduate students. In 1988 we were required to report how many TAs we had teaching lecture sections. With only a very few exceptions most of these TAs taught remedial or compensatory courses. Almost all were in the Math Education program and in the English, Computer Science and Mathematics departments. Another constant complaint was the number of TAs who were foreigners whom the students couldn't understand because of their poor use of English. Out of 871 TAs on campus 213 were foreign. Of these only 35 taught lecture sections. Twenty three of these were in the Department of Mathematics, six in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, four in Economics and one each in Electrical and Computer Engineering and Statistics. Each was an experienced student and the departments thought their language proficiency was adequate before placing them in a lecture situation. It is true that a few did have accents. Most foreign TAs were involved in laboratory sections (where there were more with language problems than elsewhere), grading papers and tests and assisting in review sessions for classes. The Graduate School did establish a mechanism for sending TAs through a spoken English language program to assure their competency in English.

While Poulton was Chancellor, because of the relationship between graduate student support and grants and contracts which we were obtaining in increasing numbers and value, he felt that there should be a formal working relationship between the Research Office and the Graduate School. So he had the Graduate School report to both the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Research. This relationship is described

further in Chapter 1 in the section labeled Functions. There has always been a close relationship between the Research Office and the Graduate School, because the first grants and contracts were processed through the Graduate School. Dr. Frank Guthrie, as an Assistant Dean for Research of the Graduate School, developed our first Research Office. This later became the Research Office which was filled by H. F. Robinson as NCSU's first Administrative Dean for Research.

This is a very inadequate coverage of the Graduate School at NCSU because it really covers only an abbreviated list of activities of that school. Graduate Education has been such an important part of our development as a University. We did have graduate programs before consolidation and I have mentioned only a very small group of activities since 1955. It is my sincere hope that someone will undertake the job to write the complete history of the Graduate School.

Grading Systems and Scholarship

At the time that Shirley became Dean of the Faculty we had an A, B, C, D, F grading system. Ever since that time, grading systems have been changed constantly at NCSU, but these changes have usually been minor.

I will not attempt to mention all the changes that have occurred since that time. Instead, I will mention some examples and discuss a variety of related issues. If one wishes to follow the grading system changes in detail they can be found in the undergraduate catalogs and in the *Adviser's and Teacher's Handbooks*. I do mention testing and undergraduate scholarship as well as grading systems and some other issues. While the Faculty Senate has been most responsible for the formulation of grade system changes, they have always involved the Provost, the school deans and the Chancellor. We, the administrators, get the blame from the students whenever there is a complaint because these changes could not have come into being without our approval.

The issue was raised in the Senate in the 1950s about what C and D grades meant. The D was described as passing and many wanted the C to be average. The question was average of what? In time the C came to be called satisfactory. This is what the C and D grades continued to mean in 1993.

In 1961 the Senate discussed the very liberal policy of allowing students to repeat an unlimited number of F grades without their being counted in the GPA. I quote from the Senate minutes. "Furthermore the 'F Rule' in its present application provides the conditions for irresponsible academic behavior. Since the inauguration of the rule, there have been indications that State College students are abusing the extensive privileges of the rule. Upperclassmen, faced with a possible D in a course, are giving up to receive a F which will, in the case of these juniors and seniors, allow them to repeat the work. The admissions committee finds itself dealing with an increased number of students who have been dropped from school because of failure to pass six or eight hours in the fall semester." The new rule would allow undergraduates to substitute the second grade on a course for a maximum of 15 hours. It allowed for repeats of grades of B, C, D, and F, with only the new grade considered in calculating the GPA. This same Senate studied the possible requirement of a C grade in all required courses. The Senate could not agree on this proposal and it did not become a uniform practice, however, some departments to this day require a C in all courses in the major.

The Deans of the Faculty or the Provosts have always sent Dean's List certificates to those students who made a high GPA on their courses at the end of each semester. The Senate in 1960-61 considered modifying the requirements for this scholastic honor and for graduation with honors, but they decided that the rules should not be changed. At this time a full time student must make a 3.0 GPA. Many years later we raised this to a scale of 3.5 for the completion of 12 to 14 hours and 3.25 for those who completed 15 or

more hours. One semester I had a complaint and a petition from several students who had failed to get their Dean's List certificates. It seemed that the professor who taught the class did not grade the final exams, but took off for an extended Christmas break. In this case incomplete grades were submitted for all students, so they naturally did not get certificates unless they had completed 12 or more hours that semester. I did complain to the dean and department head in this case. I know that it affected that professor's next salary increase. In the early days these certificates were prepared by hand and it took a lot of secretarial time. During Kelly's term these began to be produced by Registration and Records by other means. We only signed one certificate and that signature was reproduced on just over 2000 certificates by the 1980s when our enrollment had grown so much.

In 1957 I found a first reference in the files to the "C Wall". On October 8, 1957, the School of Engineering proposed that students be required to make a C in Math 102 before they could take any courses in Engineering. This was the beginning and soon afterwards in 1959 a C was required in English 111 before students could take English 112. This practice has been expanded to other courses over the years. Most, but not all expansion has been in Engineering. The rationale is that a C level of competency in the prerequisite course is necessary for successful completion of the next course or the failure rate of such students would be so high as to be a waste of resources. There have been many reactions to the C Wall. Some think that it has prolonged the stay of students who would otherwise have flunked out, and others have felt that it saved students who might have flunked out. I am certain that there are many other feelings about the C Wall. As can be seen, these two arguments show a very real spread among the philosophies of our faculty and administrators.

In 1962 the Faculty Senate passed a resolution which called for an end to the growing practice of evening exams. It was

also reported that some professors were exempting students from final exams. The Senate spoke to the value of final exams and said it would take action at a later time. In 1965 the Faculty Senate received the report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Student Evaluation. This report suggested that we move to adding other evaluative measures in addition to grade point average as a requirement for graduation. During the prior year we had moved to a sliding scale grade point average (GPA) for retention.

When Shirley became Dean of the Faculty a system of probation existed. This meant that a student who was on probation could not represent the College in any external activity. In 1960, the Faculty Senate recommended that the term "probation" be applied only to disciplinary not academic status. Instead, a "provisional status" would apply to academic deficiency, but there was no reference to representation of the College in off-campus extra curricula activities or in participation in on-campus extra curricula activities for students on provisional status. The term provisional status disappeared, but the probationary status with restrictions in extra-curricular participation was recommended by the Faculty Senate to return in 1990 and was approved by the administration for implementation.

After considerable study by the Senate, a proposal was sent to the administration to implement a policy which would let students request to be graded on a credit (CR, NC) only basis for the free electives courses that they took. This also replaced a pass or fail grade that already applied to a number of special topics, seminar, research and independent study courses. Later this was permitted when requested by students for grades in physical education courses except for Physical Education 100 and a few other courses taught by the Physical Education Department. As a matter of interest, after this became effective it became usual for us to have multiple valedictorians at graduation, and each with a perfect 4.0 GPA. This was not an outcome that was predicted.

In the early seventies the Faculty Senate recommended an A, B, C, NC grading system. The D was dropped. This system also required that a student have a grade of C or better in all courses required for graduation. It required that a student pass only a proportion of courses taken to remain in school. Under this system it was possible for a student to graduate with below a 2.0 GPA for all courses taken. A multitude of changes (mostly minor) were made over the next several years and a few major ones were added. Most of these would be effective for the newly entered students with the rule applying to the current students at some specified future date. I don't plan to go through these, but for those interested they can be found with all of their ramifications and eccentricities in the *Teacher's Handbooks* of that period. It did seem that changes were so frequent that we could only have a clear understanding of the academic and retention requirements for a set of students who entered in a specific year by referring to the official rules in the *Teacher's* and the *Advisor's Handbooks*. As we predicted, the D did come back in 1976 with the stipulation that it was not satisfactory work and at first, that no more than four courses or 12 hours of D grades in lower level courses could count towards graduation. When we ran grade reports on all classes at the 100-400 levels taught in the University, we found to our surprise, that the percentage of D grades matched the precise drop in the percentages of A and B grades awarded and there was no change in the percentages of Cs and NCs. If we ever had grade inflation, except for those in a very few professors' classes, we certainly lost it at that time. Dr. Downs prepared two documents for the Provost's Office which encapsulated these grading system changes from 1971 until 1986. One was entitled "List of Faculty Senate Actions on Academic Policies," and was dated August, 1989. The other was "Chronology of Faculty Leadership in developing Academic Policy," and was dated October, 1989. Copies of these can be found in the

Archives and in my notes in a manila folder labeled grading systems. During Hart's tenure the NC disappeared and was replaced by the F grade. The grade of CR now applies to those credits earned for courses by advanced placement, CLEP exams and through credit by exam procedures for our on-campus courses.

I asked Institutional Research to review the grades in all undergraduate Engineering courses at two different times. The first time was three and four years after we had reduced the admissions requirements to its lowest level for the admission of engineering students, and the second was when the highest requirements for admission of students in engineering. The overall grade distribution of the two groups of students was essentially identical. This was for a composite of grades given by engineering faculty in all undergraduate engineering courses. I used to argue that the engineers knew too much math and they couldn't help but grade on a curve.

Recommendations for retention and suspension of students also changed based on recommendations of the Senate. In 1968, the Chancellor accepted most of the recommendations proposed, but he changed two recommendations. One of these dealt with the quality point deficiency (QPD). The Senate recommended a deficit of 20 points for suspension. The Chancellor approved one of 25. The Senate also recommended that the Semester Rule be continued. The Chancellor said that the quality point deficiency system should eliminate the need for this. Perceived problems with the QPD was one of the causes for the development of the A, B, C, NC grading system in 1971. We had many students who had not flunked out but had huge QPDs. They kept trying to graduate. At times these were so huge that there was no way that the student could graduate. These students would continue to take courses and generally made mostly C grades which did nothing to remove the deficiency. A grade of D added to the deficiency. In some cases the students had made a C or

better on all courses required for graduation in their curricula but still had a large QPD. When this existed and I received a recommendation for graduation from the department and the school dean, I would approve an exception for graduation.

With each major change in the grading system, the retention and suspension rules had to be modified. I will not attempt to describe all of these. In 1981 the Senate recommended a sliding GPA scale for suspension. When approved in 1982 the requirements were: 1 to 27 hrs. no requirements; 28 to 59 hours a 1.25 GPA requirement; 60 to 91 hours a 1.55 GPA; from 92 to 123 hours a 1.75 GPA and for 123 hours a 1.95 GPA. A 2.0 GPA was required for graduation. It was at this time that the Academic Warning System was begun. If a student had a GPA below 2.0 he was under Academic Warning I. If he had a GPA below that of the next higher suspension requirement he was under Academic Warning II. For example, if a student had attempted 65 hours and had a GPA of 1.70 he would be in Academic Warning II. In 1990 the Senate proposed a stiffer requirement for suspension and modified the sliding scale. The new scale follows. From 1-35 hours attempted a 1.5 GPA was required; from 36-48 hours, 1.6; from 48-59 hours, 1.7; from 60 to 71 hours, 1.8; from 72 to 83 hours, 1.9 and more than 83 hours, a 2.0 GPA was required. The academic warning system was modified to the new schedule and retained. A new probationary system was added at this same time which was modified slightly in 1993.

In 1972 we were concerned about transfer credits and requirements for transfer students. To be eligible for graduation they had to satisfy all the specific requirements of a departmental major, the school and the University and to have a 2.0 GPA on their work at NCSU. As finally approved, individual departments and/or schools could determine their own limits, if any, of credit hours for off-campus classes and/or correspondence courses. To be eligible for a bachelor's degree, a transfer

student normally must have earned at least 24 of his last 30 hours of credit in residence on this campus. However, individual departments and/or schools could waive this guideline and determine their own residency requirements for a bachelor's degree. Each department's and/or school's regulations were to be reviewed by the school dean and the Provost. This recommendation of the Senate was accepted and put into practice. Prior to this time there were no University guidelines for undergraduates, and most departments had more requirements for graduation of transfer students than were required under the new guidelines. Most departments that added new restrictions made them in the course requirements in the major, with at least one-half being met at NCSU. This recommendation for transfer students was an innovative and needed change.

In 1973 after much debate and discussion by the Faculty Senate and in consultation with the school deans, we made a major policy change which was very important. We extended the principle of credit by examination. Provost Kelly in his memorandum of February 12, 1973, on Credit by Examination said

The Faculty Senate at its meeting on January 16, 1973, recommended a change in the existing policy on credit by examination at North Carolina State University. We have accepted the Senate's recommendation and the new policy is as follows: The University encourages students to consider credit by examination whenever they believe they are qualified. A currently registered undergraduate student (degree, unclassified, or special) desiring to take an examination for course credit in lieu of enrolling for the course must initiate the request with his adviser (except when a teaching department initiates group testing of beginning students for placement purposes and grants credit). Should the adviser approve, the student must arrange for the examination with the department offering the course. The department may administer the

examination in any manner pertinent to the materials of the course. The academic standards for credit by examination will be commensurate with the academic standards for the course.

If the student exhibits satisfactory performance on the examination, the instructor will notify the Department of Registration and Records on a late grade report form (pink) by stating, 'Credit by Examination'. The Department of Registration and Records will enter the appropriate number of credits hours on the student's permanent record and will issue a grade report as for courses taken in residence. Credits earned in this manner are considered in the same way as transfer credits and are not used in the computation of the student's grade-point average. If the student fails, no action beyond notifying the student is required. However, the student is not eligible for another such examination in the same course. Once a student has failed a course or has completed more than 50 percent of a course, he may not attempt credit by examination for that course. Under unusual circumstances exceptions may be made upon the written recommendation of the adviser and the approval of the department concerned.

The idea was to encourage students to seek credit for areas in which they had already acquired the knowledge of the course without regard to the method of acquiring that knowledge. In many cases there were students who felt they would prefer to take the course and thereby improve their grade point averages. With the advent of Advanced Placement Courses in high school, and the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) more students earned credit for courses. We have had a number of students who have started with more than a semester's credit by these methods of placement. We encouraged all of the departments to respond favorably to requests for credit by exam. It has probably worked best in those departments who have used their own tests or other devices for advance placement. Two

examples of this are freshmen composition and math.

The idea of a plus-minus grading system has been proposed many times and the students always objected to this. Administrators were never very keen about the proposals either. When we tried it once on an experimental basis and used the proposed scales and calculated the effect, it did reduce the overall GPA of the students. Faculty gave more minus than plus grades. This was exactly what I predicted and I never wanted to see anything implemented that would increase the grade deflation that already existed at NCSU. Anytime that the grades of C-, B-, and A- receive less than a 2, 3, or 4 multiplier factor, the GPA will be decreased because few teachers will give as many plus grades as they give minus grades. This came up at least once under Shirley, Kelly and Winstead. After I retired it was under debate in the Faculty Senate again. This time based on discussions, it sounded to me as if it were more likely to be put into practice.

In 1973 as Associate Provost, I was approving, for the Provost, a few students for graduation that had been recommended by the faculty in the major and by the school dean, who had not completed all of the requirements for graduation. In most cases the deficiency was for one or two credit hours, one to three quality points, or occasionally for one specific required course. We also had a small number of larger QPD cases. After I became Provost this function was performed by Dr. Downs. However, it seemed to me that we were simply rubber stamping proposals approved by the appropriate groups. So I delegated this approval back to the school deans.

On October 21, 1981, we held a Provost's Forum on the Senate's proposed new graduation and suspension requirements. The student leaders were especially invited to attend and to participate in the discussions. These requirements were adopted and a schedule of compliance was developed for continuing students. The major components were: a 2.0 graduation requirement, the provision for academic

departments to indicate courses or categories of courses for which a D grade would not be acceptable, a sliding scale of hours attempted with grade point averages for suspension, and an academic warning system. Details can be found in subsequent *Teacher's Handbooks*.

In 1984 the Senate recommended and we accepted a resolution on "GPA Computation for Certain Repeated Courses at NCSU." This policy permitted freshmen students to repeat up to four NC or D courses of 100-level English, math, and physical and natural science courses, without penalty. These courses could not be repeated if they were prerequisites for advanced courses for which the student had already earned credit. The transcript would show all courses attempted, but these four courses with NC or D grades, if completed satisfactorily on repeating them, would not be counted in calculating the grade point averages. This policy was intended to help freshmen overcome the great difficulty of adjusting to NCSU. More specific details and requirements to meet the policy can be found in the *Advisor's Handbooks*.

It continued to be my belief while I was Assistant Provost and Provost that we graded very hard at NCSU, and our grade point average was lower than that at most other institutions. This was also the view of Shirley. He and Bostian reported to the 1958 Visiting Committee of the Trustees the following remarks.

Out of 1200 new freshmen 300 did not attain an average high enough to come back, and 500 juniors and seniors did not have a C average. There is a feeling that our scholastic rules are much higher than other places in the State. We think that our reputation has gotten abroad over the State and is scaring students away. We want high standards and would not want to lower standards for ultimate graduation. We feel that we may have overdone scholastic requirements.

It was, of course, impossible to make a valid comparison with other universities

then and now. I know that when we investigated and began to keep a record of the courses in which freshmen made the poorest grades, we found some interesting things. Freshman chemistry, calculus, psychology, biology and certain courses in the humanities were always included. These same courses were persisted from year to year. We found that not all students enrolled in a course had the prerequisites for the course. We asked the advisers to make certain that students did have proper prerequisites. Teachers of Biological Sciences 100 continue to struggle to find the reason that large numbers flunk. Required attendance helped some. With the non-major Biological Sciences 105 course, we found the problem at one time was the teacher. Grades were appreciably lower than those of students in the general course taken by science and plant science majors. Expectations of this one teacher seemed to be unreal for a course for non-majors. A change in teachers removed the problem. Math changed subject matter in the pre-calculus course recently to include more suitable pre-calculus subjects. Math also started to have more regular faculty teach the first semester calculus course. The department continues to experiment and try methods developed at other universities hoping to find better methods of teaching calculus so that students will learn and retain more in that course. The teaching of calculus seems to be a national problem. At least at national and regional meetings of academic officers it seemed that academic officials from all universities found that teaching calculus was less effective everywhere than was desired. Our math department found that required attendance seemed to help. This has been especially helpful in improving student performance in other lower level mathematics courses and in all of the basic science courses. Many of these programs now have required attendance in all freshmen courses. I understand that some math faculty believe that students spend too little out-of-class time working assigned problems. Some

believe that these should be graded so that more assistance can be provided to the individual students perhaps in small problem sections. A computer lab has been in existence for students to use to practice solving problems in several lower level math courses. Plans are for this to be expanded at some future date. We also learned that few if any freshmen should be assigned to Psychology as freshmen. It seemed that maturity helped here, for we could find no other factor why sophomores did well but freshmen did poorly. With certain humanities and social science courses and sections in which freshmen did poorly, it seemed that if a student had passed composition, they succeeded. Our studies showed that sophomores with similar admission credentials and who had passed the composition courses almost always did acceptable work. I tried, through the Associate Deans, to get some departments to make at least one composition class a prerequisite, but we did not succeed. A response from one faculty member was that we shouldn't admit such poorly prepared students.

I have felt for many years that we at NCSU have perpetuated an attitude that we admit too many poor students. When I was a freshman in 1942, the Dean of Students said to all freshmen. "Look to the left and to the right. Only one of you will graduate." He was right. It also seems that too many faculty unconsciously grade on a curve. As our entering students have, slowly year by year, come to college with better overall credentials and we have become more and more selective in our admissions criteria, our grades do not seem to have increased by similar increments. It is true that recently under Hart there seemed to be some improvement in freshman performance and retention.

Even before there was a Dean of the Faculty, we recognized scholarship of our graduates during the graduation exercises. At first this was by graduation with Honors and with High Honors. During Thomas and my tenures we changed this to *Cum Laude*,

Magna Cum Laude, and Summa Cum Laude. It was not until Poulton came that a University-wide Honors Council was created. It was Chancellor Poulton's idea, and he followed the development of this activity closely. I advised the Chancellor and the Provost on the Honors Convocation, honors programs, and related matters. The largest change came through the Honors Convocation. At this program in the fall semester all students are recognized for scholarly achievement, including the Dean's List, and for awards received. All faculty who received honors or awards during the past year are recognized too. It has come to be the day when academic excellence in any form is recognized at this special convocation by the entire academic community. A half-day when no classes are held is built into the calendar. The first year, all of the students were to be excused from classes by instructors on a voluntary basis, but that did not work too well.

Every Dean of the Faculty, every Provost and every Chancellor since Bostian has lamented the fact that so many of the students who enroll in NCSU do not graduate. In recent years this has focused more on the length of time required to graduate. However, while this is important, I still feel that the more important factor by far is to have more freshmen eventually graduate. In my first report to the Faculty Senate, I said that I was "very concerned with the excellence and productivity of all programs, the undergraduate programs in particular. What must be done in the future is to devise mechanisms whereby more of the students gain the skills and knowledge needed to complete their courses of study. The number of entering students who do not complete their education is too large. We need to devise mechanisms and provide assistance on our campus for faculty members so that the learning experience of the students is enhanced and improved. This will be one of the most important concerns of the Provost." During my tenure we did not increase the rate of graduation as much

as I had hoped, although we worked towards that goal.

Grading system ideas can come from any source and they sometimes did. Most often they were the result of the Faculty Senate's or of faculty member's suggestions. Students or administrators also refer their ideas to the Senate for study. The Senate's proposals were reviewed under Shirley and under Kelly by the Administrative Council or by the School Deans. Recommendations in every case under all of the Provosts were considered by Student Government. During my tenure, after we obtained the Associate Deans of Academic Affairs in the various schools, the Senate's proposed system was studied first by this group and after their review and recommendations the proposals came before the Dean's Council along with any recommendations from other groups. The various recommendations were presented to the Dean's Council by the Provost or one of his staff. Under Hart and me these were usually presented by Dr. Downs. This was also true for proposed changes in the retention-suspension system.

The Graduate School always looked at the proposed system from the perspective of use by graduate students and got opinions from the Graduate Student Association. The Graduate School always had their own regulations and policies about the retention and suspension of graduate students, and these policies were developed after study and recommendation by the Administrative Board of the Graduate School. They always were different from those of the undergraduates. These recommendations were also reviewed by the school deans before implementation.

It was usual for a proposal on undergraduate grading or retention systems to have some components among the lengthy recommendations that were not completely acceptable to the schools or to the Chancellor and me. Many of these were procedural. In these cases a Conference Committee would be appointed which included some appointees by the Provost and some by

the Chair of the Faculty Senate. This committee's recommendations were then taken back to the Senate and to the Dean's Council. I do not recall there ever being a time when the Conference Committee's recommendations were not acceptable to all concerned. Of course the Chancellor was kept totally informed during the debates and would have made any suggestions that he desired. I do recall that over the years after the A, B, C, NC grading system came into being I wished we could bring a stop to the small but continuous changes that were being proposed and usually adopted. Changes in retention and suspension were always implemented first for the newly entering students. With the large number of

changes we had a number of varying systems that applied to students who entered at different times. When we reintroduced the D grade, which everyone wanted, we had to impose a time limit of six years when the associated changes would apply to all students no matter when they first enrolled.

The Provosts and their staffs have handled the administrative review of the Senate's recommendations with the schools and made recommendations based on these reviews to the Chancellors. The Chancellors have given final approval of policy changes and have usually issued the policy memoranda on these very important academic changes.

CHAPTER THREE

FACULTY AND OTHER PERSONNEL EXEMPT FROM THE PERSONNEL ACT

Personnel Policies and Procedures

The first personnel procedures were established by Chancellor Bostian and sent to Deans, Directors, and Department heads on July 16, 1956. This memorandum included both SPA (Subject to the State Personnel Act) and EPA (Exempt from the State Personnel Act) personnel, but I will refer only to those sections relating to EPA personnel. This memorandum indicated that there would be a

strengthening of channels of communication and personnel would be administered so that there would be a constant and periodic review of each employee and of the effectiveness of his work, so that all employees will be constantly informed of their privileges and responsibilities. Documents pertaining to personnel changes will be simplified and standardized in the interest of speedier handling and more adequate records to form the basis for sounder judgment in treating personnel matters.

Centralized personnel records were to be "maintained with a perpetual summary of employees in various categories made available at all times." Records of work loads and performance were to be standardized in such a way that "critical needs may be readily determined, so that the limited number of new positions made possible through periodic increases in our operating budgets may be allocated swiftly to meet these critical needs." These were great goals and over the years a variety of changed procedures and reports were developed to meet them. For example, when I first started to work in the Provost's Office, a current record of all faculty by rank, by department and by school was maintained by hand. We knew the total number of credit hours taught in

each department and in each school, and had a record of the average credit and contact hours taught by each full-time equivalent (FTE) position assigned to each department and school. Later, these statistics were available through computers because information related to classes was computerized by Student Affairs sooner than records were computerized for personnel. Student Affairs had some personnel with the competencies to be programmers and analysts. We began to provide this information to the departments and schools with what we called a cross-over analysis. This enabled every department to know where their student majors were taking courses and the numbers of students from each major enrolled in the courses that they taught. The software for this analysis was developed at East Carolina University (ECU) and was shared with us at no cost. I always thought that this was a very valuable informational tool for academic units to have, but I suspected that many departments made little use of this data.

In a memorandum of Feb. 5, 1957, the Chancellor announced the introduction of the PA-1 form. This form developed by Shirley has been modified frequently. It is used today in a very modified form except that it is entered into the computer by departments or schools. That memorandum read:

This form, again in five copies, will be used for all requests involving change of status for all other non-classified personnel, for appointment, reappointment, change in academic or professional rank or title, change in salary or salary distribution, leave of absence, or termination of contract. These requests will normally originate in the Department or Division and be forwarded to

the dean or administrative head responsible. All of these materials will be transmitted directly to the Dean of the Faculty who will be responsible for routing through proper channels of approval and maintaining constant check on the expedition of such requests. It will be the responsibility of his office to see that University or Trustee approval is obtained when it is required and to make final distribution back through channels to the originating source.

Bostian added,

It is our hope that the standardization of forms for multiple purposes and the development of clear-cut routing and approval channels will speed approval requests, simplify routine operations, and eliminate much of the red tape which has congested both departmental and school offices.

It is of interest to me to note that the form had only two races listed, white and Negroes, yet it had the following categories for marital status: single, married, widowed, divorced, and separated.

In 1962 all personnel decisions, including new appointments, still had to go through the President, and Caldwell reminded the campus not to indicate firm and final offers or to close contracts with individuals prior to such approval. Of course it would have been impossible to hire anyone without having everything agreed upon by the College and the prospective employee if this rule was followed precisely. We began to use "contingent upon approval of the Trustees" and later the BOG when that was necessary in letters offering positions. The secret was **DO NOT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES LET THIS GET INTO THE PAPERS BEFORE WE HAVE OBTAINED APPROVAL!**

In 1965 the proposals for continued employment over the age of 65 were requested and handled by the Chancellor's office. It was at this time that Kelly requested that he would like to see the proposed list.

The list had to be approved by the President and was reported to the Board of Trustees and to the Retirement System. The latter was really a necessary informational procedure. Dr. Kelly's Personnel Office soon received the job of obtaining the lists from the deans and had to prepare the material for the Chancellor in a form ready for his signature for submission to the appropriate places. Dr. Kelly then did get to see the list in advance of its submission to the President and even before the Chancellor saw it.

The issue of hiring faculty who obtained Ph.D. degrees from NCSU was raised by the Chancellor and by Dr. Kelly in 1964 when a department wished to hire one of its own graduates. In 1967 we began to keep not only a running list of the numbers of NCSU Ph. D. graduates on our faculty in each department, but also maintained a list of numbers of graduates from other institutions. For example there were significant numbers of UNC-CH graduates in certain departments. We began to raise the issue of "inbreeding," both from the perspective of NCSU as well as from a few other colleges. This list was also helpful when we needed to answer how many doctorates we had on a departmental faculty or on the University's faculty from any specific institution. It was surprising how often that question was asked.

We had a nepotism policy in 1955. In the days of Shirley the Chancellors approved the exceptions to this policy. These approvals were indeed rare at that time. The policy prohibited hiring relatives (mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, spouses, nieces, nephews, uncles and aunts) in the same school, but we could hire children who were students for part-time or summer work. I recall our wishing to hire an outstanding faculty member who really was in the same field as his wife who was already on our staff. By this time the policy had been modified so we could make subdivisions of the large schools by grouping related departments. For example the biological science departments were grouped together, but Plant Pathology was placed in another group of plant science

departments. We were able to hire the husband in the Department of Genetics whose wife was a faculty member in Plant Pathology. If a couple got married and they were in the same departmental group, one would have to be transferred to another unit or leave the University. Nepotism policies included both EPA and SPA personnel. Later the Board of Governors, to avoid claims of discrimination on the basis of sex, changed this policy so that we could hire relatives in the same unit, but it still prohibited supervision by a relative. This made it possible for us to hire a number of outstanding faculty whose disciplines were the same who previously would not have been hired. Prior to this time we had to try very hard to find jobs for spouses for prospective faculty at neighboring institutions. We lost a number of excellent faculty when we or the spouse, could not find a satisfactory job. I recall two cases that I found of interest. My nephew, upon graduation at NCSU, got a job in the library. By this time uncles, aunts, nieces and nephews were included in the nepotism policy. We could not hire him since the library reported to me. I also recall the case of a faculty member who was divorced and married again. He had a grant and wished to hire his former wife who was quite competent and would be available immediately to work on the grant. The dean called to see if the supervisory role existed here. I told him no, but I was not at all certain that the idea was wise. Upon questioning later, I found that this had worked well. About the time that I became Provost, through the efforts of our Assistant Affirmative Action Officer, Claudia Pattison, a network of Research Triangle Park institutions and the Triangle's colleges and universities was established to facilitate the hiring of spouses. It seemed to work well for a while.

It is always amazing how simple things that have good intentions can cause a lot more work. After the passage of the Buckley Amendment we had to ask those writing letters about students to put only one student in a letter. This was true when I was

making exceptions to the rule for graduation requirements or for graduate students to remain as graduate assistants when they had grade point averages below 3.0. The concept was that it was illegal for us to give out information except to those who needed it for administrative purposes and not to other people. If two people were in the same letter then we violated policy when we gave both affected persons a copy of the same letter for their records. In 1974-75 this became even more serious for there were State laws on freedom of information which spelled out what we could release and what could not be released to others. Anything in the files about an individual became open to that individual. This meant that we had to require those who wrote a letter about more than one individual to rewrite separate letters for each individual. If we did not get separate letters, we had to make Xerox copies and blacken out the information about the others included because we put the correspondence in each person's individual personnel folder. As we responded and gave approval we had to respond with separate letters. It became our usual practice to write approved and to put the approval date and initial or to sign the letter which requested the approval and make a copy for the files. Information such as salary, the last salary increase, promotion, rank, and date of employment was to be available to any citizen of the state who asked for the information. While this is not the complete list, it illustrates that we could give out only the allowed information or we were subject to specified levels of fines. The consequence of this freedom of information and the restrictions made a lot more work for all, but it had a very good purpose and was worth the effort.

As a part of this law we had to give out the salaries when requested to North Carolina citizens. Little else was usually wanted. The Chancellor set up procedures so that the Provost was designated as the giver of the allowed personnel information, except for athletics, and the Director of Athletics was authorized to release that information.

At first we kept a list of salaries and made it available in the Provost's Personnel Office for those on campus who wished to see the list with the social security numbers blacked out. Later we could ask the computer to prepare a list with the social security numbers deleted. It was illegal to give out social security numbers. We did not make copies of lists to send out, and a salary had to be requested for an individual by name. This later became a large inconvenience for the staff and we prepared a total list, without social security numbers, which was placed in the Faculty Senate Office for those on campus who wished to see salaries. The Senate had volunteered to do this. A copy of the BD 119 (a form listing salaries and salary increases was prepared for the State) contained this information and was in the D. H. Hill Library and several State offices, but an individual paid from two salary sources would appear at two different places. If individuals wanted a list of persons and their salaries they could make it. For those off-campus requests we gave out information if a few individuals were requested. If the list requested was long we required the person to come to the Provost's Personnel Office and copy the salaries they wanted. Whenever the Personnel Office or I gave out a salary to anyone from off-campus, we informed the individual on campus whose salary had been requested. This procedure is still followed. At first there seemed to be a large number of persons who wanted to know the salaries of others. Today, except for a few major appointments which are requested by the newspapers and those on the faculty who wish to see the salaries in the Faculty Senate Office, there seem to be very few requests. More recently Chancellor Monteith required all off-campus requests for personnel information to be reviewed by the University Attorney. It seems that this was necessary because the old policy seemed to have been forgotten and too many persons on campus were giving out personnel information, some of which might not be permissible under the statutes.

For many years we had questions of exactly what was the academic year calendar. We always considered this to mean a nine-month period. In 1979, we tried a system of floating dates, but it seemed that this caused confusion too. These were associated with the beginning dates of the fall semester and the end of the spring semesters. For example, the academic year began on August 18, 1980, and ended on May 16, 1981. For 1981-82 we began the year on August 24, 1981, and ended on May 15, 1982. To avoid this controversy and confusion, because no one seemed to remember the dates and they were important and established the dates eligible for summer pay, we simply began to make these dates August 16, for beginning the fall semester, and May 15 for ending the spring semester. Policy permitted no one to earn more than three months pay in the summer. These new dates helped everyone to avoid an overlapping of the employment schedules of the fall and spring semesters with the Summer Schools every year and employment for more than three months in the summer.

In 1984 the Faculty Senate recommended an annual performance review of all non-tenured faculty and other EPA professional personnel, a review of all tenured associate professors at a minimum of three-year intervals, and of the professors at a minimum of five-year intervals by the department head. The recommendation was accepted by the administration. The administration would have preferred an annual performance review with all faculty for we felt that these should be tied not only to promotions but also to salary increase recommendations. In many departments reviews did occur for all faculty almost annually and in others, especially those that were very large, the heads followed the policy with considerable griping. We felt that there would be less controversy over the salary recommendations if they were linked to the reviews. We thought that the reviews would make it very clear to non-tenured faculty what was expected of them if they were to

gain tenure. It soon became obvious that not all reviews were as stringent, honest and critical as they should have been. There were still individuals who were certain that their performance was satisfactory based on these reviews, but they were still denied tenure and promotion. It also became obvious that in certain cases the expectations of the senior faculty who debated and voted on tenure in a department sometimes differed from those of the department head. We then reminded the departments that the expectations of both the senior faculty and the department heads should be made very clear. This continues to be a problem, but it is not as great as it was before this policy was adopted.

Chancellor Poulton established a new process for final approval of all matters that were to become policy, by having such matters go to the Trustees. It was his belief that the policy should be sent to him for submission to the Trustees. Since I dealt with the Personnel Committee of the Trustees, I still had to prepare the recommendation and to defend the recommendation to the Personnel Committee.

There are a large number of other personnel policies discussed in many of the other sections of this history when the policy is related to those sections. This is especially true in the other units of this chapter. Other policies may be found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Rank and Tenure

Shirley and Bostian both placed a high priority on obtaining the privilege of tenure for the NCSC faculty. Tenure and academic freedom were discussed frequently on campus by the faculty, and the Faculty Senate was a strong proponent. Based on a number of memoranda and discussions of the Senate, the hold-up seemed to be the Board of Trustees. Although it was one of the first things that Bostian had indicated a need for when he became Chancellor, it was not until after Caldwell came that tenure was finally awarded to the faculty.

One of the other things that Shirley attempted to establish were uniform systematic procedures for promotion, and defined requirements for academic rank. At the time of his appointment this had been more or less a school matter with review by the Chancellor, but each school seemed to have some of their own unique criteria, rules or procedures. At first the Faculty Senate was not in favor of a uniform system. They argued that the needs in one school or department might differ from another. Some deans were not enthusiastic either, for this reduced their power to control appointments and promotions. Part of the issue really resided in the fact that we had a large number of faculty whose highest degree was a master's degree. The world was changing so that few new hires were being made for faculty with a master's degree, even in the Agricultural Extension Service, except in a few areas where the master's degree was the terminal degree. The change came quickly and after Kelly gained the title of Provost, we required a justification for any permanent faculty member to be hired whose expectations did not include the doctorate. This became the process when tenure was awarded and the request had to be approved by the BOG. We continued to hire a few persons who were near the completion of the requirements for the doctorate, but we added to the letter of offer that the person was employed as an assistant professor contingent on the doctorate. If the doctorate was not earned by the beginning of the fall semester the rank automatically would be made instructor. The rank would be changed to assistant professor when we were notified that all requirements for the doctorate were completed. We did continue to hire a few exceptional and experienced faculty in several fields with the master's degree. We were beginning to have the expectation that almost all faculty would contribute to scholarship as well as to serve the University and to teach. Many faculty with master's degrees contributed in very significant ways to scholarship. For example Doolittle in Mechanical Engineering and

many others wrote texts that were widely used for years. Many holders of master's degrees were researchers and also contributed to other forms of scholarship.

In 1973 the UNC System was in the process of developing a code for the system and for each campus of the system. Included was to be the rank and tenure and academic freedom statements for the system and for each campus. This was heavily debated in the Senate and several of us were on a NCSU committee to interface with the UNC System, which meant Dr. Dawson and Dawson's associate, who was the author of the system's code and whose job it was to assure that the documents of each campus were compatible with the BOG Code. Out of this came our current tenure regulations. We had the normal ranks of instructor through professor but also added those of lecturer, demonstrator and laboratory supervisor. These are essentially as published in the *Faculty Handbook* today. We would have liked to have had a few additional minor revisions that were not permitted, but the document as it was revised by the Senate and the NCSU administration and finally approved by the BOG was a very good one.

At the Faculty Senate meetings on October 2, and October 9, 1973, there was much debate about a quota tenure system. This is a popular item for discussion in the press every three or four years. This seemed to appeal to a few members of the UNC Trustees and later to a few members of the BOG. The Senate said in its minutes that:

Many faculty members were confused as to the implication of the statement in the Provost's memorandum of May 17, 1973, on Faculty Manpower Planning, a discussion of an appropriate distribution among academic ranks as an appropriate ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty for a school. If the appropriate ratio is considered to be above three-fourths tenured faculty, please justify your recommendation on grounds other than existing conditions.

Some faculty members have interpreted this statement to mean that some sort of quota system or limit to the number of tenured positions in a given school is under consideration.

The Faculty Senate at its October 2, 1973, meeting rejected the concept of quotas on tenure and rank. The Senate Resolution read as follows:

The Faculty Senate believes that the justification for granting tenure should remain the qualities and accomplishments of the individual faculty member and the best interests of the department in question; therefore, the Senate rejects the concept of quotas on tenure and rank since such action does not serve the best interests of the University and threatens the future of present non-tenured faculty. We urge the University administration not to apply any such procedure at all. There is nothing inherently wrong with a department composed of 100 percent tenured faculty if the faculty in question performs its function at the highest level of competence that the University can expect. Academic excellence requires both new ideas and methodologies, which are generated by tenured and new faculty, and long-term applications and research, which are maintained by tenured faculty. The life-blood of any university is in its tenured professors. The University should invest more resources in this area, including more emphasis upon faculty retraining and the institution of a workable University-wide off-campus work assignment.

I do not think that was Provost's Kelly's intent. However, he did ask the deans for a lot of information about the proportions of faculty with tenure in each department, and the ages of faculty et cetera. I recall no discussions with Dr. Kelly about limiting tenure or a tenure quota. At this time the new tenure policies of the BOG were established, and we also were required to have procedures on how to handle a financial exigency. This obviously would let faculty

and others go in times of financial disaster. Another reason was that reports had been published of a projected decline in future college enrollments. This theme was frequently a subject in the academic press and popular press. It would have been helpful if our personnel data base had been adequate at that time to do the study centrally without asking the deans, but it wasn't. I recall attending a meeting where a chancellor of an institution gave a talk which described the proportions of professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors needed on the basis of the numbers of graduate, senior, junior, sophomore and freshman credit hours taught at his institution. He was a very short time Chancellor of one of our system's institutions. While only an Associate Provost, I recall asking him if his professors never taught freshmen and didn't he think that they should. I also think that I told him, in polite language, that his thesis was one of the most stupid that I had ever heard. At any rate, our procedure at NCSU continued to be to search hard for individuals with great potential as new hires with the hope that they would indeed gain tenure and in time the rank of full professor. An investment in a faculty member who does not make those contributions and does not have the qualities needed to gain tenure is costly for the institution and indeed a waste of developmental time for the department.

Near the end of Provost Kelly's tenure as Provost, we initiated joint and associate faculty appointments. This was done to encourage collaborative ventures between faculty of different departments but with some common procedures, expectations, goals and objectives. It did stimulate faculty collaboration by encouraging more faculty to work together. A joint appointment meant that the two departments were both involved in paying the salary of the faculty member, and the faculty in turn had responsibilities to both departments. For a joint appointee promotion and salary recommendations had to come from both departments. An associate member was expected

to cooperate in ventures with the second department. In both of these cases the faculty in the new department had to approve the new faculty member's having rank in that department. Associate members might serve on graduate committees or other committees or have joint research projects in the new department. Their salary increases and promotion recommendations were limited to the department which paid them. Opinions concerning quality of shared contributions were expected to be sought from the associated department. Prior to this time there were faculty who were members of more than one department; however, the rules and the responsibilities were as variable as the relationships. Some departments encouraged joint and associate faculty memberships. Others made it very difficult for a person from another department to gain faculty rank and membership in their department and did not seem to like the idea.

With Dr. Kelly's retirement we had several instructors with master's degrees who had taught at NCSU from 10 to 15 years. All were very good teachers and most of them were female. With the recommendations of the senior faculty they were promoted to the rank of assistant professor for a three-year term. Dr. Kelly promised these individuals that they would gain tenure at the end of their terms. When the time came, I proposed these individuals for tenure without promotion, and I assumed that Dr. Kelly's commitment would be honored. The proposal was not accepted and we had to wait for the final year of a second term before they were tenured. Provisions under the NCSU tenure policy did not provide for early tenure without promotion. Until the departments really understood that this was an inflexible provision it did cause severe disappointments for a very few faculty. Some came to us with the expectation that time spent in rank elsewhere would count toward tenure here. I think that the provision which had been adopted was good for the accomplishments at NCSU and the ingredients needed as a base for a tenure decision. An

example of great disappointment in my later years was that we could not get visiting time in rank at NCSU counted. I wish it had not been so important to the individual because it did cause disappointment and hurt feelings. We had a faculty member whose visa was not proper for us to award him anything except a one-year contract as visiting associate professor. When the visa problem was cleared we appointed him as an associate professor for a five-year term. At the conclusion of his third year in this contract he requested that he be considered for promotion and tenure by his department. The senior faculty recommended tenure but not promotion. When the issue came to me I requested that they reconsider promotion for his credentials seemed to be excellent. I would have no problem in getting a request which included promotion approved at the BOG level. For whatever reasons the senior faculty did not want to recommend promotion. So he did not get tenure then, but the next year when he was in the fourth year of his five year term he got promoted with tenure. I had tried to explain that his contract protected him and that certainly, if the senior faculty had approved him for tenure at this time, they would propose him the following year too. I think many considered this to be unnecessary bureaucracy. Maybe it was. The system was very inflexible for many years in letting us hire anyone as a new associate professor with tenure. One day a new department head, Downey Brill of Civil Engineering, called me and said that he had stopped by to see Dr. Dawson and talked to him about tenure for the new associate professor that he wanted to hire. I had just told Brill a few days earlier that tenure would be impossible to obtain and that if his newly sought for-hire insisted on tenure, we could not get it for him. I was somewhat (this is too mild a word) shocked that he had talked to Dr. Dawson, but I was delighted to learn of the result. He informed me that Dr. Dawson had told him he would approve exceptions when justified. It had been turned down several times earlier, but I had not asked recently. We then began to

hire a few exceptional persons who were in fields where faculty were scarce, and a few based on race and gender in fields where they were very scarce. In general it is not wise to award tenure until the faculty member has enough on-campus experience to know that they will succeed in the NCSU environment, but as is true with most rules it is nice to be able to make that occasional exception.

Late during Poulton's term we found the need for more faculty for research activities than could be obtained through the faculty formula or from appropriations. The Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Forestry had a way to accomplish this for research and extension functions. We had since our first beginnings of tenure, permitted tenure to be awarded to faculty whose salary came first from Hatch, and later from Smith-Lever and McIntire-Stennis funding. The other schools wanted a mechanism too. We established a rank called research professor, research associate professor, or research assistant professor. Under the terms for rank with the prefix "Research" was the understanding with the employees that after a specified period of time those person would be responsible for obtaining the grants and contracts that would pay their salaries. We had wanted to have these positions non-tenured, but under the provisions of the NCSU tenure policies, we were not permitted this, and Dr. Dawson did not want to take a revision of the code to the BOG for this purpose. So we agreed (the Chancellor, the Provost, the VC for Research and all of the school/college deans) that the establishment of the research rank would be a good thing too when used in exceptional circumstances. We began to add a few research faculty in the Forest Resources, Veterinary Medicine, PAMS and Engineering Colleges whose titles were Research Professor et cetera. Most of these appointments were at the Research Assistant Professor rank. It was agreed that we would not use the prefix "Research" in the title of all ranks for new appointments except these, but we would permit those few professors in the

university who had the research prefix to retain it. We agreed that we would not add it to any new hires except for those hired on soft funds. With this approach we could then just look at the titles and be able to see how many soft money tenured faculty we had in a school or department without going through hand searches in the files. The volume of such appointments were to be carefully watched so as not to over-extend the privilege in any unit. We would expand our research staff and add to the quality of our efforts. These full-time research faculty could be given released time from their grant funds for any instructional efforts that they performed and the instructional budgets would then pay them or else reimburse the grants appropriately for these functions. These research assistant professors and associate professors were given appropriate term appointments as described under our tenure policy except we added to their letter of appointment that their continuation as faculty was contingent on the sources of funds they obtained through grants or contracts. We normally tried to be as specific as possible in defining the sources of pay in the appointment letters, but it was clear that if their ability to get grants to support their research and to pay their salaries and fringe benefits was lost, then they would no longer be employed.

Provosts or Deans of the Faculty have always had reviews with the school deans on their recommendations for promotion and tenure. In the case of these two matters there is a prepared record for review. At NCSU the senior faculty in a department serve as a promotion and tenure committee and recommend those of their colleagues who will be considered. In a few instances, and the number seems to be growing, the individual faculty members decide when they want to be considered and these faculty prepare their own dossiers for review. Our practice had been that the review is made by the department's senior faculty. In most early reviews, the senior faculty have asked that the review be undertaken. The idea may come from the department head and today

it sometimes comes at the request of the individual faculty member. I did not want to get the materials prepared by the faculty member who was under consideration for promotion. I wanted not just a presentation of the facts of background and accomplishment as viewed by the candidate for promotion, but an assessment of the faculty member's credentials from the perspectives of the quality of teaching, research, extension and service of the faculty member to the department, school and university. I always felt that the best source of this assessment came from the judgment of the senior faculty in the department. If I did not get an assessment and value judgment from them, I was not likely to get any other informed judgment. They could extend their sources to include assessments by outsiders on research and extension and for teaching by students and the advisers of students who took classes under these faculty. At NCSU the department head usually prepared the promotion and tenure document. Central committees and the Provost rarely have the ability to read and comprehend backgrounds from all fields and to make qualitative judgments. Qualitative judgments are what is needed in promotion and tenure decisions. I had sat on school and university review panels and had seen cases when only one, or frequently none of the reviewers had a sufficient background to assess the quality of what was presented. Who could read the papers attached and tell whether they were good? So I wanted to avoid the tendency to weigh or to count or to look for the pretty presentation of the material. I always felt that I did not have the experience. I needed the material submitted to convince me that the work of this person was of sufficient quality to justify the proposed action. I remember one prospective faculty candidate whom I interviewed who brought along the material that he prepared for his promotion at his home institution to show me. I told the young man that I did not want to see what he had prepared, for I did not have the ability to say whether it was good or bad. I suggested that if he had not prepared it he

probably could have published another major paper or to have at least had the time to do the research to be ready to write another paper now. He looked at me with surprise and said that he hoped that he would get an offer from NCSU and if he did that he would accept it, and he did.

The statement of Academic Freedom and the ranks used and the requirements of each for appointment, promotion and tenure can be found in several sections of the latest *Faculty Handbook* (the 1988 edition).

Named Professors

In 1959 there were seven named professors in the School of Engineering, thirteen in Agriculture, four in Textiles, and two in Forestry. Each of these were supported by endowments that provided salary supplements. Today there are many more of these named professors. In 1959, Shirley served on a committee for the UNC system which came up with guidelines for named professor positions. This was implemented, but on June 20, 1960, that policy was modified slightly for NCSC. Caldwell stated the following guidelines and procedures for named professors.

To insure that only men of real stature are so recognized, the distinction of the candidate must be measured against:

1. All the members of the department to which he is to be assigned. He must clearly be the outstanding scholar and teacher in the department, or of distinction equal to that of other named professors in that department.
2. The whole faculty of the institution. The quality of these men must be such that they command the respect and admiration of the general faculty of the institution and the University.
3. The community of scholars of the nation and the world. Named professors should be favorably known to scholars in their fields beyond the University and the State and the Region. Active participation and

recognition in the professional societies and organizations of the nation will normally be expected of men of this distinction.

The procedure was to have the dean of the school notify the Chancellor when such a position became vacant and that dean would appoint a committee with the Chancellor's approval. During Thomas' term as Chancellor, he delegated to the Provost the responsibility to review and to give the dean approval of the committee's membership. This process continues today. Nominations would be open to faculty. The dean would then present his and the committee's recommendation to the Chancellor, the Dean of the Faculty (Provost), and the Dean of the Graduate School. The Chancellor after consultation with those two, accepted or rejected the dean's recommendation. During Chancellor Thomas' term the Dean (Vice Chancellor) for Research was added to the list of the Chancellor's consultants. The appointment then went to the Trustees, and after the Board of Governors came into existence, if there was a salary increase involved (and it usually was), it went to the BOG.

The process has changed based on the recommendation of the Senate and school deans. The committee which the dean recommends and the Chancellor (Provost) approves:

is to consist of no fewer than three or more than five persons. The membership of the committee shall be persons, no one of whom would himself be under consideration for the position. The members shall be active or emeritus professors of North Carolina State University or of another faculty of the University, although the committee may include one or more members of some faculty outside of the University. The members of the committee shall be persons who would have knowledge, and judgment in the field of scholarship of the named professorship.

Ample opportunity shall be provided for members of all departments con-

cerned to nominate to the Dean's committee any person in the world of scholarship thought to be worthy of the position without regard to his known availability.

The committee may consider persons nominated by members of the committee itself.

The committee shall procure essential information on the teaching, and research qualifications of the nominees.

In 1986 the process was very similar except that it was called Professorships of Distinction. It also stated that: "The selection process described shall not apply to special award professorships." Special award professorships were defined to include only those professorships which are for a defined term, an example being the Alumni Distinguished Professorships. The alumni professorships were always chosen by an entirely different process, and there have come into being several other award professorships in the various schools. There was also added the following category: "In special circumstances where the conditions of an endowment require special procedures of filling an Endowed Professorship, these procedures may be amended by the Chancellor."

The Professorships in a particular school are selected by the previously described processes, and the initial committees are appointed by the dean with the concurrence of the Provost. These make up a majority of the named professorships. Committees to nominate University Professors that have not been allocated to be appointed only in a specific program or school/college are appointed by the Provost after consultation with the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Dean of the Graduate School. This trio reviews the proposals from schools/colleges to determine which unit will make the search for the next University Professor except for those limited to a specific field. They then make their recommendations to the Chancellor. In all cases of University Professors, the Provost will make certain to appoint a committee to review the credentials of prospects

to determine that they indeed meet the qualifications for a University Professor.

We established the title of Distinguished Visiting Scholar in 1990. These were to be members of the national academies or organizations of similar distinction who came to NCSU after their retirement at other institutions. Committees for the review of their credentials were appointed by the Provost. We now have two such scholars. These two would probably have been appointed as adjunct faculty in departments if we had not have the Distinguished Visiting Scholar title. In this way we have received a far more beneficial and intimate association with each. These and the University Professors, make up the Council of University Professors. This council was established at the request of several University Professors who felt that we were not using them adequately except in their departmental and college functions, and the recommendation was liked very much by Chancellor Poulton. The idea was that we should from time to time seek the council of this distinguished group of scholars on subjects of interest and concern and especially in areas of scholarship. The council may also discuss areas about which they want to advise the Chancellor and Provost. The Chancellor and Provost met with the Council about once a semester while I was Provost. In some cases the Provost attended additional meetings. These faculty sometimes came to see me individually for a cup of coffee and to offer me their advice.

Members of the Council of University Professors are members of the faculty in their departments and are expected to serve as role models and are, if funded from academic affairs budgets, to do some teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels. It was not expected that they would carry a full teaching load, but they were to provide scholarly leadership in their departments and colleges. Some of these professors were likely to be appointed to serve on a variety of special and *ad hoc* committees as needed by University administrators or by the college deans.

University Professorships have come from several sources. The first five were from a special Legislative appropriation to enable us to bring some additional distinguished scholars to our campus. They were allocated, with two to the School of Engineering, two to PAMS and one to SALS for biology. When vacated these positions were to continue to be allocated in Engineering and in the Sciences (including math), but the administration was free to assign them to other departments. Each time that a member of our faculty is elected into the National Academy of Science or the National Academy of Engineering the Provost appoints a committee to review their credentials for a University Professorship. Faculty elected to other organizations of similar distinction could also be nominated for consideration. Another group was added when the University (Chancellor Poulton was the primary driver and originator of this appropriation) received an appropriation for three positions in biotechnology and for four additional high technology positions. These last were accompanied by an annual appropriation of \$250,000 each, which was to pay the salaries and the fringe benefits. Any remaining funds were for support. Most of these have grown in value because of salary increases received by the professors who held these positions. We (the Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Research and the Dean of the Graduate School) received applications from the schools which suggested potential nominees and reasons why we should assign these positions to a school or program. The positions were expected to be filled by members of the national academies. They were allocated to chemical engineering, computer engineering, computer science and to biotechnology (animal science). The position in computer engineering, in so far as I can tell, had never been filled and the position in chemical engineering was vacant in 1993. The three biotechnology positions which were appropriated included salaries and some support but were not at the high support levels mentioned earlier. These were allocated after review to

chemical engineering, botany and microbiology. The microbiologist had not been proposed for membership as a University Professor in 1993 and was initially hired at the associate professor level. In recent years another group of distinguished professors has come into being with incentives provided by the Legislature and by industry. These are the "million dollar chairs." This means that they are supported by endowments of one million dollars each. Most of the salary and a head count position was provided by the school deans or the Provost with some funds for salary coming from the endowment also. Two of these were given to the University in such a way that any unit on campus was eligible for them, the Moore and the Friday Professorships. Each of these million dollar endowed chairs is eligible for consideration for membership in the Council of University Professors. In 1993 only one of these had been nominated and selected for membership. This was the Kobe Steel Professorship filled by Professor Robert Davis. From time to time we have a very distinguished scholar who may be nominated for membership in the council. These may continue to occupy their current positions as do most members of the national academy members. At times, and in one case of a National Academy of Science member, a position was created by the Provost. Each of these are reviewed by a special committee appointed by the Provost. Not all nominated to become a University Professor and a member of the Council. In 1993 three present or former members of the Council had been chosen by this route.

On December 13, 1977, a policy was established for the appointment of Distinguished Extension Specialists. Those appointed so far are the Phillip Morris Specialists in SALS. There are three of these.

The awards to professors for whatever reason, and the Alumni Distinguished Professorships, have meant a lot to the University because they finally gave us the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, research and extension with a financial

recognition in addition to a certificate. At first, in 1968, the Alumni Professors were awarded only to teachers of undergraduate students. These awards were for \$2000 a year for five years. In time the number of awards increased. We all agreed we had so many excellent teachers that it would be better to give more awards each year. The length of the award was changed to three years. The Alumni Association increased the funding too and added an award for excellence in graduate teaching. Once a person is named as an Alumni Distinguished Professor, they retain the title until retirement.

The named professors, named extension specialists, University professors, the million dollar chairs, the awards to special professors, and the distinguished scholars all have been very valuable to us in attracting and keeping our faculty. They have enabled us to be better in all that we do in teaching, research and extension at NCSU. With these as well as all other appointments or title changes, the Chancellor signs the appointment letters.

Teaching, Research and Extension Faculty

One of the first functions assigned to the new Dean of the Faculty by Chancellor Bostian in 1955 was oversight of the teaching function. This was done in part to look at teaching loads to provide a better basis to allocate new positions. No mention was made at this time about responsibility for allocating these new positions. In a statistical report in 1958, the average full-time faculty teaching load was described as 14 credit hours. Later while Kelly was Provost, the full time faculty load was usually described as three courses. In addition, an increasing number of faculty were expected to contribute to research and/or scholarship. For faculty who were not involved in scholarship and research the described load was 12 credit hours per semester. Both groups were expected to render service to the department, school and to the University. Of course there have always been some large classes. At times there might be three or more full time equivalent faculty teaching a

single course to a few hundred students. In these cases several faculty equivalents might be teaching full time on one course of three or four credit hours, and shown on such a record as teaching one-third or one-fourth of a course. To explain the range and each type of example, always took too much time and might get misinterpreted. I could imagine seeing a newspaper headline that might say there are teachers at NCSU who do not teach a whole course.

Over the years there have been complaints about poor teaching and large classes. In 1959 a letter to the *Technician* created a stir on and off-campus. The references were to several departments in the physical sciences and in engineering. It turned out that the letter was fictitious. At least there was no such student enrolled at NCSC. We had then and continued to have some large classes, but we also had many small classes. Some but not all of the large classes had smaller laboratory, discussion or review sections. Most large sections are not bad educational experiences for students, and some small sections are not well taught. I am sure that the current practice of a mixture of large and small classes will continue. I do know that we were concerned about the size of composition classes and wanted them to be small enough for the instructor to have individual time with each student both in and out of the scheduled class time. We did not wish to continue the high school practice of individual teachers having so many students and papers to grade that they could not give adequate attention to the problems of each student after the papers were graded. Of course there never has been an educational rationale that all subjects should have classes of similar sizes. Individual teachers may be very good in large sections and so valuable that more students should have the opportunity to be taught by that teacher. Unfortunately all large classes are not taught by such teachers, but most are. We did encourage departments to move those who were less effective in large classes to the teaching of other smaller classes. In turn, teachers of

large classes usually had graders and certainly would not teach the same number of sections if they were to be accessible to students outside of the scheduled class time. In other words, uniformity or equality of work-load is not definable, but it is also educationally very undesirable if interpreted to mean the same number of classes, sections or numbers of students taught.

Shirley was responsible for enhancing the faculty quality and reviewing all appointments. He soon began to interview most new faculty appointments. This practice was continued until several years after I became Provost. While I was Assistant Provost, Chancellor Caldwell asked Kelly to have me interview all instructors who were expected to enter the tenure tracks. At least faculty of the rank of assistant professor and above were interviewed by the Provost or one of his assistants whether they were to be involved in teaching, research, extension or any combinations of these functions. In most cases when the interviewee was to be a professor, a department head or an assistant dean, the Chancellor also interviewed the candidates. Later he came to interview only the final candidates for department head and assistant dean positions. He continued to interview all candidates for named professorships, major directors and deans. For many years the Chancellors usually had separate interviews. At other times and when possible, to save the interviewee's time, we had joint interviews until Chancellor Poulton began to interview only the final candidate for these several positions. My staff and I continued to interview all the faculty, assistant dean, dean and vice chancellor candidates who came to campus. At times I was asked to interview assistant and associate vice chancellor candidates.

The numbers of faculty nominees became too large for the Dean of the Faculty to interview them all. When I became Assistant Provost I interviewed the assistant professors and if I was unavailable Mr. Simpson interviewed them, as he sometimes had before I joined Kelly's staff. When I

became Provost these became the responsibility of Dr. Downs and Dr. Clark. The numbers of assistant professors became large and the amount of other work that had to be done grew too fast. So they dropped the interviews of assistant professors and began to interview only the associate professors unless there was a special request by the hiring department or dean. When Dr. Witherspoon joined our staff he also interviewed some of the associate professors. By then I interviewed only the professor and administrator candidates. I still think that interviewing all faculty candidates was of benefit. When I interviewed all of the assistant professors I knew at least a little bit about all of the new faculty, what they were interested in, and what they wanted to accomplish. They also felt that they knew me, Downs or Clark, for they had met someone from the University administration. When Monteith became Chancellor he indicated to me that he would continue the practice set by Poulton of interviewing only the final candidate for department head, assistant dean and University Professor positions.

Students have always had a keen interest and desire to evaluate the teaching faculty. The first such University-wide evaluation was started under Provost Kelly. A committee of faculty developed an instrument to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and an instrument for course evaluation. The instruments were simple and their use was strongly encouraged for several years. Groups of students used this information from computer printouts along with other information in deciding which faculty to recommend as new members of the Academy of Outstanding Teachers. The individual faculty evaluations went to the department head but not to the school dean or Provost. Each faculty member received a copy of the instrument's summary for the courses that they taught. Most faculty also asked for and got written comments from the students enrolled in their classes. One time a student on the committee to select

Outstanding Teachers took the information from the computer printout and published anonymously in the *Technician* a list of faculty with the lowest scores on a single summary question on teaching. The headline read something similar to "The 99 Worst Teachers at NCSU." This created an uproar, for he also published each person's salary too. These were available at that time to the public in a State governmental office. Of course the questionnaire was not designed to rate the quality of teachers on this question only. Even on this one question many listed had received a rating over 7.0 on a 1 to 10 scale. Our students gave our teachers better grades than the teachers gave the students. According to the scale a rating of five was supposed to be average, and very few faculty were rated that low. The average score on the summary question was well above seven each year. This *Technician* story caused a loss of confidence by the faculty in the questionnaire and in its confidentiality. We had a great debate on campus about evaluation, and a number of faculty no longer wished to participate. Many of the faculty had never liked the instrument, but we still felt there was a need for student input into the evaluation process. With the advice of the Faculty and Student Senates, our next step was to have the departments devise their own evaluation procedures and to have a copy of them on record with the Provost. This effort was coordinated by Dr. Downs. We continued to encourage evaluation each semester.

Some faculty would not be evaluated by the students. I recall one teacher who got no merit salary increase who complained to me. I told him that I had reviewed his case with the dean and his increase was based on the supposed poor quality of his teaching. He showed me a few letters from students, all written in several different semesters about an upper level course, which indicated that he was good. He did not have all of the students participate in the evaluation of that course and none in any of his other courses. The department head had told

both the dean and me that he had advised the faculty member that the only things that he had to use in evaluating his teaching were student complaints. They were numerous, universally bad, and he had not one good report to use.

At a later time the students became unhappy with the evaluation process of the departments and decided to do their own evaluation. We supported them, but they had to do all the work in sending out the questionnaires, collecting them, and getting the results published. We had the Computer Center score the evaluations, summarize them, and do the analysis that the students wanted. The students soon found after only a few years that this was a lot of hard work and that the evaluations did not change much from year to year. They soon lost interest and discontinued the project.

It was at about this time that the Faculty Senate realized that the subject of teaching evaluation and improvement was not only very important, but it also took up a lot of the Senate's time. They proposed that a standing committee be appointed and that any policy proposals developed by the committee come back to the Senate before they were acted upon. We did this, and the Teaching Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee was established. It advised the Provost on policies and programs for the enhancement of teaching. It conducted a major survey of the effectiveness of TAs, advised on the selection of mini-grants for innovative teaching and for computing grants, designed the first *Teacher Handbook* and it recommended and monitored the procedures for the selection of Outstanding Teachers. It was in the mid eighties that the Teaching Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee began to organize an orientation session for new faculty just before the beginning of each fall semester, which emphasized excellence in teaching. These were coordinated by Dr. Downs and the committee with assistance from the associate deans of academic affairs in the schools. Some of our truly great teachers have been involved.

This committee also was the review committee for the mini-grants awarded to teachers. The role of teaching evaluations is discussed further in the Rank and Tenure section of this chapter.

Our students, their parents and others complained about the accents of foreign faculty and teaching assistants. There are letters and newspaper stories in the files. We did have many foreign born teachers. In certain fields, if we had no foreign born faculty, we would not have an adequate number faculty to teach. Students have complained about any accent, even those of the persons from England, Canada or Australia. I guess that it was tough for students to realize that some of the accents of certain areas of our state of North Carolina are also difficult to understand. The majority of foreign born faculty have been in those fields that do not produce enough doctorates in this country to fill the available positions in universities. At NCSU these have been in math, engineering and in some science and applied science fields. We have a few foreign born faculty in most areas of the University and this has been educationally sound and good for us. At times they are among the very best qualified persons in their scholarly fields in the world. The accent as a serious problem rarely exists, and certainly not nearly as much as the students and the newspapers make it out to be. There seems to be a revival of complaints every few years. I recall one example of a father calling President Friday to complain about our foreign faculty who could not speak English and he also complained about the poor quality of faculty advisers. President Friday gave me the name of the student and the course and wanted me to call him back with the results of my inquiry. I looked into the accusations and called the President back, but he decided that he would rather I called the father with the detailed and complicated message. This is the story. The student was in a course in engineering with a foreign born teacher. The department head said that he had never before had a complaint about this teacher's accent. I continued to

look into the advising accusation. It seemed that the student had a B.S. from another university and wanted to enter graduate school at NCSU in the fall. Although he was not a student here the faculty member looked at the student's transcript and found several deficiencies in the student's background. He advised the student to take specific math and physics courses in each of the two sessions of summer school and then he would be prepared to take a very fast 400 level course in the fall which would enable him to make up the deficiency of two other undergraduate engineering courses. He told him that if he did well in that course then he would recommend that the graduate school admit him into the desired MS degree program. He told me that he had spent a large amount of time studying the transcript and talking to the young man on at least two occasions. The young man flunked the 400 level course and told his father he couldn't understand the foreign teacher and that was why he flunked the course. He told his father that almost all of the students in the course flunked. Upon further checking we found that he was the only student who failed the course. The student had taken none of the math and physics courses in summer school. He hadn't enrolled for any courses in summer school. He had no trouble with the teacher's accent, but he was so unprepared for the course he couldn't understand the vocabulary of the course, much less be able to work the problems assigned. I called the father and the father said, "I don't believe you, but I'll find out." In a few hours he called back and apologized for his son's behavior, for the trouble he had caused and for falsely accusing us on two counts. I don't know what happened to his son, but based on his discussion with me, I'll bet that it wasn't pleasant.

Over the years many changes have been made in our grading systems, and these are described in Chapter Two. I doubt if any of these changes have substantially improved learning or teaching. Effective teaching occurs when learning occurs. Learning appears to occur when the students are

enrolled in a class for which they have the appropriate background, skills and prerequisites, and if the student is sufficiently motivated to put out the necessary effort required to learn that subject. Teachers can encourage motivation and they can discourage it. There is ample evidence that a teacher's attitude toward students does enhance learning and that remarks that degrade a student, whether based on race, gender or any other things, can discourage student learning. Of course knowledge of the subject by the teacher is essential, and if it is presented in an interesting manner and organized in a learnable way, student learning is enhanced.

Most research faculty have traditionally been appointed to 12 month positions. The summer is essential to do field research in programs in agriculture and forestry. Faculty in many others areas of the University do research in the summer, but they are not appointed on research budgets and their salaries are paid from grants and contracts in the summer. In 1982 the issue of whether or not the 12 month appointment was a right came up. The issue was whether the faculty on partial research or on full time research and now on a 12 month research appointment could be placed on a nine month basis. I said:

It has always been this institutions understanding that regardless of whether or not a faculty member has permanent tenure, an appointment can be changed from a 12 to a 9 month basis from one year to the next depending upon various circumstances. To state the proposition more directly, the fact that a faculty member received a 12 month appointment at the time he or she was notified that permanent tenure was effective does not constitute a promise by the University that the individual will have a 12 month appointment until he or she retires or resigns. The term of appointment can be changed annually just as the faculty member's salary can.

We began to change contracts in some schools and faculty were converted to a nine month basis. The faculty members who were not productive in research were returned to a nine month basis with only an appropriate salary increase on the nine month base salary and were rewarded for the quality of their teaching and service. In other cases we had very grossly underpaid excellent faculty and did not have the funds to make adequate salary adjustments. In these cases we gave the faculty member sufficient time to obtain grants that would pay their summer salaries and used a substantial portion of their current 12 month salaries to increase the nine month base. This practice was used extensively in Textiles, and for all of the budgeted 12 month research faculty in engineering and PAMS. It was used to a lesser extent in Forest Resources. I recall no person being converted in SALS or in Forest Resources who were paid from Experiment Station or Extension Service funds.

In 1977 the Legislature required that a study of faculty work loads be conducted by the Board of Governors with a report to the General Assembly no later than February 1, 1979. It was pointed out in a memorandum of October 19, 1977, from Roger Fites, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, who attended the meeting with VP Dawson, that such a study had been conducted in 26 states at the request of other legislatures. The reason for the North Carolina study was that the Legislators did not know what faculty did because they had a contact hours in the classroom view of full time work. It was really railroaded through by one legislator who seemed to have a dislike for universities, and especially faculty. He definitely did not think that they worked very much. Dawson said: "There have been a number of studies that have attempted to elicit the reasons for what many consider to be Legislative intrusion into the realm of faculty work." Fites wrote to the Faculty Senate members explaining the rationale. He goes on in that memorandum to say that most studies had shown the faculty to work on the average from 55 to 60 hours per week at

their jobs. When we did our study our faculty fell into this range too. The study did make a lot of work. Dr. Dawson selected a typical week and had every faculty member in the UNC system record what they were doing during this week. I don't think that this ever satisfied certain legislators because the question continued to come up with an inference that the faculty didn't work enough. It was nice to be able to refer to the study from time to time, so it was worth something. Just before I retired the Legislature also wanted another work load study. We were fortunate in this instance because they were satisfied with a sample of institutions and NCSU was not asked to participate.

Every year we had a report from Institutional Research that gave the credit and contact hours taught in each department by course level and with a total of both undergraduate hours and graduate hours. We also had the average number of each per full time equivalent faculty position assigned to the department. After computerization these calculations were easier. We could and did obtain this information for every course. In this way we could look up specific information about each course or section taught by every faculty member. I recall when I was teaching Biological Science 100, I was concerned that the grades in one laboratory section were very good and in another they were very poor. I asked through channels to find out what the average grades of students in each section were in other courses taken by these students earlier at NCSU. I found that by the luck of the draw I had one laboratory filled with students with good GPAs and in the other with much poorer GPAs. I began to offer the poorer performing section extra help and time. Their grades did improve some with the extra time, but they were not as good as those in the other section.

The credit hour summary data was very useful in faculty position allocations and will be discussed in Chapter Five in the section on Budget Allocation. The individual course data was used less frequently but occasion-

ally for specific complaints of students or to provide information to faculty. We did use this information to determine which courses or sections of courses flunked the most freshmen. This has been discussed earlier in Chapter Two in the section on Advising.

For many years it was required that all faculty attend graduation. To miss it required the approval of the Chancellor. With time it came to be a large matter to review requests for absences. Many more faculty were absent without having requested approval. So the approval process was delegated to the school deans. It does little good to have the Chancellor approving something when no one pays attention. It soon became obvious that most faculty were not in attendance and were not getting approval to be absent from the deans either. When we looked at the school procedures in 1986, only the Dean of Veterinary Medicine was still requiring faculty to attend or to get approval not to attend. So we changed the rule and began to just encourage faculty to attend. With this voluntary process as many attended as before and we still had almost all of the seats in the coliseum assigned for faculty filled. If all had attended we could not have seated them in the faculty section. It was embarrassing to the School of Design students and the School Dean one year, for Chancellor Poulton to ask all of the faculty in the schools to stand at graduation when degrees were awarded to undergraduates from each school. There was only one faculty member, Bob Burns, from the School of Design present. From that time on there were at least a few more Design faculty at the general graduation exercises.

In the late eighties there were many national stories claiming that professors at research universities didn't teach undergraduates. *The Raleigh News & Observer* naturally followed suit and assigned a reporter to do a story locally. On our campus we had just completed a survey which showed that almost all of the faculty except those budgeted against organized research and extension funds, taught undergraduates. A very large proportion in those de-

partments which offered freshmen and sophomore courses also taught freshmen and sophomores. The reporter was given a lot of information from this report by me when he called, but he expected a propaganda line from me and wanted to get the "facts" from the teachers and students. I suggested that he talk to faculty in the Senate, and to persons in PAMS and CHASS, the colleges which teach the majority of freshman and sophomore courses. I even suggested that he talk to Dr. Abraham Holtzman, a professor of distinction, who had just been named in the prior year as one of the nation's best teachers and had won an award as North Carolina's top undergraduate college teacher. When the story came out in the *News & Observer* it involved mostly conversations with Duke and UNC-CH. There was a discussion with Holtzman, however I would never have figured out from the story that he taught at the undergraduate level. The story reported what the national stories had shown but did not reflect at all what our professors were doing at NCSU. Since NCSU has become a nationally prominent research university the press consistently equates all the triangle universities as if they were all peas in the same pod and that the pod has only one pea.

With the exception of SALS, Forest Resources, and to a lesser extent Textiles, there are very few faculty hired from Organized Research and Organized Extension budget funds. In SALS there are more faculty lines or positions from each of those two sources than there are from the Instructional-Departmental Research budget. In SALS and Forestry there are a large number of faculty who are paid from only one of the three sources. There also are many faculty who may be paid from two or more sources. It is not unusual for a member to be paid from extension and research funds or instructional and research funds, or from other combinations of funds with the commensurate responsibilities. In each case the faculty member has responsibility in the proportion of his/her budgeted salary to perform in the various areas. Research

faculty normally did not teach except when budgeted against instructional funds. They did have graduate students and supervised their research and served on graduate student advisory committees. As the years have passed more extension personnel are performing these functions. Some of both advised undergraduates but did so on a voluntary basis. Similarly extension personnel have taught at both on and off-campus sites and at times have taught courses for credit. However, most of these offerings were non-credit instructional courses or short courses. In later years extension personnel have begun to do much testing of research findings at a variety of sites and to do more and more applied research. In Textiles the organized research lines were usually split with instructional or extension lines. A few extension lines were full time, however many other textile faculty taught some off-campus extension credit and short courses on an overload basis. In Engineering most extension lines were full-time. In Education and CHASS the few lines were part-time with instruction. In these two colleges a person might be on extension for only a short time and then others would be assigned to these functions. In Engineering some organized research lines were full time, but those few lines that existed in all of the other schools were used on a part time basis with instruction or for release time.

When I came to NCSU in 1953 the work week was for five and one-half days. In 1957 there was a survey to determine whether we would change from a day that started at 8:30 and lasted until 5:30 for five days a week. Neither faculty or staff wanted that change. I don't know when we changed to an eight to five workday for five days a week, but we did. Later we provided where it was possible, opportunity for the staff to use flex time. Many did change based on their individual home and sometimes child care circumstances. In the Provost's Office we had a number of staff who came at 7:00 and left at 4:00. Other who had to drop off children might arrive at 8:30 or even 9:00. The faculty hours and work days were quite variable.

The faculty were theoretically at work all of the time. I have known of professors who worked on a sensitive experiment for a continuous 24 hour period or longer. It was expected that they would in turn take off a similar amount of time because we did not pay a faculty member for overtime.

You will find faculty and their various functions discussed in much greater detail in almost all of the other sections of this history.

Professional EP A Faculty Who Hold No Academic Rank

From the appointment of Shirley until Hart left the Provost's Office there were disagreements with the State Personnel System about whether professional staff who hold no faculty professional academic rank should be classified as EPA. After Kelly became the Dean of the Faculty the issue was raised about the EPA status of librarians. In 1964 the Administrative Council of the Consolidated Office determined that they were EPA and that they should have faculty status.

On November 22, 1957, there was correspondence which clarified that the campuses would have responsibility for positions involved in teaching and research. Precise definitions were not included for either function, and that was probably intentional. One major basis for disagreement was that comprised the two functions. NCSU and the UNC-Chapel Hill campus tended to make our own decisions and to treat the definitions broadly. I believe that all of the other campuses of the old UNC consolidated system capitulated eons ago. We always considered those doing extension work as teachers and researchers, and they are. Many areas of Student Affairs provide teaching, primarily but not entirely, in the form of non-credit instruction. They also frequently provide counseling and advising which are components of the teaching function. Our definitions would include EPA personnel in admissions, financial aid, registration, student center, crafts, institutional planners and researchers and other

similar types. The issue was raised after Caldwell came in 1960 with no conclusion, at least I found none in the files, but NCSU continued to follow the same practices as before. A very important area for us were research assistants, research associates (the SPA system has the same titles) and post-doctorates where personnel do research on a grant or in projects which might be State supported, but they are not the major investigators and they do not have a professional rank. The ability to make quick decisions with only simple job descriptions enabled us to hire such employees as soon as a grant was funded, even on the same day if necessary. This flexibility rather than having the positions classified (we believed improperly) in some SPA job descriptions, has been fundamental to our ability to deliver quickly on research and other types of grants which provide us with the majority of our funds for graduate student support, for cost of research and for the salaries of many personnel including many who are and should be SPA personnel and for graduate student stipends. I used the concept of an individual's doing independent research rather than having to be supervised, to separate these categories of personnel. The only job description that I was interested in receiving was that the person was to do research in civil engineering, textile chemistry, or whatever field was involved. The SPA system wanted a complete job description in the format of SPA forms to study the description to determine if the positions should be SPA or EPA before it was filled.

The most difficult group to defend was that group of employees in the areas of Public Affairs and Development. The issues regarding these and many other individuals were raised in 1964 when Dr. William Turner the Business Manager, argued that:

There are, at this time, a relatively small group of employees at NC State who are neither faculty nor subject to the Personnel Act. This group includes librarians, student counselors, editors, and others who are closely allied to

teaching and research. They are making substantial contributions to the objectives of the University; yet there has been considerable confusion regarding the long-run status of these positions. They are currently budgeted and administered as positions exempt from the Personnel Act. The Personnel Department, however, on several occasions has reviewed the duties and responsibilities of these positions, apparently with the intent of incorporating them into its classification plan.

We submit that there are many of our higher-level professional positions that should be exempt from the Personnel Act even though faculty rank may never be assigned thereto. Non-faculty EPA positions should include those now in the so-called gray area, plus a relatively few that are now subject to the Personnel Act. The recognition of a third category, identified as Academic Professionals, would eliminate the "gray" list. A more liberal interpretation of that portion of the Personnel Act which exempts employees from its provisions and controls would be most helpful.

In another portion of Turner's memorandum, he states:

The problem is accentuated by the fact that these employees must work shoulder to shoulder with all academic administrators on campus. These employees are charged with responsibility and authority that require them to hold their own with deans, directors and department heads. The area of their responsibility crossed all organizational lines. The level of concern embraces judgments and decisions which affect directly all management and operational activities of the university.

I saw no response in the files to Turner's memorandum, but NCSU continued to operate on the same basis as before. In these cases these employees are significant administrators and in our view need to be EPA because of the status needed to work in both on and off-campus settings. These

and the other positions have always been EPA going back at least to the days of Harrelson. We felt that a change and movement into the SPA Classification arena would cripple our efforts.

During the later years of my term as Provost there was a constant effort to have more of the other EPA staff positions reviewed for SPA status by the State Personnel System. This continued throughout Provost Hart's term. The effort included getting position descriptions for review by the Personnel System before we would set up or fill the position. These professionals would determine whether the positions would be EPA or SPA. For the last several years the UNC staff represented by Dr. Raymond Dawson and later by Dr. William Little joined into the fray to see if the issues could be resolved. I took the EPA lists of our employees as provided from the General Administration computers, excluding those with faculty rank, senior administrators and the librarians, and prepared a justification which was jotted down on the list on the basis or our criteria and the functions of the position as provided to us by the holders of the positions. They were classified when I did the project to include those that taught, did research or fit otherwise into the system. I performed this function a second time using some of Dr. Dawson's suggestions. Dr. Hart performed this same function again. I do not believe that as of July 1, 1993, they had resolved any of the issues. Of course, senior administrators have always been excluded from oversight by the State Personnel System.

On October 20, 1988, Chancellor Poulton wrote to Mr. Richard V. Lee, the Head of State Personnel. I will quote a part of the letter. "I met with my colleagues here and expressed to them your concern that we are disadvantaging some people by wrongly classifying them as EPAs, and I cited some of the examples you gave me. I expressed to them your concern that we might be creating a legal problem for ourselves."

Legal counsel says in reality everyone who works at North Carolina State Univer-

sity should be exempt from the personnel act. Her brief is as follows:

The statutes clearly state that the Board of Governors have the sole responsibility for defining the Mission of North Carolina State University. The Board of Governors have, in fact, defined that mission in writing, and it is a mission that speaks only to teaching and research. The statutes clearly exempt from the personnel act those persons who are involved in teaching and research. North Carolina State University's full spectrum of activities relate to teaching and research. We have no activities at this University that are not mission related. That is to say, we have no non-related business activities at North Carolina State University, although I realize such activities do exist at some universities.

In summary, a combination of statutes and trustees' policies really dictate that everyone who is employed by North Carolina State University is employed for the purpose of providing programs of teaching and research, and therefore all of our employees qualify for exemption from the State Personnel Act.

I will be interested in your reaction, and if you would like to go to lunch again, let me know.

I think that they did have lunch again, but I did not see a response to that letter, and the debate continued.

We have a large number of EPA positions that do not carry faculty rank. It had been our practice, at least under Kelly, Hart and myself to provide them with the same benefits and privileges as the faculty with rank except that these employees were not eligible for the TIAA-CREF retirement option. This was changed in 1990 for the Librarians when they became eligible. These EPA personnel did not earn tenure and were not appointed to terms. Unless otherwise indicated in their appointment letters, they were considered as permanent employees. Most persons employed from soft-money sources did have conditions applied.

In 1976 Chancellor Thomas approved a proposal by the committee appointed to study the employment status of individuals holding professional appointments without faculty rank. This provided for the establishment of appointment terms. Our campus liked these provisions very much. Many of the units developed a system of term appointments with reviews, and a system of reappointments. Others units such as Extension and Student Affairs did not establish a term system. On January 18, 1979, President Friday sent to the Chancellors a draft of policies for non-faculty positions not subject to the State Personnel Act. There was great concern and disagreement on our campus with the content of this proposal. On February 2, 1979, Chancellor Thomas wrote to President Friday and proposed that Dr. Banks Talley and Dr. Clauston Jenkins (Dr. Jenkins had left us earlier and gone to Law School at UNC-CH and was now NCSU's University Attorney) serve on the committee to study the new personnel policies. He said, "Since we have almost half of the total participants in this category on our campus, I believe it would be appropriate to have both of these individuals serve. I remain very concerned about development of these policies and fearful of the inevitable results."

After considerable study that committee recommended a format of privileges for these employees. That policy as it applied to NCSU was passed on May 22, 1979, by the NCSU Board of Trustees. The most significant change was that new employees would gain annual leave on a schedule very similar to that of SPA employees. There were exceptions that could be made so that the experience of an individual coming from other agencies could be considered and that the number of days of annual leave that the person had earned in their last job could be considered and used if they exceeded that adopted schedule. We were able to retain most of the other privileges that we had made available to our EPA non-faculty employees. These regulations can be found in the *Faculty Handbook* of 1988 on pages 65 through 72.

Salaries and Salary Administration

When Dean Shirley was appointed Dean of the Faculty, Chancellor Bostian assigned him the responsibility of reviewing all salary recommendations of faculty and other EPA personnel for the NCSC administration. It was not clear in the earlier memoranda what the role of the Dean was in the allocation of salary increase funds. It appeared from the letters that the Chancellor continued to do the allocations. However, by 1960 it was apparent that the division of the salary increase funds for units was made by the Dean of the Faculty followed by a review with the Chancellor. The Dean of the Faculty then prepared the letters of allocation for the Chancellor's signature. As a matter of interest, the entire School of Textiles received a total of \$4000 for salary increases in 1960, including funds for promotion and merit. The Legislature ended its sessions early (around April 1) and met only every other year, so the increases could be processed and were always in the July pay-checks.

In 1956 the formula used to convert a 12 month salary to a 9 month salary, or visa versa, was 20%. About the time of the establishment of the BOG this was changed to 22%. Except for the faculty in SALS, Forest Resources and Veterinary Medicine, almost all faculty were and still are on a 9 month basis. The factor set by the BOG staff for faculty in Veterinary Medicine for conversion from 9 to 12 month salaries was one-third of the academic year's salary. Personnel in administrative positions and in almost all of the positions reporting to a Vice Chancellor are also on a 12 month basis.

In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell added to Shirley's responsibilities the authority to negotiate salary recommendations with Deans and Directors. This practice continued with all of the persons who held this position. The primary difference was that as the University increased in the number of such employees, the amount of review by the Chancellor decreased. For instance, when I was Provost, Chancellor Caldwell wanted to review only those who were associate or

assistant deans or their equivalents. He also wished to review those salaries that I planned to question with a school dean. This practice continued with Chancellor Thomas and Chancellor Poulton. In their first year or two, both Thomas and Poulton reviewed all of the salary increases of one or more groups. For example, Chancellor Poulton reviewed all persons his first year. Salaries for school deans and for the Vice Chancellors were set by the Chancellors; however, each always asked me to suggest increases for the school deans. Sometimes they agreed with my recommendations, and sometimes they didn't. I understand that this practice continued under Monteith while Hart was Provost. The Chancellors always wished to know what had been recommended for a few individuals. There were times when they did not agree with the dean's proposed salaries or with the Provost on some of the salaries that the Provost planned to question with the deans. After review by the Chancellor, the Provost had a meeting with the School Dean, the Vice Chancellor or with other unit heads who did not report through a school or Vice Chancellor. Chancellor Poulton sometimes handled the entire review of the salary increases proposed by a Vice Chancellor.

Dean Shirley proposed that all academic year employees be paid their academic year's salary in 12 monthly installments. This was accepted. In 1963 salary maxima and salary minima were already in place. If a faculty member were recommended to receive a salary in excess of the approved salary maxima from state funds, it had to be approved by the State Department of Administration. In 1965 the State Budget Officer set the maximum salaries by rank from state funds. He did not set minimum salaries by rank for the first time, although the UNC administration did set them for that year. In 1966 the schedule showed no minimum salary scale. In 1966 the scale was as follows: Dean, \$23,400; Director, \$21,000; Distinguished Professor, \$25,000; Professor, \$17,800; Associate Professor, \$13,900; Assistant Professor, \$11,900; and Instructor,

\$9,600. Soon after this the salary maxima were set by the Board of Trustees based on the advice of the President and his staff. When the BOG was established, a scale was established which included the following salaries from state funds at NCSU. The salary scale maximum for a dean was the maximum set for the Provost. Other administrators' salaries, including directors, were set for the maxima of the particular academic rank of the holder. For example, if an assistant department head was an assistant professor then his salary maximum was that set for that rank. The BOG set the salary maxima for all of the vice chancellors and administrators that reported to the Chancellor. These varied very much among the various Vice Chancellors. This was one of the reasons that Chancellor Thomas desired to have Rigney report to me for his salary maximum as set by the BOG was entirely too low for his value, contributions and experience. Maxima were also set for the professional ranks and for instructor. Each year these were usually increased by the same or just a little over the percentage of the average salary increase appropriated for that year.

In 1970 Provost Kelly wrote and signed the letters of allocation for the merit salary increase funds allocated to the school deans. He may have done this earlier, but these were the first letters I saw signed by Kelly. Since so many of the guidelines on salary administration were dictated by the General Administration of UNC and occasionally by the Legislature, the Provost assumed the responsibility of writing the letters of policy explaining how the increases would or could be handled, and his staff worked up the allocations to be included in the letters with any restrictions and the deadlines for each step in the processing of these increases. He also included any restrictions imposed by the Chancellor.

There were usually no additional NCSU restrictions except to encourage as much use of the funds as possible and as permitted for merit increases. In making the allocation of the funds it was necessary for the Provost to know of unusual circumstances that

would require a deviation from a proportional distribution of the increase funds. Each source of pay in the salary of an individual had to pay for the increases in the same proportion as the position was budgeted. For example, the Legislature did not appropriate increases for the salary supplements which came from endowments for the named professors. I sometimes used funds from the increases for vacant or temporary positions to make up for this deficiency. When I became Provost I always kept some funds back from the temporarily allocated positions so that we could increase the salaries of women, because I felt that they were not on par with those of men by field in 1974. I kept a small amount of funds, as had Kelly, to use to increase salaries of a few individuals whose contributions to the University had not been adequately rewarded by the local units. The Chancellor had to be contacted to see if he had made any promises that must be met. Any remaining funds were distributed to deans for addition to an individual's increases or was added to the increases for the continuing personnel in the temporary positions or for graduate teaching assistants. When Shirley and Kelly were in office the salary increase funds came as a lump sum for academic affairs except for those earmarked for the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Agricultural Extension Service. This meant that there were only three separate salary increase lines in the appropriations and the increases could not be transferred among these three budgets. We could if we wished, and did provide at times some extra funds for increases among the academic affairs units. For example Kelly, and at first I gave some extra increase funds to the Library's EPA staff, for their salary levels were so very low. Soon after the University System absorbed the campuses that had previously reported through the Board of Higher Education, restrictions among budget lines became more numerous. Soon after I became Provost we could not transfer salary increase funds from the 101-1310 lines (faculty lines for teaching and departmental

research positions) to those in the other lines whether administrative, library, organized research, Student Affairs, organized extension et cetera. But we could transfer salary increase funds from these budgets to those faculty under the Instructional and Departmental Research lines. To avoid problems in allocation and use, we made these increase allocations separately as well as those for the Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Research Service. One of the things that this accomplished was to make the percentage increases of continuing faculty greater than those for any others, including all department heads, deans, directors, vice chancellors, and their associated assistant and associate positions, the organized research and organized extension positions. We could use the increase funds allocated for vacant positions or positions filled temporarily in this budget for continuing personnel. We had a very small proportion of administrative positions vacant, hence no or little extra funds were available for these increases. This helped the increases for continuing faculty except in those units which had a tendency to keep all positions filled on a permanent basis. This did not change the average salary per full time equivalent faculty position. In an occasional year we could not apply increases to vacant positions without justification. All of the Chancellors and Provosts have approved of this salary increase scheme and have thought this was a very good idea. Under the Board of Governors directions each year, we were required to use all salary increase funds for salary increases. No new positions could be created under these rules with these funds and all salary increase funds had to be allocated at the same time and none could be held for increases later on during the year.

Under Thomas and continuing under Poulton, I began to monitor the increases of the highest paid professors and of the named and University Professors to insure that they got adequate salary increases. Chancellors until Poulton's term were almost always the highest paid individual on

campus. Occasionally a salary supplement for a named professor might make that salary higher, but these were very rare. We soon began to have (if one converted salaries to a nine-month basis for comparison) a number of faculty whose salaries were higher than that of the Chancellor. Dr. Poulton used to brag about the number of faculty whose salaries exceeded his. I did have to watch these high salaries because there is a tendency not to give similar percentage increases, even if deserved, if the total increase was very large and considerably higher than the dean's, associate dean's and department head's salaries. One practice was to require at least an average percentage increase unless a lower increase could be justified on the basis of performance, as I did with the named professors.

A major objective of the salary reviews by the Provost or Deans of the Faculty was to try to keep the system honest so that the increases reflected only judgments of quality for any merit funds awarded. There were always some recommendations for promotions and to eliminate inequities, but we wanted no bias for reasons of malice or dislike. This is very hard to judge, but it was almost always true that when a department head change occurred a few faculty, who were receivers of smaller increases in the past few years, began to get better increases under the new head. In a few cases after a change of deans, increases proposed for a faculty member viewed as exceptional in either the good or bad direction also changed.

I tried to make certain that no department head gave the same amount or the same percentage increases to all faculty. If such a recommendation came over it went back to have the salary recommendations done again. After the second year as Provost I got a few such recommendations and these were most likely to be from administrative instead of academic units. In 1988 our time schedule to get the salaries in, processed, approved and into the payroll was so short that I did not have time to have many reviews with the deans. In cases of questions I

called, but I accepted almost everything proposed. I did write a couple of deans and told them I did not think all of the increases which we had accepted because of the short time schedule, reflected the differences in quality of performance among the faculty that I knew existed in certain departments, and next year I would expect a greater spread. One of the problems was that everyone who was involved in salary increases had a shortened schedule too. In my reviews with the deans I tried to ask enough questions to make certain that the dean knew and had a reason for all very low and very high increases. I asked enough questions to feel that the deans knew why the average increases were proposed too. In a few cases I did change or caused salary increase changes to be made, usually for a larger increase. My questioning was to keep the system as honest as I could. I never reviewed more than a sample of faculty with any dean. Of course I did have some assessments and computer runs to review before the reviews which gave me lists of females and others who seemed out of line. It seemed to me that the department heads and deans did not always adequately reward service to the University and sometimes even service to the school. Throughout my tenure as Provost I was determined to get rid of what I could not prove but felt was salary inequity for women. For this reason, I always made certain that the average percentage increases of females with faculty rank in the university, exceeded those of males in each of the seventeen years that I was Provost. When I retired Institutional Research assured me that there were no statistical differences in salary based on gender.

It was the normal operating procedure from Shirley to Hart that all salary increases during the year not included in the normal annual increases for faculty would have to be approved by the UNC System administrators, and at times the UNC Trustees (or the BOG), and by the NCSU Trustees. At first under Shirley, there were additional approvals from State government officials. Approval of increases for research assistants or

other personnel paid from soft money sources and especially research grants were not usually required. One or another of these was renewed on almost any day during the year, and renewals usually had funds for salary increases for these employees. It was such a hassle and involved so many rubber stamp approvals and extra paper work that this was usually delegated to the local campus and increases could be approved by the Provost to take effect the day that the grant was approved or when the funds became available. These increases almost never required approval by the NCSU Trustees because the salaries were too low and below the minimum required for their approval. Under Hart there was a period of a year or two when BOG Administrators had to approve all of these increases as well as the new positions created under such grants. This created some havoc and poor morale for these employees and considerable anguish for NCSU administrators at all levels and for the faculty holding grants which supported these valued employees.

In the mid-eighties I realized that we were still paying academic year employees on the basis of teaching days. I had thought we had changed this much earlier. This made no difference in the pay that they received if an employee left us at the end of a semester. However, we did occasionally have a person leave us during the semester. We almost never had an academic year employee arrive during a semester. In my opinion this led to overpayment or underpayment depending on when during the semester the person left. It was very difficult to explain to an employee who had served for one-half of a semester why they did not receive one-half of their pay. But we had always done it this way, so it was very difficult to change. My argument was that faculty worked in the semester before classes started to review instructional materials and to get their teaching notes and ancillary supporting teaching materials up to date. Those of us who taught biological science and a number of other subjects that had laboratory sections had to begin to grow plants or

microbes and to prepare materials for laboratory well in advance of the semester. Considerably more effort and work in teaching occurred more than just on the days that the classes met. I argued that for most faculty some work occurred in the few days after the end of the semester. I tried for several years to get these pay periods structured on the basis of the proportion of the semester taught. I was determined that this change would be implemented before I retired. While it affected only a small number of persons over the years, it was still important. On August 30, 1989, I finally got this method of payment in place in the payroll system. The spring started on January 1, and ended on May 15, and the fall semester began on August 16 and ended on December 31.

At the time that Shirley became Dean of the Faculty the policy of the system was that faculty could be paid for specific services beyond their duties. Approval in each case required the approval of the President and the BOT. There were also supplements at this time for named professors.

In 1962 the policies about supplemental pay were not uniform or clear. Each action required special approval. The Institute of Statistics paid supplements from receipts from consulting which were approved annually. Most of the faculty received payment for Summer School and extension (off-campus credit and non-credit) teaching. Shirley wrote Ruggles, the Director of Extension, that we needed to have regular approval by the department head of the faculty teaching these courses. He said that if we are to have an alert faculty, we must not permit them to overload themselves to the detriment of study, research and professional development.

In 1963 the Evening College activities were merged with the regular functions of the departments and schools and of the faculty. Salary supplements were no longer paid to faculty who taught on-campus credit courses in the late afternoon and evening. In 1965 we had one summer session and the rate set for payment was set at two-ninths of

the academic year salary. When we moved to two sessions this was changed to one-sixth of the academic years salary for teaching two three-credit courses. Rates were a little higher if two four credit courses were taught. On March 4, 1968, the Consolidated Council approved the following guidelines for extra compensation for EPA employees:

1. During the regular academic year, an EPA employee on a 9 month or a 12 month contract may earn extra compensation up to 20% of his/her annual salary by teaching in the Continuing Education program.
2. By teaching during the summer school, an EPA employee on a 9 month contract may earn extra compensation up to 20% of his/her regular 9 month salary. If an employee earns more than 20% for teaching during summer school, justification must be submitted and the Provost must approve an exception to this policy. A teaching load of 6 hours is considered full time, and an employee may not work full time in both summer sessions.
3. During the summer, an EPA employee on a 9 month contract in research may earn extra compensation up to three ninths of his/her regular salary. The maximum that a research employee may earn during one month is one ninth of his/her salary.
4. For an EPA employee on a 9 month contract who is involved in both teaching and research, total summer earnings may not exceed 33.3% of his/her regular salary. An employee is not allowed to work more than full time in the summer.

I am certain that the figure of 20% was associated with the formula for conversion from a nine to a twelve month contract, which happened to be 20% at this time.

Once the question of payment to teach in summer school arose for a 12 month employee. The request was for overload pay. I wrote back that I had never approved

payment for overload teaching for a 12 month employee in summer school or for a 12 month person employed 100% in research at any time. I did explain that there were several cases of released time being used to hire someone to perform those functions not now performed by the 12 month employee. The units were compensated but not the faculty member.

After Charles Edwin Bishop in the Consolidated Office as Vice President for Research and Extension devised the policy described earlier, summer payrolls were still being sent to the Chancellor for approval as late as 1973, with a copy to the Provost since his staff had to check salaries and make certain that an excess salary over the 20% was not being paid. When I became Provost, Caldwell assigned this function to me for approval since my office did all of the checking. I also was assigned the responsibility to approve exceptions to this policy in the rare circumstance where it was justified and necessary for the program to be completed. We also permitted up to 20% of the nine-month salary as earnings in Summer School with approval by the Provost to teach and earn more than that under extenuating circumstances. With the increased emphasis on research it sometimes became impossible to find another qualified teacher for these courses in the summer in a few fields. We strongly discouraged this because we felt that some vacation in the summer was needed.

We had a provision that under certain circumstances, such as directing a major summer project in a training program in summer school, a faculty member could earn from the soft money sources up to three months summer salary if they were not on any other salary budget during this time. No one was permitted to earn more than that amount, except that a person could also earn 20% of that summer salary for extra extension activities. This meant that the biweekly payrolls in the schools and the summer school salary payroll sheets had to be cross-checked. The policy for any extra

compensation for extension activities also had to be cross-referenced and checked to make certain that no policy was violated. At one time Mr. Simpson and Mrs. Strickland did this checking. Later the staff in the Personnel Office including Mrs. Strickland did it. In a very few cases we did find individuals in situations where their earnings from several payrolls would have exceeded 100% for a summer session, for a month or for the three summer months. These were all corrected. In some cases we had to tell the individual that they would have to choose which project that they would work on and be paid from for they could not be paid from them all. A few individuals could not understand why they could not teach full-time in one session and also be paid from their grants for a part of their time to do research. Of course during the academic year faculty who were paid in part from a grant had an equal amount of time and salary released from their academic affairs position. We made no exceptions to this. This cross-referencing of payrolls from different sources was very necessary for fiscal reasons as well as for other reasons; such as, you cannot work more than 100% of the time. Too if we erred, the auditors would have required us to return those resources to the granting or other appropriate agency.

In 1976 the Faculty Senate appointed a Senate Committee on Salaries. The committee was chaired by Professor Jack Wilson. Other members on the Senate's Committee have varied over the years, but Wilson continues. Each year the Provost's Personnel Office has provided the committee with all the salary and salary increase information that the committee has requested. Basically this committee has provided a statistical analysis of salaries by rank and gender so that faculty can figure out where their salaries are in relation to others. This has been a good and very useful committee and has served the campus well. Anyone could use the data provided in the report and calculate how their salary related to other salaries

in their school, department, and in the University. While they may have thought that they were underpaid, now they knew their comparative salary status. I reduced but did not eliminate the complaints from individuals who felt that they deserved more when they compared their salary with that of others, but it got rid of a lot of gossip and reduced suspicions and mistrust. Individual salary information has been available for years in the Faculty Senate Office.

On campus I was constantly told that good teaching was not rewarded in salaries. Another committee of the Senate did a study to determine whether being selected to the Academy of Outstanding Teachers had any effect on salary. I report from this study on the 1986-87 salaries: "These results suggest that good teaching is, on the average rewarded in terms of salary. The coefficients are cumulative for more than one award." The report indicated a 5.86% salary differential with one award and an additional 3.65% for the second award. The third award and the effect of being selected as Alumni Distinguished Professor had little further effect. It should be noted that to be an Alumni Professor you had to be a member of the Academy. I was delighted to see these data because each year I had all of those who had been selected to the Academy indicated for me in my reviews of salary increases. I thought that I always remembered to question the increases of those who were members if their proposed salary increases were low.

In 1985-86 Chancellor Poulton had an idea we should make some arrangement so that when a person became a department head that we would make a more logical increase in salary for the period of time that he/she was head and then we would reduce the salary by that supplement when the person returned to the professorial ranks. With the continuing decrease in the length of time a person was willing to be a department head, we needed something to assist us in salary determination for departmental administrators with their return to the

faculty ranks. The deans and I thought that this was a very good idea. We worked together to come up with variable supplements that were set depending on the size and complexity of the department. In fact we liked the supplement idea so well that we made them for assistant and associate department heads and for assistant and associate deans too. We did not make this system retroactive and only used it for new appointees to these positions. I had a copy for the entire system at my desk and one in the Personnel Office for reference. Each dean knew what the supplements were for their units and each new appointee knew what part of his/her salary was supplement and which was base. With salary increases the base grew, but the supplement did not. As we developed our base I had contacted several other universities to determine their systems. Advice that I received was don't make the supplements too large or you will have difficulty in taking that much away when the person returns to the faculty. For NCSU the head of the Department of Economics and Business was to get the largest supplement. I never got to use that one for Economics and Business, because we did not have a change in that position while the system was in effect. We did use it for several heads and a number of assistant heads and assistant deans. Later, and before I retired, we learned from VP Dawson that we could not use the system any longer. We could set the initial salary and convert the salary to pay a head for 12 months. Under this system we then had to determine what salary the heads who returned to teaching and research should receive. Frequently an individual got only a small reduction or no salary reduction except for the conversion to an academic year basis. This conversion called for a 22% reduction for a change from a calendar-year basis to an academic-year basis. Since we had to give many an initial salary boost to get them to accept the position as head we frequently did not give them a merit increase on their return to a faculty position because their salary might

already be high for their current worth as a faculty member.

Off Campus Scholarly Assignment and Leaves of Absence

One of the first things Dean Shirley recommended in 1956, at a conference of representatives of the UNC campuses was for a system of sabbatical leaves.

In 1960 there was a report of a special committee to the Senate which had studied sabbatical leaves. There had been repeated attempts for many years with the Visiting Committee of the Trustees and within the UNC system to acquire sabbatical leaves. Everyone seemed to be in favor; however, the stumbling block was funds, and there did not seem to be a way to get the State to fund them.

In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell assigned responsibility to the Dean of the Faculty for review and recommendation of approval of all requests for leaves of absence. At this time most leaves were without pay. Our leave system was never funded with endowment or even special appropriations for a sabbatical leave system. Even as late as 1965 the Visiting Committee recommended, as they had for many years, that NCSC get funding for sabbaticals. On March 11, 1965, I found the first reference to off-campus scholarly work. Provost Kelly wrote a memorandum to deans and directors on the subject of off-campus scholarly work. A part of that memorandum follows:

Whenever it is practical from the standpoint of the departmental teaching load and other responsibilities, a Department Head with the approval of the Dean of a school may assign a faculty member to off-campus duty for a semester (a member assigned for a full year would be placed on half-salary) permitting him to engage in scholarly work and refreshment. In each case the Department Head and Dean must approve the assignment, report it to the Dean of the Faculty for record, and require a succinct report at the end of

the assignment period. Under this type of arrangement no earnings may be received from any other source.

In 1971-72 there was a clarification of the faculty members ability to earn additional income. This is described in the following paragraph.

As we began to use the off-campus assignment system we adopted the following strategy. When one person was on off-campus assignment in a department, the other faculty in that department assumed responsibility for their colleague's work. It was only in a few special cases, a very small department or a very specialized position where others in the department were not qualified to teach a specific subject, that I would assign a temporary position for this purpose. Our plan was to have the faculty member go on assignment if they were nine-month employees for a semester with full pay, or for an academic year at one-half pay. For 12-month employees the assignment could be for a semester or for a six months period. If the person was to receive pay from the institution for services rendered where they were completing their off-campus assignment, we reduced their compensation from NCSU accordingly. We did not consider any living expenses provided by the agency or the granting agency as salary. In many cases, such as a Fulbright appointment overseas, the appointment was for a year. In such cases the person usually got some cost-of-living allowance and a small salary. They could then earn up to one-half their salary from NCSU for a year-long appointment. In some cases the salary earned was less than the salary at NCSU and in these cases if the appointment was for a semester the salary from NCSU could make up for the difference in that paid by the host or sponsoring agency and the NCSU salary. With Kelly as Provost, we required the approval of the Provost and reported these assignments to the Board of Trustees as we did other forms of leave. Although the Provost approved the individual requests from the deans, the Chancellor had to approve the material sent

to the Trustees and was informed by this mechanism of the numbers of leaves and off-campus assignments.

We encouraged our faculty to take these off-campus assignments for professional development because we wanted those who needed to learn new techniques to take these assignments too. For many years faculty seemed to think of the system as a reward or an "excellence in performance system". In such cases most went on off-campus assignment to do research in their specialty at a location where there were resources not available at NCSU, or just to have time to devote fully to the project. As we encouraged the assignments for professional development, more and more of our faculty began to go to places where exciting new innovations in teaching or research were occurring. This then truly began to accomplish the objectives intended for the system. Assignments could also be made available to all full-time permanent EPA employees.

In 1973 it had become clear that the faculty did not always know what their privileges were while they were on leave without pay, on partial pay, or on full pay. Provost Kelly began to write to the faculty when their assignment was received and approved administratively before they were approved by the Trustees. The intent was to make certain that the faculty knew what they had to do to remain in the retirement system or to maintain other benefits while away from campus.

On March 23, 1978, Ellis Cowling and Jasper Memory made their report on Faculty Professional Development at NCSU. This report covered many forms of professional development and encouraged the further use of off-campus scholarly assignments. It was at this time that I renewed my efforts to encourage these assignments. It was a great surprise to me when I talked to the faculty of SHASS, that I learned there were only a few there who had heard of this possibility. The meeting was well attended. Several departments in CHASS began to develop plans for using this mechanism.

As the use of the system developed and was used more frequently, we realized that some departments were using the mechanism for assignments to full-time research or for other special assignments with the faculty members remaining on campus. Shortly after Chancellor Poulton arrived and at his suggestion, we asked the departments if they considered this as the equivalent of an off-campus assignment. If so, they were asked to keep their own departmental or school records, but do not report these as off-campus scholarly assignments.

During the 1980s we had a number of assignments where the faculty were off-campus and working full-time for another agency. In such cases the agency, most frequently a governmental agency, reimbursed NCSU for the salary and paid for all the faculty members fringe benefits. We did not call these off-campus assignments but maintained a separate count and listing of those who were on this type of inter-governmental agency program. Assignments in special circumstances could be with industrial companies. In a few cases special arrangements were made with a few companies to exchange a faculty member with an employee from industry for a semester or for a year. These were exchanges most frequent in Textiles and Engineering. We also had an occasional exchange between a public school system and the School of Education. In such cases we continued to pay our employees and the other party in the exchange paid their employees. This did not affect or disrupt anyone's retirement or benefits systems. These were excellent programs and we would all benefit if they were used more.

The places where the off-campus assignments and other leave systems worked best were in those department where they planned years in advance so that there was no risk of having key personnel or the same specialties absent at the same time, or risk having an individual's plan turned down at the departmental, school, or University levels. At the same time we had to be flexible enough to take advantage of the opportuni-

ties that sometimes became available at the last moment. This usually happened when someone won an award. Of all of the departments on campus, I believe that the History Department may have done the best planning and made the best use of this program. While it was not a privilege to be applied to all every seven years, we discouraged assignments more often than that. Exceptions were made on rare occasions when needed. We did not like to have a person on leave without pay for more than for a two year period. This was a policy that was made so that departments could plan for the future and not keep key positions vacant for extended periods, although funds in these positions were available for use by the unit or school. We did make exceptions to this length of time, but they were rare and usually were for assignments with State or Federal governmental agencies. In some cases we did tell an employee that their leave would not be extended after this period of time. In a few cases the employee resigned; however, in such cases they lost the time while they were on leave in the retirement system because a person had to return to work for a year after a leave without pay or with partial pay to retain the time in the retirement system. In such cases the employee knew what the cost would be.

Faculty Benefits and Privileges

In this section many of the benefits of faculty and retirees with which the Provost dealt are discussed. Most of these will be concerned with non-compensation matters. A few will deal with issues concerning extra compensation. Retirement pay, and the amount of earnings permitted after retirement will be mentioned. These policies were set by the Legislature or by other agencies of the State; however, it became the duty of the Provost's Office to enforce the policies and to make certain that many of these were followed. While we had group life insurance, Individual Retirement Accounts and other tax deferment plans and group dental insurance in the eighties, these were the responsibility primarily of the Vice Chancel-

lor for Finance and Business. The Provost was informed and had a member of his staff on the committee concerned with these matters, but they will not be discussed in detail here.

The use or continued employment of faculty and others after retirement was not encouraged in 1955. I noted in a letter from VP Carmichael to President Gray that retirees could be employed after retirement only if they were paid from non-state funds. Faculty would lose some of their retirement pay if paid from state funds. There was some carry-over from this policy for many years under a policy of the UNC Board of Trustees which stated that you could not be continued on the payroll from state funds after age 72 even on a part time basis. I recall seeing correspondence from Shirley to Cahill in 1961 about a case where a faculty member had been denied extra compensation from state funds for overload work in 1944 that was still being argued. Cahill wrote, "The thing that disturbs me about it, however, is that the whole situation seems to reflect a lack of generosity and a smallness of spirit that we ought not to exhibit. It does not seem to me to be reasonable to expect Mr. X to display excessive patriotism." Shirley wrote back and said, "Let's face it we're cheesy and unpatriotic." The issue was over \$281.88, and of course it had been determined that state funds could not be used for this supplemental pay.

Prior to 1959, on rare occasions, supplemental pay could be approved from grants and contracts when the grant specifically permitted it. On October 29, 1959, a policy was announced that prohibited this practice and required that salary lines from grants for faculty be used not as a supplement but for released time. Of course, it was to continue to be possible for a nine month faculty member to earn full time pay in the summer if they were not on other payrolls. At this time, if the earnings exceeded 20% of the nine months salary for the summer an approval was required. By the time that I became Provost, this had been changed to permit up to three months pay from grants

in the summer, if the faculty member was on no other payroll. This policy continues to be in practice in 1993. Later, and for many years it was possible to continue on the payroll after retirement at one-half time so long as your retirement pay and the wages earned did not exceed the average of the last five (this was changed later to four) years' pay which was the base on which the retirement pay was calculated. During the first Hunt Administration several retired persons were employed by the State and drew their retirement pay and a salary for their positions. At least this is what gossip says occurred. The Legislature reportedly became unhappy with this practice and began to set each year a specific annual and monthly rate as the maximum that a retired person could earn. This was a serious blow to our continuing to hire retired faculty for more than for a token amount of salary and time. Before this the practice of using retired faculty had been very helpful in getting some classes taught at reasonable rates by experienced and capable teachers, especially in areas of teacher shortages and during the summers.

For many years the mandatory retirement age for State employees was age 65. NCSU had provisions for the continued employment upon approval by the Provost and the Chancellor on a year by year basis. These were reported to the Trustees. Full time employment would end at age 70 and part-time employment at age 72 if paid from State funds. This remained our practice for many years until the federal and state governments passed legislation which became effective in 1989 that eliminated age as a basis for mandatory retirement but permitted universities to retain age 70 as a mandatory retirement age until January 1, 1993. In 1993 retirement could no longer be required on the basis of age. Of course with retirement or with age 70 on January 1, 1993, tenure expired. This was not a thing which the Provosts helped to create or even wanted, but it was a policy that required the Provost's staff to retain adequate records and to prepare reports to the Trustees which

gave the numbers of faculty in various age groups. In the Faculty Senate Minutes on page 131 of 1962-63, there is a poem quoted from the AAUP Bulletin 44(2): 500, 1958. Retirement at this time was required at age 65. It reads as follows:

No more the morning's sudden thrill of joy,
The gently tolling bell, the feel of chalk,
Tired students' eyes, ideas in endless flow;
No more the atom's soul, proud walls of Troy,
Sad poetry of living things. The talk,
The endless, lovely talk, is stopped and so,
Not old, I leave the friends I love the most,
To be a guest where I have been a host.

The practice has usually been followed that an administrator served at the pleasure of the Chancellor and they have usually expected those administrators to step down from their administrative office at age 65. Each year I prepared for the Chancellors a list of those who would be age 65 during the next year. Normally this change would occur in the academic year that a person became 65. Most administrators retired at age 65 because they were ready to do so. I usually asked deans if they wished to stay on in a small part time capacity for a few years to complete some project. We did ask some administrators to stay after age 65. This was usually the case when a committee or the University had not found a replacement.

When I was first employed at NCSC in 1953, twelve month employees had one calendar month of annual leave. This was never, or almost never taken by a person in one lump. So in reality this turned out to be the number of work days in a month or about 22 days. No annual leave could be carried over after December 31, but leave could be taken at any time during the year. In the eighties this was changed to 24 calendar days per year and one could accumulate unused leave with a maximum of 30 days carried forward on January 1, of a new year. It was established in July 19, 1889, that records had to be verified so as to prove that the amount of unused leave was accurate upon retirement. It was proposed at first that we maintain records of annual leave in

the Provost's Office personnel files. We knew that this would be a tremendous undertaking and would be no more and probably less reliable than the records kept by the faculty within their departments. Leave records were retained and maintained by the faculty and verified when necessary by the department.

This was also the practice for sick leave. We had to obtain on a university-wide basis the number of unused days of sick leave so as to have the accumulated number of days unused. Sick leave could accumulate from year to year, and unused days were added to the employees accumulated years of service in calculating retirement pay. These were furnished for EPA personnel by the Provost's Personnel Office to the Business Office which made the annual report to the appropriate State agency.

Although the Provosts were not directly involved, Professors Horace Hamilton, D. M. Petersen, J. S. Doolittle and A. C. Linnerud were among those who contributed much over the years for the benefits that came into being for faculty. In 1966 Hamilton was much involved in the death benefits' modifications for the spouses of faculty.

In 1956 Dean Shirley was involved in an all UNC System conference, including NCSC faculty representatives, which recommended that Academic Freedom become a reality on all campuses of the University. They indicated that the faculty and the administration supported the right of faculty and students to participate, or refuse to participate, in controversial issues in public affairs, as long as they acted as private citizens and not as representatives of North Carolina State College or of the Consolidated University. This was to be adopted by the UNC Board of Trustees some years later.

In 1956 the Senate recommended that an award be made for Excellence in Teaching. It was learned from the Attorney General that the source of funds for the award could not be State funds. First eight teachers were to be selected for the new teaching academy. I'm not certain how the first eight were to be selected; however, after the first

eight were selected there would be a second eight selected by those then in the Academy for Fostering Excellence in Teaching. There would eventually be 24 members each serving for a three year term. The academy would then select one member to receive a \$500 award annually. A committee was to be established to develop the plans for the academy. Dean Shirley was supposed to appoint such a group, but in 1959 the Senate considered again the matter of awards for excellence in teaching. In that discussion it was said that, "Several years ago a plan to reward good teaching came a cropper in the Faculty Senate." The minutes also said that "This matter was considered by the Senate some years ago and was dropped because of the difficulty of measuring teaching performance." I saw on the Liaison Committee report as described on March 14, 1961 in the Senate Minutes, that on March 1, 1961, a teaching award was established for one outstanding teacher award of \$500 in each school. Schools developed procedures for selecting and recognizing the one teacher for these teaching awards each year. In 1964 Dr. Kelly, at the request of the Senate and because he felt the need to reward and to recognize good teachers in a better way than we were doing at the time, appointed a Committee on Support for Teachers. On December 16, 1965, Dr. Kelly announced to the Academic Deans and to all faculty members a new procedure for the evaluation of faculty by students and a new process to select the outstanding teachers. These were to make up the Academy of Outstanding Teachers (at this time the title considered was an Academy of Faculty Fellows) and would lead to the Alumni Distinguished Professor Awards. With the establishment of the Academy of Outstanding Teachers there was also the two annual teaching awards for the newly selected Academy members. The Senate came up with the procedures which were used to select Academy members and the Alumni Professors.

In 1970 the Graduate School began to make awards to 10 Outstanding Teaching Assistants. At a later time these were also

paid for by Alumni Association funds. Later the Alumni Association provided funds for faculty awards in each of the areas of extension and research annually. These are all recognized at the Alumni Award's Luncheon and at the Honor's Convocation. In 1986 the NCSU Student Aid Association (The Wolfpack Club) provided the resources to give outstanding scholarships to students for academic reasons. The awardees were selected by the Academy of Outstanding Teacher's Executive Council. The awards are given in the name of the faculty and are called University Faculty Scholarships. This was fostered by Chancellor Poulton.

In 1959, Chancellor Caldwell raised the issue of extra compensation for extension activities. At this time there was no uniform policy and procedures varied from school to school; however the practice had existed many years for overload pay for extension and for off-campus credit courses. No uniform policy existed among the schools for maximum participation until one was established by Vice President C. E. Bishop of the UNC System in the late 1960s which was described earlier in the section on Salary Administration. This policy provided for extra compensation for extension activities up to 20% of the faculty member's annual salary during the faculty member's contract period. Any amount that exceeded this level was to be approved on each campus. Approval at that time was by Provost Kelly, and later by other Provosts only in exceptional cases.

Consulting has long been practiced in several of the schools as a benefit and as a part of faculty members responsibilities to transfer knowledge. It has probably also been used by a few to make extra money, and extra money does come to those who consult. Our practice has been to limit consulting so that it does not conflict with the faculty member's duties on campus. This has generally been understood not to exceed one day a week. That has been understood as the maximum by all concerned, that would not conflict with regular duties, although that limitation has not been pre-

cisely stated in the policies. I do not recall ever seeing a consulting report where any faculty member consulted for that many days in an academic year. The consulting effort also should not cause or be a conflict of interest. This generally meant that the faculty member would not have a grant from a company and consult for the company too. In a few cases there has needed to be an exception to this guideline, because in some cases it was necessary to have the faculty members consult to assure that the knowledge from their research supported by the grant got used and put into practice to benefit the public. The cases where there has been most controversy are in the professional fields of engineering and design. In these areas there are many practicing professionals in business and in some cases they believe that the consulting is in competition with their businesses. The professional groups wanted the faculty in these areas to have enough practical experiences to make their teaching more relevant to real world needs, thus making the students more aware of practical problems and not just aware of theory. One area of conflict was with the Landscape Architecture faculty. The national professional organization encouraged practice and developed a guideline for its members. It stated:

It is recommended that staff members be also practicing in the profession at the same time that they are teaching in order that a closer tie between education and practice may be promoted. It is recommended that in all such cases the practicing staff member should be associated with a professional office of recognized standing, either his own or a that of a fellow practitioner. It is recommended, however, that no staff member should conduct a professional practice while he is carrying the full-time teaching load characteristic of his school unless such outside work is confined to summers or other off periods.

As you can see this was a very touchy matter for faculty, the school and for the university. One group would accuse you of

not being in touch with practice in educating students in the various fields while another during the same year would charge you for the same activity with doing too much so as to interfere with those in private practice. This is where there had to be an approval mechanism. At first this approval was to keep the dean informed, and then it began to require approval at the Chancellor's level, and approval was quickly transferred back to the dean's level. If a conflict arose the matter would be referred to the Chancellor. Later this review was delegated to the Provost for resolution. Few issues came to Provost Kelly or to me. I recall one case where a nine month appointee's request for consulting was refused by the Dean and was appealed to me. This was a request of a faculty member who taught two large classes to be absent for two weeks including the Thanksgiving holidays. I also turned down the request, for although colleagues had agreed to cover the classes, I felt that the consulting time was excessive and especially so since it was so near the end of the semester. The matter of consulting reports and consulting policy development was handled by the Research Office after that office was established. There was consultation on these matters with the various Provosts. At a later time after Frank Hart became Vice Chancellor for Research, the Board of Governors staff developed a system-wide consulting policy. Dr. Hart's advice was sought and used and the then existing NCSU Policy was a blue print for the development of the UNC policy.

On July 10, 1961, in a memorandum to all academic deans, Chancellor Caldwell stated the new policy for Emeritus Status. The policy had been approved by the Consolidated University and by Caldwell. It states the following provisions.

1. Emeritus status at the last earned rank will be accorded to all faculty members of tenure on their first retirement.

2. A special certificate to this effect will be prepared and awarded by the President of the University at the meeting of the Board of Trustees (now the Board of Governors) honoring retiring faculty members.
3. Catalogue listings of faculty will carry Emeritus Personnel so long as they live.
4. Emeritus personnel will be invited to all formal faculty convocations, including the annual O. Max Gardner Dinner.
5. Certificates of merit will be issued to all non-tenure faculty members and to all professional personnel retiring from North Carolina State College after ten or more years of service.

This policy remains in practice today. The privilege described in item 4 was deleted after a few years and invitation to this dinner was for only a few selected persons. I never received an invitation even when an NCSU faculty member was the recipient while I was Provost.

When I became Provost it had become practice for the Deans to request a few exceptions to the policy. Emeritus status was provided to these exceptions. This was especially true for long time extension employees, instructors and certain others who held administrative offices on their retirements. These might include others holding the titles of vice chancellor, director, librarian, counselor, admissions officer et cetera.

In 1962 the Faculty Senate reviewed the benefits given to emeriti faculty and the benefits and privileges of faculty. Benefits of emeriti included free parking which was later to be changed to \$10 per year. That figure was retained with the support of Worsley and me when a University parking study recommended a significant increase in the rate for retired persons. The Association of Retired Faculty, especially Howard Miller, called this to my attention so that I could help to retain the privilege. Privileges also included listings in the catalogue, the cam-

pus directories, invitation to formal faculty convocations, use of the library, use of the laundry, voting privileges in the general faculty, faculty priced tickets to athletic activities, tickets and participation in activities as provided for faculty at the Student Union, at the Craft Center and at Thompson Theater at the faculty rates. When possible, space could be provided for emeriti in their departments. This last benefit has become a very prized and relatively rare privilege. Mostly this includes a shared office with several other emeritus members in the same department. It has been provided less frequently as space becomes more scarce. Membership in the Faculty Club, at a reduced rate as determined by the Faculty Club, was also included, as was use of the gym at regular faculty rates.

Benefits of the faculty and staff have slowly improved over the years. Most of these, such as life insurance and dental insurance, have been at the employees' expense. However, the benefits of lower costs for a group has been helpful. Group activities have also consisted of several tax deferred plans. By far the most important and biggest benefit has been health insurance. The state now pays for the health insurance of the employee even after retirement. This was adopted one year during the first Hunt Administration in lieu of salary increase funds. It has benefited us well and is more than we would have gotten from a comparable salary increase because costs of health insurance have risen rapidly and almost every year, and even though the deduction has increased and the coverage has decreased, it is still a great benefit. The family's health insurance is paid for by the employee.

One very important provision recommended that both faculty and staff could have the privilege of registering for courses for a minimal registration fee if space were available in the class. This was made possible by a bill passed by the General Assembly on June 10, 1965, and it was announced on our

campus by Dr. Kelly on August 9, 1965. This fee has been \$7.00 per semester for one course for many years. I recall my sitting in on a course in Intermediary Metabolism, with the permission of Sam Tove, the instructor. In the earlier years these registrations of employees was counted as a part of our official enrollment for budget purposes. So registration, not sitting in, was encouraged, and if you did not want credit you could audit the course. The regulations which existed for many years were as follows:

1. Free tuition privileges shall be allowed for full-time faculty of instructor rank and above and other full-time employees of the university who hold membership in the Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System. (This excludes all part-time teachers, all part-time research staff, all graduate students and all temporary employees.)
2. Free tuition privileges shall apply only during the period of one's normal employment. (The period of normal employment may be for an academic year or for a calendar year.)
3. Free tuition privileges will be allowed on one course only in each semester or summer term during which one is permitted to register. The course may be taken either during the day or the evening.
4. Free tuition privileges will be allowed only to employees who meet the requirements for admission to the university and who have been duly admitted by the appropriate Office of Admissions.
5. Free tuition privileges do not include such other charges as registration, laboratory, or material fees which must be paid by the student.
6. A member of the full-time faculty or full-time staff of the University shall be eligible, within the limitations of these regulations, for free tuition on any campus of the university.

7. Members of the faculty and the staff who enroll for a course under these regulations shall be required to complete the full schedule of work encompassed in their normal employment obligations.
8. Each applicant for free tuition privileges must complete and submit through regular administrative channels a 'Request for Full-Time Faculty and Staff Enrollment in Course' form.

Two other provisions were added to the 1965 regulations.

1. Nine-month appointments are not eligible for free tuition in summer school.

This later became the practice for all employees at the time that persons could enroll on any of the campuses of the UNC System.

2. Any full-time employee taking more than one course a semester will not be eligible for free tuition privileges.

These were wonderful privileges for the staff and faculty pursuing a degree; however, they did not help many employees to obtain professional development. This soon was modified so that employees could take courses even if they were not admitted by the Admission's Office. They enrolled through what is now called the Adult Student Program. This was a very important change because it enabled individuals who did not want a degree and certain employees who could not have gained admission to take courses for professional development and improvement. In certain cases other SPA employees took the courses and earned the credit hours needed to gain admission and to enroll as degree students. We had a number of individuals who wished on occasion to take two courses. In these circumstances the employees had to pay for tuition in the second course. To take one course required the approval of the Department Head and the School Dean or the Business Manager. To take more than one course

required the approval of the Department Head, the Dean, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Business Manager. Approval for more than one course was denied frequently by others and occasionally by the Dean of the Faculty if the request came for two or more courses in consecutive semesters. I recall one case where an employee in a unit that reported to the Provost wished to take three graduate courses in each of two consecutive semesters so that he could push his graduation date earlier. The request was denied and the employee resigned. He planned to leave us when he obtained his doctorate too. He could not understand that there was no way he could do his full-time job and take three graduate courses simultaneously. The times that we permitted persons to take two courses most often were when both courses desired by the employee during the year were taught in the same semester. Occasionally, to enable a student to finish his program sooner we would approve two courses. A few years after I became Provost, it seemed to me that I was simply rubber stamping the requests and they were very few. So in 1978 I delegated the approval to the school deans and the vice chancellors and continued to sign only those forms of personnel in the offices that reported to me. Provosts have encouraged this means of professional development and improvement.

It was in the early 70s with the new UNC system and the Board of Governors, and after expansion to the 16 campuses, that this opportunity became available to staff on all campuses. This meant that an employee at one campus could register on another for that campus's minimal fee if space was available in the desired class. This was a valuable addition and the loss to the campuses was that the students could not be counted as a part of the budgeted enrollment. At this time we had around 300 FTE students who were our own employees enrolled in courses at NCSU so this was a budgetary loss; however, we were over-enrolled at the time so it didn't hurt much

then, but it did reduce our budgeted enrollment. Approval for an NCSU employee to take a course at another institution required the approval of the Provost in addition to the other approvals. I found that this approval could not be delegated. The requirement of the host institution was that registration could occur if there was space available in the classroom. We did try to make certain that prerequisites were met. This was enormously helpful to our off-campus personnel, especially those in the Agricultural Extension staff who were located in the counties and wished to take courses or pursue degrees on campuses closer to their place of employment, but it was even more important to faculty on other campuses because it opened the courses in doctoral programs at UNC-CH, UNC-G, and at NCSU at very cheap rates to the faculty and staff of the other campuses.

Patent Policies have existed at NCSU for many years as a benefit to faculty. These will not be discussed here since the development of these policies has been the responsibility of the Dean and later of the Vice Chancellor for Research. Patent policy brochures have been given to all employees.

Publications and the resultant recognition and prestige have come to individual faculty, to departments, to schools and to the University. Support of publication costs and any arrangements or requirements for sharing in profits from publications have primarily been provided by the schools. The usual practice has been for income from the publication of scholarly books to be retained by the authors. CHASS has a different policy when the total or a partial costs of publication of books and other text materials are provided by the CHASS Foundation's funds.

Research by most faculty in time came to be expected as a part of the faculty members' functions. Reimbursement policies for travel costs to professional meetings to report on scholarly achievement and to keep up in the fields of knowledge were set by the schools and varied widely. The Provost was not involved in determining these matters,

but they have encouraged attendance and participation in these activities.

In 1971 the length of time required for vesting in the retirement system of the state was changed from 15 to 5 years. It was just at this time that retirement system and the General Assembly approved TIAA-CREF as an alternative choice to the state retirement system for new faculty. This was extended in 1990 to include librarians. Although many persons worked for this benefit for many years, much credit must go to A. C. Barefoot who represented the UNC System in the deliberations over a long period of time. This was a very valuable development for it gave us an excellent recruitment tool.

In 1975 the Teaching Effectiveness Committee began to select from among faculty proposals those to receive financial awards for the improvement of undergraduate courses. The idea was that we wanted to encourage classroom instructional innovation and improvement and that these grants would help to pay the costs of the experiments. This money was frequently multiplied for it was often supplemented by other departmental or school funds. In the early eighties we also added a complement of additional grant funds to bring experimentation with computers and their uses into classroom activities in areas where they were not a normal part of the instructional methods. These two activities were coordinated by Dr. Downs.

On February 23, 1976, the matter of liability insurance for teachers was discussed at the All University Committee on Faculty Welfare. This later was adopted and implemented at NCSU.

In 1978 the Retirement System added a \$20,000 death benefit to all employees who were members of the State's retirement system.

In the late 1980s the Legislature passed a bill that enabled all citizens over 65 to take courses by paying only the registration and other fees if there was space available in the course. These citizens also do not count in the budgeted enrollment.

In 1989 we extended a recent policy change instituted by the General Administration of the BOG for its staff to the faculty of NCSU to enable payment for unused annual leave. This had been the practice for all SPA employees for many years. On Nov. 2, 1989, George Worsley and I sent a memorandum to Deans, Directors and Department Heads which established the policy. The policy reads in part: "Twelve-month EPA employees eligible under University policy to earn vacation leave will be permitted to receive a lump sum payment for unused vacation leave (in an amount not to exceed 30 days) when they retire or separate from employment on or after November 1, 1989." The policy change indicated that the departments "are responsible for maintaining evidence to support unused vacation leave balances."

Before I became employed at NCSC we had a policy for sick leave and a specified number of days allowed as established by the Legislature for State employees who are permanent employees and on a full-time and a twelve-month basis. Over the years we have not had a policy for sick leave for academic year employees. In most cases there was a general understanding that when an employee was ill that colleagues in the department would handle assigned responsibility for that individual. That faculty member would reciprocate later when another faculty member was sick. In cases of longer illness the individual might be put on leave without pay or other arrangements in assignments might be made. In most cases these were resolved to most individuals' and departments' satisfaction and did not create serious problems. As the numbers of female faculty in the child bearing ages increased, we found that the departments were handling the matter of maternity leave in a great variety of and in very inconsistent ways. This necessitated a study of maternity leave and what we were doing for these employees. In the spring of 1990 we undertook a maternity leave, disability leave survey. As a result an *ad hoc* committee was appointed to

review and proposed policy and to address paternal leave policies and procedures in their recommendations. In the *Official Bulletin* of May 8, 1992, the following announcement appeared.

We are pleased to announce that the Board of Trustees has approved a Maternity Leave Policy for permanent EPA employees who do not currently earn leave (i.e. EPA faculty or EPA staff who have less than a 12 month appointment). It ensures that faculty and EPA staff women who do not currently earn leave will be able to arrange maternity leave.

This new policy represents our view that people who work and learn at North Carolina State University need to have a working and learning environment that is supportive of their personal and professional development.

Personal circumstances other than maternity sometimes require faculty and staff to request leave. We will continue to encourage administrators and supervisors to accommodate faculty and staff leave requests for family or personal needs. However, such requests should be reasonable and achievable within the resources of departments, and consistent with current University personnel policies.

This policy is not intended to replace existing policies concerning extended leave. Extended leave for off-campus scholarly and other assignments already have been addressed in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The new policy was accomplished with the effort of a number of women faculty members who were persistent and with the aid of Provost Hart. I have not stated the policy in its entirety since it was recently established and all faculty and staff received a copy. It will appear in its entirety in the next revision of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Of course parking in the early years was truly a benefit for it was free. As the years progressed it continued to be a benefit but at gradually increasing costs. Today some consider it to have been entirely lost as a

benefit, but if one compares parking fees at NCSU with those in other agencies of similar types, it still remains a benefit.

Retirement Age

President William C. Friday reported at a cabinet meeting the following as Retirement Policy: "The Visiting Committee of the Board of Trustees has (1) reaffirmed the recommendation contained in their 1956 Report, and (2) stated their position that the presumption is that the law applies, and (3) that our people, upon reaching 65, shall retire unless his or her superior officer makes the case for continuation of service. The effect of this action by the Visiting Committee makes it mandatory that, in those instances where continuation of service beyond 65 is desired, a substantial case be made." Then the employee could be retained on a year to year basis until age 70. After age 70 persons could be employed only on a one-half time basis. It was understood that the Consolidated Office would support the recommendation of each Chancellor in these instances and they usually did.

In the early years before the establishment of the Board of Governors, the Chancellor usually approved those over age 65 who would be continued as employees on a full-time or on a part-time basis. Requests were prepared after a reminder was sent out by the Provost's personnel staff. The names, ranks and departments of those approved were sent to the Board of Trustees of UNC for their approval. After the Board of Governors was established this function of approval was delegated to the Provost who prepared the report for the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees of NCSU for their approval. After age 70 the employee had to revert to one-half-time. After age 72 there was an expectation that the employee would no longer be paid from State funds but could be kept on a part-time not to exceed one-half time if they were paid from soft money. This in essence kept us from employing anyone over age 72 who did not have a grant that provided the source of

the salary funds. After the federal and State governments passed the non-discrimination on the basis of age provisions, the Board of Governors discontinued their rules about employment over ages 65, 70, and 72. Of course the over age 65 rule was abolished, but faculty with academic rank could still be discontinued after age 70. On very rare occasions we might continue a person full time until age 72. We continued our policy of over age 72 but did make rare exceptions for payment for part-time assignments from State funds. As has been mentioned under Benefits, the state had eliminated the provision many years ago of continuing a person on the basis of one-half-time. At this time the Legislature set the maximum that a person in the retirement system could earn during a month and over a calendar year period. This was a very small sum which has increased slightly over the years. This regulation continues, and it has limited our employing many retired persons for pay beyond that maximum exempted by Social Security. This included most retirees because the extra earnings were now hardly worth the trouble, red tape and headaches involved with Social Security. It has also limited the employment of retirees from teaching more than one course in either summer school or in a semester.

It was of considerable interest that the new retirement age provisions at the time of my retirement had not caused many more faculty to continue to work full-time after age 65 than the campus had experienced before these regulations came into being. I do remember the concern about this as a potential problem, and it was on the programs of national organizations at their annual meetings for several years. I know that we did some worst scenario studies at NCSU. There were a few cases when we would not have continued a specific faculty member who continued after age 65, but not very many. I asked the deans each year and the most ever reported for the entire University in a single year was three. So all those meetings, studies, and worries were not needed at that time. Most faculty have

things they want to do and wish to retire so that they can get them done before they become incapacitated. I understand that under the Hart administration there were more faculty continuing until age 70. The effects of the demise of the retirement at age 70 requirement for mandatory retirement after January 1, 1993, remains to be seen.

Other EPA employees in the University were under the federal and State guidelines, and by January 1, 1993, the universities no longer could require mandatory retirement at age 70 for any employees including those with professorial ranks.

Major administrators work in their administrative positions at the will of their supervisor, the Chancellor. In general, there has been an expectation that they will leave their administrative position at age 65 unless requested to stay longer.

Over the years we have had many retired faculty who continued to teach for very small wages after they retired. We have had a few others who continued to teach a few sections for several years after age 72 when we could no longer pay them any salary. The largest group of these were from the Department of Mathematics. I believe that Professors Hubert Park and Jack Levine each taught mathematics successfully to NCSU students for more than fifty years.

Interns in Academic Administration

There have been two programs that have brought interns in academic administration to NCSU or in which NCSU faculty have participated. One of these started as the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation's program and later was adopted with some modification as the American Council on Education's Administrative Fellows' Program. I was selected to participate in the Phillips' program. Chancellor Poulton was one of the first participants in the ACE Fellows Program.

Faculty who have come to NCSU for their internship from other universities have included Arlon Elser in 1967-68, Tony Mobley in 1970-71, William Harvey in 1986-

87 (Harvey later joined our faculty in the School of Education) and Alfred Sullivan in 1987-88. These individuals were officially mentored by the Chancellor. Since Chancellors do not have enough time to schedule the individuals and to introduce them to all of those persons on campus that they need to work with and to know, the Provost really becomes their mentor, too. In the first two instances the individuals shared my office while I was the Assistant Provost. I made certain that they were included in a wide variety of meetings and that they saw correspondence and knew why it had been handled the way it had been, or that they talked to and learned from the administrator who had handled the matter. While the Chancellors gave them some projects, I also gave them additional projects to perform so that they could have some things they had to accomplish. These involved interpersonal activities as well as studies and reports. The next two ACE Fellows did not share my office; however, I did make certain that they had projects and functions to perform and that they gained insight in administrative practices and behaviors. By this time ACE had a more structured program which required the interns to complete several projects including some on budgets.

Jasper Memory, a Professor of Physics, and Assistant Dean of PAMS was selected in 1971-72 as the first of NCSU's ACE fellows. He went to the University of Maryland for his internship. Dr. Lawrence Clark, a Professor of Mathematics Education, was one of our own ACE interns who stayed at home and continued to function in his assigned responsibilities as Assistant Provost, but he was mentored by the Chancellor and in this way gained overall university administrative experience. He worked some of the time with other administrators on campus. Debra Stewart, a Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, in 1982-83 did her internship at Duke University and with the UNC General Administration, so she participated in some projects involving NCSU. Donald Simmons, a Professor from the School of Veterinary Medicine in 1984-85;

Dario Cortez, Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures, in 1985–86; and William Grant, Professor of Zoology, in 1986–87, participated in Fellowships at other universities. In time Dr. Simmons and Dr. Cortez left NCSU to join the administrative staffs of other universities. Dr. Grant served in the CALS administration and later moved to the Provost's Office.

Under the terms of participation in this program the home university continues to pay the salary of the Fellow, and the Fellow continues to participate in the fringe benefits of their home university. The host university provides some travel and support funds, space and secretarial support.

On our campus, with the recommendation of the Faculty Senate in 1986, we began our own program to give faculty some administrative experiences. At first we agreed to limit ourselves to one intern per year and agreed that these must have the approval of their school dean and the approval of the host dean to participate. Interns could also be mentored by the Chancellor and the Provost. The Provost would appoint a committee (I used former ACE Interns on the committee) to receive nominations and to make recommendations to the Provost. The Provost in turn, would take the nominations to the Deans' Council for consideration and approval. No one recommended by the Committee has ever been turned down by the Deans' Council. Persons who have been selected and participated have been:

1. James Gregory from Forestry in 1988–89 whose mentor was Dean Toole;
2. Joanne Rockness from Accounting in 1989–90 whose mentor was to be Chancellor Poulton. When Chancellor Poulton left the Chancellor's position, Dr. Rockness became an Intern under both Chancellor Monteith and me. At first I thought, what in the world will we do to make her experiences profitable. Later I said that I did not know how we could have survived with all of the extra work that came to us that year without the help of Dr. Rockness.

3. Three faculty have mentored under Dean Debra Stewart's direction. These were: Margaret King from English in 1989–90, Ellen Vasu from Curriculum and Instruction, in 1990–91, and Karen Johnston from Physics in 1992–93. Dean Stewart is as vocal in her welcome and appreciation of the assistance that these interns have given the Graduate School as I was about Rockness' assistance.
4. Thomas Hammond from Multidisciplinary Studies in 1991–92, mentored under Murray Downs when he was Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies. At this time Dr. Downs also needed help and was appreciative of the program.

Although he was not formally an intern selected by the above process, Dr. Russ Lea served under Franklin Hart.

There have been a large number of faculty who have filled administrative positions on a short-term or on a part-time basis. Others have been given released time to undertake some administrative job or assignment. Many have filled an administrative position for a year or more in variety of departmental, school or university administrative positions. More individuals have gained administrative experience in this last way than in any other.

Another position that has given faculty administrative experience has been the Chairmanship of the Faculty Senate. This seems to be a training ground for administrators, because a significant number of these have either become department heads or have held other administrative positions in schools or in the University.

Faculty, Advisors and Teachers Handbooks

I found a reference to a draft of a Faculty Manual prepared by Dr. Claiborne Jones on October 8, 1956. This draft was in the hands of Consolidated UNC Provost Whyburn, and he was to study the draft and submit it to the Chancellors for their consideration. This document was to serve the

system. I could not find a copy of this manual in the files.

I have been told we were supposed to have a mimeographed handbook for years, but it was not kept up-to-date and in time it became almost unknown and little used by anyone. In fact, as a faculty member, I don't recall having seen a copy and I could not find a copy of this handbook in the files. In 1967-68 the Faculty Senate encouraged the Provost to prepare a faculty handbook. They also proposed that selected members of the Personnel Policy Committee of the Senate review the drafts of this handbook and make appropriate recommendations as to its content. They proposed a table of contents for such a handbook. I am not certain that they wanted that precise table of contents but rather wanted those matters included. Dr. Kelly appointed Professor A. S. (Kit) Knowles of the English Department to work on the handbook and hired him on a part-time basis to accomplish this task. This was published as a loose leaf handbook in January 1971 based on policies in existence before November 1970, and it was distributed to all faculty. In 1973, Dr. Murray Downs prepared an updated and more detailed handbook again in loose-leaf form. When I became Provost, Dr. Downs was given the assignment of *Faculty Handbook* revisions and as he developed revised sections he was to confer with the leadership of the Faculty Senate. This then became a continuous consultative arrangement. The *Faculty Handbook* was eventually accom-

plished, but it is never finished. I have not discussed or described the several handbooks' contents for they are lengthy and copies of the Knowles (1971) and the Downs (1973-88) versions are readily available.

Additional major contributions of Dr. Downs was the publication of the *Advisers' Handbook* and the *Handbook for Teachers*. These two publications brought together extensive policies and procedures into a single place and was most helpful. The *Advisers' Handbook* which was initially published by Student Affairs was updated annually by Downs and went to all advisers and contains policies, procedures and information necessary for advising students. This requires the reviser of the handbook to keep up with all proposed changes by academic and other units to see that these are consistent with University policies and procedures. These handbooks also had extensive review and input from many units of Student Affairs. The University Teaching and Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee and the Associate Provost (in this case Downs) published a *Handbook for Teachers* that is updated annually and distributed periodically to all teaching faculty and graduate teaching assistants. This booklet contains information on all University-wide policies and practices of importance to the classroom teachers as well as on sources of support. Among its contents were the grading systems then in use. These handbooks can be found in current and earlier versions easily so they are not discussed in detail here.

CHAPTER FOUR

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Issues Concerning Women

It was not until we began to award degrees in the humanities and the social sciences that we had more interest from prospective female students and began to actively recruit female students. At this time we had only a small number of female students and only a scattering of female faculty. With the advent of the School of Liberal Arts we began to see an increase in their numbers. We had no residence halls for women and very few other accommodations. In the 1960s few people on campus seemed to care very much. A few more years would go by before we began to see more than a handful of women enrolled in non-traditional fields. In fact most people seemed to think that the B.A. degrees might create more problems for us than they would solve. Of course the factor which helped make the need for women faculty more evident was the increase in women students. A major factor which helped besides the offering of degrees more traditionally sought by women, was the existence of housing on campus for women students. One important development which had encouraged the faster construction of on-campus housing was a resolution of the Faculty Senate to build such housing which was passed on March 3, 1964. At that time there were plans for such housing, but Senate support was helpful. The B.A. degrees and the associated increases in enrollment of women, as well as renewed interest in the sciences and engineering, contributed to our rapid growth during the 60's and early 70's. By this time, women students were sought and recruited, and we had residence halls for women students. However, in 1969 we had only 140 women graduates out of a total of 1652 who graduated that year, a very large increase over the two who earned degrees in 1948.

In 1964 we became a Corporate Member of the American Association of University Women. At this time NCSU viewed the organization as primarily a link for women students. Dues cost \$25.00, and Miss Anna Clyde Fraker, a Research Associate in the Department of Engineering Research was our first liaison representative. In 1967 Dean Peterson filled out a questionnaire about mature female graduate students for the AAUW. The organization still seemed primarily concerned about students, and an EPA female staff member, Eleanor Lami in Student Affairs, provided liaison for us for many years. By the time I became Provost the organization was very concerned about the status of faculty, and we began to have a series of senior faculty women who were our liaison representatives. A faculty member usually served for two or more years.

It was in the late 60's that concerns about an adequate number of female faculty began to be discussed. It was also in the 60's when I found the first mention of a concern about the curriculum as it affected women students. At this time females were not enrolled in ROTC. The issue was: Is it appropriate for women students to graduate with fewer hours because they did not take ROTC? It was then recognized that ROTC was no longer a requirement for all male students. The issue was resolved after study, by requiring all students who were not enrolled in ROTC to take four more credit hours. This later was resolved by making all hours taken in ROTC courses a part of the free electives.

On April 18, 1968, NCSU adopted a very modified nepotism policy which liberalized, and for the first time, permitted the employment of relatives in the same department. This policy enabled us to attract couples to our faculty and increased our chances to employ more women. Prior to

this time we had groupings of departments or even entire schools in which we could not employ relatives in EPA positions. The limiting factor now was that a related person in a department or unit could not be in an evaluating or supervisory position to a relative. In 1972, the Faculty Senate considered a revision of this policy but recommended that we not change the policy. On April 13, 1973, the BOG approved a new policy for all campuses of the System. Although there were considerable word changes and the new policy was longer and written in more "legalese" language, it did not substantially modify our existing policy.

I am certain that the existence of Title IX spurred our campus to try more diligently to make certain that we were not discriminating against women. The fact that we were under external pressure helped to encourage us to make changes. I know that Dr. Clark and I did use this as additional rationale to units that appeared slow in their recruitment efforts for women faculty, to other EPA positions and for SPA positions, in addition to clerical positions. Another factor that helped was to have a cadre of well respected women on campus who gave us advice and who did not let us forget the need for administrative assistance to make the playing field level at NCSU. The most valuable and constant assistance was provided by Dr. Clark who was appointed as the NCSU Title IX Compliance Officer on November 26, 1975. At periodic intervals as illustrated by the Affirmative Action Plan for Equal Employment Opportunity, we made modifications in our plans as required "Pursuant to the Requirements of Executive Order 11246, as amended." These resulted in modifications in our goals for both women and for blacks in all categories.

One of the first assignments that I received from Chancellor Caldwell after I became Provost was to advise him on a request he had received concerning the identification of the marital status of females on office door labels. The suggestion was that we say Mr. or Ms. Doe or give the males

and the females first names. I asked a few persons for their opinions. Most did not give a hoot. To a very few persons it was important. Since we had no uniform policy on how names would be put on doors, my recommendation was that we not establish a door policy but encourage department heads or those responsible for labels on doors to label the door as that employee wanted. This was to be our practice, but I don't know whether it was totally implemented.

Women's concerns and issues have always been a responsibility of the Provost and began during Dr. Kelly's tenure. While the women on campus through the AAUP Committee W and through the Women's Concerns Subcommittee of the Affirmative Action Committee, and the current Council on the Status of Women, have always wanted to report to the Chancellors (who have all been deeply interested in these matters), it has been the Provost who has been most involved in the finding of solutions to problems. For example, when I became Provost I recognized that women were being hired in many departments at salaries lower than those for men at the same rank and with similar experience. I soon began to keep a running list of all the new hires and their salaries at the different ranks by department. I required that the salary proposed for all new faculty to be hired to be approved by me. If a department wanted to make an offer at a lower level than that made to a man with similar experience and rank, and some did at first, I required that the same salary be offered to the female prospect. This solved the problem of different salaries at the entry levels which are so difficult to overcome, except for those who become stars among the faculty.

To illustrate the problem, I will describe one department where, during the years of Shirley's and Kelly's tenure a serious problem developed. During Kelly's last years and my first years as Provost we had to correct it. We had a long time head of a department with good faculty, and a number of these

were female. The salary structure in the department defied interpretation. Insofar as I decided, or guessed much later, he had something like this as a guideline to determine who got paid the better salaries. There did not appear to me to be different competency levels related to gender. If you were single you did not need as much to live on, he reasoned. If you were married and both members of the marriage were working you needed even less, and it appeared to be so especially if you were a woman whose husband worked anywhere. Men with larger numbers of children needed more; however, there did not seem to be a similar reward for women who had children, and this was especially true if the husbands also worked. This was a problem we had to try to get into focus so that all of the people were rewarded for the quality of their work. This department got extra salary increase funds for several years and the then department head was most helpful in getting the differences resolved as quickly as we could. He did have some problems with the questions raised by one Labor Department review which questioned several female salary levels. We agreed with the department head's assessment, but we were required to raise the issue anyway. He said in a letter to me: "Surely the Department of Labor is not going to be 'selective' about what objective criteria are to be used in determining equitableness." Some Labor Department employees who did these investigations had little experience with universities and university practices and procedures. Fortunately many learned quickly and were willing to listen to rational reasons.

Dr. Clark was also a wonderful mediator for NCSU. There came a time when we technically were supposed to have an affirmative action review every time that we had a grant of one million or more dollars. That became a frequent experience, and fortunately we did not have to go through this each time we received such a grant.

On July 15, 1977, I wrote the school deans the following memorandum.

Subject Female Salaries

Within the next few days, I expect to be making allocation of the salary increase funds. I wish to remind each of you that the Department of Labor will be investigating our pay practices and levels as they relate to specific (perhaps all) females with faculty ranks this fall. You will recall that the 'Equal Pay' investigation was supposed to begin again early this past spring. I was able to persuade Mr. X, the representative for the Department of Labor, to postpone the investigation until this fall, allowing us to make further adjustments where necessary.

The intent of this memo is to remind you that we may well be called on to justify any or all salary differences between men and women. Earlier this year we sent some of you forms which might be used for comparative purposes. I am asking you to remind your department heads to be very much aware of the need to eliminate discrepancies where they cannot be explained, justified and documented. It is my sincere hope that the salary differences between women and men at all ranks in the university can be reduced this year.

Of course I did keep a little larger than usual fund to help eliminate discrepancies that I had noted in the same information that had been sent to the deans. The campus responded very well.

The first memorandum I found that provided specifically for extra salary increase funds for minorities and women was in a "Note to File" that I had prepared at the request of Provost Kelly on November 15, 1972. This note said that we would have a small quantity of salary increase funds to be applied to salary increases effective January 1, 1973. This note indicated that I had called the school deans and indicated to them that "as a top priority, we ask you to consider the salaries of all minorities and all women paid from 18141 (academic affairs) funds to your school to determine whether their pay is appropriate on the basis of merit." The note

indicated that as a second order of priority we would consider increases for full professors or other special needs as resources permitted. The sum of the salary increase funds was \$20,000.

In Chancellor Caldwell's annual report to the President for 1972-73 he stated: "The intelligent and conscientious efforts throughout the campus to expand the number of women and minority race students and staff in the enlargement of educational justice are conspicuous. Evidence seems to come slowly, but every year shows measurable advance."

On April 12, 1976, I sent the Deans, Directors and Department Heads a memorandum reporting on an AAUP Committee W survey and a meeting that I had with about 30 members of this AAUP campus group. The information that I shared with the Deans and the other individuals was the perception of a majority of the women faculty on the NCSU campus. I asked them to review the material carefully, and consider the points raised, to make certain that we were treating our women faculty equitably and that we were giving them the same opportunities given to others. The issues were as follows:

1. Salary - It is true that the differences in the salaries of women and men increased last year at the various ranks.
2. Workload - There is concern that women are sometimes given the more mundane and less likely to be rewarded assignments.
3. Scholarly Activities - While some individuals feel that the workload for women provided less opportunity for research, more individuals express concerns that women were contributing to scholarship, but that existing contributions were not fully recognized.
4. Graduate Faculty Membership - Proportions of women are less than for men. This is also related to the concern that few women teach graduate courses and chair graduate committees.

5. New Hires - Few women are being selected for interviews and even fewer are being hired. We are making little progress in increasing the number of women faculty.

I felt that the issues were important but that their resolution required not only the constant concern of the Provost and dean, but also the entire faculty of each department. Hence, the major emphasis and focus was on the department where the assignments were made.

In every letter written to allocate salary increases I always asked the deans to make certain that these funds would also be used to eliminate salary inequities. I had used as support the salary study of Institutional Research as developed by a committee of AAUP Committee W, as well as a study by Dr. Clark which provided the deans and department heads with a computer print-out comparing female salaries in each department by rank with the males in that department. Hence, the deans always knew which individuals had been identified as having low salaries. We, of course, expected a number and a proportion of female faculty similar to that of male faculty to deviate from the average, in both the high as well as the low salaries. So our concern was not just with those with low salaries.

I also realized that the salaries of present women faculty in most departments were lower than those of men by rank. I established each year during my tenure as Provost some salary increase funds to try to address these differences. At first the problems were worse in SHASS which had the most female faculty appointments. The report of Dr. Clark's provided information so that salaries would be seen by the department head and the dean and evaluated on the basis of contributions at the department and school levels for salary increases. It also gave me a tool to aid in my salary reviews with deans. In the mid-to late eighties we began to require that the deans explain the rationale if a female faculty member on the AAUP Committee W list did not get at least an average increase. I listed from an analysis

of salaries some females whose salaries were statistically below those of similarly ranked faculty men. I held a special meeting with each dean prior to my making the salary increase allocations each year. In this case the dean provided me with reasons why the female's salary was lower or a statement that he would make an adjustment. Just before I retired I could look at salary data, and feel that we had really reached my goal of having no real statistical differences by field by gender in salaries. I understand that Hart continued these studies and reviews.

I also followed rank and promotions carefully. In this case I could find little difference by gender in the time required for promotion in a specific unit. Dr. Kelly's and my early efforts in this area seemed to have reached appropriate status sooner. There are some female faculty whose salaries were low in units, but there were similar proportions of men. This is also true for rank. There are considerable differences among schools for both salary and time required for promotion, but I could not detect differences on the basis of gender within a department.

The most difficult problem was getting more female faculty hired. This was a concern of Provosts Kelly and Hart too. In 1971, when I was reallocating positions for Dr. Kelly to the Deans, we began earmarking a few positions that must be filled by a black or a female. One such example was in PAMS where they had two vacancies, so one was earmarked for a female. In 1972, as another example, I met with a search committee in Psychology and explained to them why we would not consider white males for a vacancy in their department until we considered qualified blacks and/or females. At that time they had neither on their faculty. I indicated to them that we had encouraged employment of females and blacks in the past but had seen little increase in the number of such faculty. I indicated that: "We are now attempting to identify vacant positions and are requesting that certain of these be filled by either blacks or females." The search committee indicated that this had

been a traumatic experience for them and they had wished that we had explained this in person. I indicated in a "Note to File" on January 24, 1972, that we parted on friendly terms and that they had volunteered to help in the development of our compliance plan. They did fill this vacant position with a female.

I finally decided that most departments on most occasions could and usually did find a "better qualified" male to fill vacancies based on the criteria that they used (which seemed to include number and quality of publications). In many fields doctorates among females were scarce. The breakthrough began to come when it was learned that a school or department would likely get a new and extra position if they found a qualified female prospect. While I did not hold a pool of vacant positions for females as I did for African-Americans, I always asked before I allocated positions about the prospects of new female faculty hires and gave new positions for this purpose. The major source for these newly allocated permanent positions was the temporary position pool where I would convert a temporary position to a permanent one. It helped in many cases, but I'll only mention two. In one case a dean came forward with a proposal for a substantial increase in the salary of a temporary faculty member in a department which had no female faculty. I asked, if she is this good why hasn't she been made permanent. The dean thought this was great, so the faculty in the department also decided that they wanted her and the additional permanent position. In another case I had been trying for years to give a position to a department with no women faculty. They never seemed to be able to find a woman as well qualified as some male applicant. On the retirement of the department head, the dean of the school and I connived and discussed the problem with prospective heads in interviews. When the department came up with three prospects who were the best qualified (and they were), the dean and I found a way to provide positions for all three. Our best

success in recruiting female faculty has been in CHASS. Each year when I asked deans to outline their needs in their requests for new positions I reminded them that their requests should include positions "needed to meet your affirmative action guidelines for blacks and women which cannot be met with positions to be vacated by retirements." In my letters of position allocations to deans or to other units I always reviewed the progress of our efforts in meeting our affirmative action goals for women and blacks. In 1976 I included in the allocation letters a statement similar to that:

I hope that these positions, as well as other positions which are or will become vacant in your school, can be used to increase the numbers in these two employee groups. While we are not asking you to employ unqualified persons or saying that the positions cannot be used to employ white males, we do expect you to make substantial progress in meeting your affirmative action goals.

We also established a policy which required a review and approval by Dr. Clark of affirmative action efforts before any offer could be made to fill a vacant position for EPA employees.

On October 5, 1973, our Affirmative Action Plan was reported to the NCSU Trustees. This plan was, of course, a part of the BOG System plan which had been submitted to HEW. It was indicated that HEW had informed us that a preliminary evaluation of the proposed Affirmative Action Compliance Program had been completed and that for the most part the proposed NCSU plan was responsive to the HEW requests for corrective actions relating to Executive Order 11375. We were at that time preparing additional information requested by HEW before final evaluation of the plan could be completed. As we all know, it would not be long before the Courts would rule that the plans of several states, including North Carolina, were not satisfactory and it was not until later (see the Race section

which follows for details) that the courts finally ruled that our plans, revised many times, were satisfactory.

As we set up our affirmative action structure on campus under Dr. Clark's direction, we set up each school as a separate unit with additional affirmative action units in Student Affairs, Libraries, Business Affairs, University Extension and Special Units. Each had an affirmative action coordinator in the school or unit who reported to the dean or other appropriate administrator and who was accessible to Dr. Clark. Each worked within their own units to develop goals of employees in the following groups of personnel: EPA Non-Faculty, EPA Faculty and SPA employees. Goals were set for race and gender. This plan then got all of the units and even departments or groups of departments to set their goals and make them a part of the program. We hoped that this would make them feel responsible for reaching the set goals, and in general it did. In a few cases they set goals above those that we would have considered minimal. In a few other cases we did have to ask a unit to reconsider their goals and to try to come up with a higher goal. Goals were set on the basis of new doctorates awarded in the field (or the appropriate terminal degree for the field) and based on estimates of vacancies to occur in the unit and on anticipated increases in faculty or staff. For SPA employees the goals were set using other manpower data and were based on availability figures of personnel in various fields. Soon after Dr. Clark came to NCSU, I designated some funds which could be used to bring female role models or others to address issues of concern to women on our campus. This has, I believe, been quite successful. We also normally have paid for or helped to support the speaker at the Susan B. Anthony dinner. I asked those responsible for the development of the programs which we sponsored to try to have a program which would give us some goals to accomplish rather than just to have an expensive name who would give a nice talk. I hoped that these programs would

leave us better off than we had been before we had them. We also wanted to sponsor those who would address issues that were of most concern to our faculty and staff. In the spring of 1988, I thought that we had an especially effective series of talks and seminars in addition to the Susan B. Anthony speaker, Katherine Stinson, our first female graduate in Engineering. Talks given that spring included some local and some visiting speakers. Most of the six special seminars dealt with communication and networking.

An additional item encouraged by Provosts Kelly, Hart and me was to increase the number of women's studies courses available. The need and wish is exemplified by a request from Joan Crockett and a group of students who signed a petition which was sent to the Head of the History Department in 1977. The petition has no date. The letter reads: "The attached petition is for your consideration in determining the interest in a women's history course at North Carolina State University. As you will see from the petition, there are many women on our campus who are very interested in learning more about women's history and we feel special attention to this subject is necessary because of the negligent way it has been treated by authors of our history books." These students wanted a course at the 400 or the 500 level. We called Dean Tilman to let him know that if it were a matter of resources, we would help. We also strongly supported the development of the Women's Studies minor, which did later develop. None of us encouraged the development of a major in this area. One of the early courses taught was in University Studies entitled "The Role of Women." It was first taught by Barbara Baines (English), Renee Steffensmeier (Sociology) and Robert Fern (Economics). It was novel enough that the *Raleigh Times* published a story about the course on July 26, 1973.

In the early 1980s we did begin to get some complaints from women that we were overloading women with assignments on University committees. While the complaints

were not overwhelming I thought that it was very pleasant to receive that complaint instead of one that said that women were underrepresented on University committees.

On January 4, 1984, Chancellor Poulton established the Council on Women's Affairs. He stated:

I am this date establishing an Advisory Council on Women's Affairs. The function of this Council will be to advise the NCSU Chancellor and Provost on matters pertaining to the needs of women at NCSU and to enhance a positive, harmonious University environment supporting the fullest development of all human potential. I am anticipating the Council's meetings with me to involve time commitments of two hours occurring once or twice a semester.

In 1987 the Council met with the Chancellor and Provost and the following were items on their agenda: (1) Academic and Administrative opportunities for NCSU Women; (2) Sexual Harassment Guidelines; (3) Faculty Salary Study, and (4) Establishment of Administrative Position for Women's Concerns.

In a 1985 paper, "Affirmative Action for Women Faculty, Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions, in the *Journal of Higher Education*, (May/June 1985, 56, pp 282-299), Patricia Hyer selected NCSU, based on national data, as a place where efforts to hire women were working. We were selected as one of three doctoral granting universities for inclusion in the study. I quote a brief account of what she said.

A constellation of factors was responsible for the institution's progress in hiring and promoting women. The first factor most often cited by campus interviewees were: commitment and leadership by the Provost, federal pressure on the issue of racial duality, and women speaking out on their own behalf. Structural and environmental changes played an important supporting role in facilitating affirmative action

implementation. The perception that the Provost was committed to affirmative action is remarkably consistent across campus, one reason being the consistency of his behavior and rhetoric. Another is widespread recognition that decision makers will be held accountable for decisions that do not help the institution achieve its affirmative action goals. The Provost's effectiveness as a change agent was greatly enhanced by his choice of a low-key black faculty member as assistant provost with responsibility for affirmative action. Together they provided leadership and attention to affirmative action implementation on campus.

Each year Dr. Clark and I together took our data to the school deans' office, rather than have them come to my office, to talk about the number of hires against their goals.

Sexual harassment has occurred on our campus as on others. We had treated the matter as very important and established a policy against such activity and had developed a process for the study and investigation of charges. These were all done in concert with the advice and help of appropriate faculty, staff and students and in consultation with the University Attorney. In 1982 NCSU issued its first policy on Sexual Harassment. A copy was distributed to all students, staff and EPA employees. A committee of faculty also developed an Informal Grievance procedure which everyone hoped could resolve most complaints and problems. Formal charges were to be handled through existing grievance procedures for EPA employees, SPA employees and students. In 1982-83 the Faculty Senate developed a formal Student Grievance Procedure which was adopted after a conference committee was formed in 1983. In 1983-84 we had a series of seminars on sexual harassment. In 1986 the Faculty Senate made recommendations to revise the Grievance procedures.

We have handled a number of major and minor problems. Fortunately most cases were handled by the informal procedures.

All cases were serious and quite real to the affected persons. In handling cases where individuals were found guilty of sexual harassment we have offered, in a few cases, the opportunity for the employee to resign at the end of the semester or to be fired using the standard procedures. In a few others it seemed more appropriate simply not to reappoint the individual at the expiration of a term when the person was in the last year of their appointment. These were the most serious cases. I do not recall any who did not accept the offer. In others we removed the faculty member from the classroom or from the administrative responsibility in the area in which the harassment was occurring. In others we reduced the salary increase or eliminated a salary increase. In all cases where there was harassment, the faculty member or the person in charge was held accountable. We also had claims that upon investigation were not found to be sexual harassment. We did adhere to the NCSU policy on sexual harassment, and in 1987 we revised our policy and procedures.

In the late eighties, I supported a group who studied sexual harassment at NCSU. Members were Rebecca Leonard, Laura Carroll, Gail Hankins, Carolyn H. Maidon, Paul F. Potorti and Janet Rogers. On September 19, 1989, they submitted a report to me. On September 26, I wrote the Dean's Council sending them a copy of the report and placed it on the agenda for the October 11, 1989, meeting. I indicated to the deans that, "Specific cases that have been called to my attention have made me aware that this is indeed a most serious matter. This study causes me to have even greater concern. We will not review the details of the report at our meeting, but I will be looking for suggestions of how we can enhance the awareness of the seriousness of this issue among our administrators and faculty." We later held a series of meetings to which all faculty and administrators were invited to attend to increase campus awareness. The report was also made available to each department with the hope that

all would read it. It was agreed that we would resurvey the campus for sexual harassment activities every five years. I do believe that our efforts helped to increase understanding of the existence of the problem and helped to reduce the incidence of harassment, but I am certain that the problem was not eliminated.

One of the two recognitions that surprised me the most and that I am most proud of was the "Equity for Women Award" given to me on September 11, 1990, by the NCSU Council on the Status of Women. It is a clock plaque and states: "In recognition of his leadership in the advancement of Women at NCSU."

Issues Concerning Race

In 1955 Walter Peterson, Chairman of the Faculty Senate wrote to William Friday, Secretary of the UNC System, and told him of a resolution under consideration by the Faculty Senate. The resolution read:

Whereas we acknowledge the recent actions of the Federal Courts in eliminating racial discrimination in the admission of properly qualified students to undergraduate as well as graduate schools of the Consolidated University of North Carolina;

And whereas we are convinced that qualified students of any race can and will be assimilated without damage to the educational standards or the loss of good will;

And whereas we believe that the University can and will assume leadership in the state in showing that the problems of desegregation can be met intelligently and with good feeling;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the State College at Raleigh goes on record as commending the University Administration for its acceptance in good faith of the modification of admission policy as effected by the recent Federal Court decision. Also, the Faculty Senate goes on

record as pledging its full support and cooperation in implementing that policy.

Dean Shirley wrote the Director of the College Union on June 23, 1956, and said:

With the acceptance of undergraduate Negro students, the question has been raised about policy in handling these students in dining halls. Acting President Friday, on the telephone this morning, informs me that the university policy is to treat all regularly enrolled students in the same way, regardless of race. This means that in the dining halls and activities, Negro students will be treated exactly like white students, without special concessions or restrictions. Since this is university policy, it should be placed in effect immediately, if it has not already been followed.

In 1962 after Shirley had been elected to the Chairmanship of the North Carolina College Conference, he recommended that the N. C. College Conference merge with the Negro College Conference in North Carolina. In so far as I can tell this was the first proposal for this merger and it was soon adopted. The two merged and now meet as the North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities. This was an important step for higher education in North Carolina and probably would have happened in time, but I'm proud that a predecessor of mine made the proposal.

I could not detect that Dean Shirley played a major role in affirmative action or race related activities during his tenure. There are suggestions in the files that he and other members of the Administrative Council were consulted but that Chancellor Bostian, Chancellor Caldwell and Dean James Stewart, the Dean of Student Affairs, were much more actively concerned and played the leadership roles while Shirley was Dean of the Faculty.

Early in Dr. Kelly's tenure I began to note that he was encouraging a variety of activities. These included hiring minority

faculty and staff. In fact he was the first major office holder in Holladay Hall to hire a black woman as his secretary. We had other black SPA personnel on the Provost's clerical staff. He encouraged a closer working relationship with the predominately black colleges in Raleigh and was especially helpful to St. Augustine's College. He was very much concerned about the well being of our black students and encouraged an increase in the number of black students. At this time the Admission's Office and recruitment was under Student Affairs. He supported Student Affairs in its request for more resources and for other types of assistance in this area.

On February 20, 1968, Dr. Kelly wrote the National Science Foundation a letter which responded to an inquiry. He said:

It was good to hear from you through your letter of February 15, and I welcome the opportunity of commenting on your 'Student Science Training Program'. I would like to relate the circumstances under which the points of the program came strongly to our attention.

Two years ago we spent a whole day looking at the question of why more Negroes do not go into science and engineering. We invited a group of Negro high school teachers, a group of teachers on our campus, a group of Negro students on our campus and presidents of Negro colleges.

The group of Negro students on our campus were the most help. When we asked them how they decided to go into science and engineering and why they came to this campus, we learned that the majority of them had attended a summer science program of the National Science Foundation either at the end of their junior year or at the end of their senior year. They told us that without this experience they would not have dared to enroll here. In addition, they told us that the sociological experience was just as important as what they learned in science. For all of them this was the first experience they had away

from their socio-economic environment, and it gave them the courage which they would not have received otherwise. They reported that they had to work very hard, much harder than the white students, but they were encouraged that with extra effort it was possible for them to compete.

On March 14, 1968, a report said that with the exception of one Extension Assistant Professor in Sociology who was employed by the Agricultural Extension Service, and six part-time instructors at the Fort Bragg Division, all of our African-American EPA personnel were employed as Extension Specialists in the Agricultural Extension Service. This was a sad commentary on our failure to attract black faculty in academic affairs. This lack would not improve rapidly.

In its resolution of April 9 1968, the Faculty Senate made a statement on Racial and Religious Discrimination. It expressed the gravest concern about the unsolved economic and social problems which are an important cause of much of the civil disorder afflicting our country. The resolution of April 9, 1968, called for action by national and state governments, but recognized that:

Governmental action alone will not suffice to solve the economic and social problems which are among the prime causes of such violence.

Substantial progress against the racial and religious discrimination which is an important factor in many of the economic and social problems of minority groups depends less upon governmental action than upon individual personal commitment, expressed both in attitude and action. The Faculty Senate endorses the following statement because we find discrimination based on race or religion abhorrent and incompatible with the idea of a university.

We invite all members of the administration, faculty, staff, and student body, of this University to subscribe to the following statement of position; more fundamentally, we call upon every member of this University community

to accept personal responsibility for making his own contribution in his own way to the kind of free and open society we must have in America if our historic ideals are to remain viable. This statement will have served its purpose if it provides a framework within which each individual may guide his own action

Organizations. While most professional organizations are not segregated, certain fraternal organizations, civic, service, and social clubs to which faculty, students, and staff belong are still segregated on the basis of race or religion. We urge each individual to search his own conscience to determine how he can most effectively work to eliminate discrimination within his own clubs and organizations. We believe that under no circumstances should any University function be held in any facility that denies membership or service on the basis of race, nationality or religion.

Housing. We note with approval that University housing is unsegregated. Segregation persists, however, in off-campus housing. We support and promote open-occupancy practice in Raleigh. Open housing is vital to the well-being of a university that serves and is served by persons of all races, religions and nationalities.

Employment. This University still employs few members of minority groups, particularly Negroes, in non-traditional positions. Every member of the University community has a responsibility to do his part to insure that the faculty and staff are employed on the basis of individual qualification, without regard to race, nationality, or religion.

Recruitment of Students. We ask all who are responsible for recruiting and admitting students to give full and equal consideration to qualified applicants from minority groups. We, ask further, that special care be taken to publicize the fact that this University welcomes qualified students from minority groups.

University Extension. We commend the Agricultural Extension Service,

particularly the 4-H Club activity, which has long offered professional employment to Negroes, and is abolishing racial distinctions in its internal organization. This University has done and is doing much to improve the education and the economic well-being of minority groups in the State. Extension activities are of such significance in the improvement of lives of disadvantaged persons that we emphasize our belief that University Extension, including Industrial Extension and the Division of Continuing Education, as well as the Agricultural Extension Service, must continue to play a major role.

It was about this time that the NCSU Women's Club was scheduled to have a meeting and dinner at the Carolina Country Club. When those arranging for the meeting learned of the Club's Segregation Policy they rescheduled their meeting elsewhere. With respect to housing we did start to refuse to list off-campus housing that would not make facilities available to persons of all races, religions or nationalities. This was an important matter because at that time students who did not get on-campus housing usually went first to the Housing Office to find other places to live.

At this time we did not have many student applicants who were Negro, qualified or unqualified. It was soon to become evident that advertising alone would not get many applicants. We began to employ and use some undergraduate black students to help the Admissions Office in its recruiting efforts. We had to try very hard to get minority students to apply for admission to NCSU. We first added one full-time black Assistant Director of Admissions and later we added a second. They helped our recruitment efforts very much. We had almost no applicants from Wake County at this time, and it was not until about the time that I became Provost we began to understand the problem.

In 1969 Provost Kelly received an inquiry about Black Studies at NCSU. His response included. "At present we have few black courses; however, through a coopera-

tive arrangement with Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College, students from NCSU may take any of their extensive offerings in Black Studies." This was through the Cooperating Raleigh Colleges programs. He also indicated that we had no plan to offer a degree in the area, but that we did hope to offer more courses in sociology, anthropology, literature, history, and politics.

In the early years of the 1970s we could not ask prospective students what their race was. It seemed that those who created the national regulations felt that if we knew a prospective student was black, we would be more likely to discriminate and not to admit them to NCSU. So at that time we could not say precisely how many black students we had in various categories. However, since we had very few black students, our estimates were probably close. In the early 1980s our records were accurate and we did ask prospective students, faculty and employees for their racial identity because all had learned that progress was better when there was identity.

The first African-American faculty member was Vivian Henderson, a Visiting Professor in Economics, who came in 1962. Dr. Henderson was to become one of Dr. Martin Luther King's lieutenants during the Civil Rights Movement. Our first faculty member with faculty rank and in the tenure track was Dr. Dorothy Williams, and she came to NCSU in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in 1965. She resigned a short time later and went to Shaw University. Harold McNeill became an Assistant Professor of Adult Education in 1968. P. P. Thompson was appointed in the Sociology Department in 1969. These last two faculty were long time members of the Agricultural Extension Service and were paid from that funding source. In 1970, the only black faculty member employed at NCSU against the academic affairs budget and in the tenure track was Dr. Odell Uzzell, Associate Professor of Sociology. He came to us from Fayetteville State College. I had gotten to know Dr. Uzzell through my work with the Fort Bragg Branch of NCSU and had a lot to

do with assisting the department to hire him. When I first mentioned the possibility to the department head, he said that they would be delighted to have a chance to hire Dr. Uzzell, but at that time they did not have a vacant position. Dr. Kelly gave them a new position and at the salary level needed. In the spring semester of 1973 Dr. Uzzell was the leader and coordinator for a symposium "The Black Experience: Blacks in Business and Politics." Among the outstanding cast of speakers was Vivian Henderson who was now the President of Clark College in Atlanta.

Augustus Witherspoon obtained his Ph.D. in 1970 and, I believe, was the first of several African-Americans who became faculty members at NCSU after obtaining their doctorates here. He had been an instructor for a couple of years in the same department. Witherspoon held several important positions in the administration at NCSU and played an important role in helping us to improve the climate for African-Americans at NCSU. Some of the others who obtained the doctorate at NCSU and who were faculty at NCSU in 1991 were: Clyde Chesney, Orlando Hankins, Carol Love, Pam Banks-Lee, Jackie Hughes-Oliver and Harold Freeman. Dr. Freeman, a native of Raleigh and a graduate of the old Ligon High School in Raleigh, is a professor in the College of Textiles. He is also our first African-American to become a Named Professor; the Ciba-Geigy Professor of Dyestuff Chemistry. Others who obtained their doctorates here and served here for a short time have moved on to other universities or to industry.

In 1970 the Chancellor told the Faculty Senate that we would be unable to hire more black faculty members unless we actively sought them. In 1970, the Chancellor's Good Neighbor Council proposed that one way we could get more black faculty on campus, would be to have some faculty exchanges with predominately black institutions. It seemed that we had a number of faculty who would like to participate. This turned out to be very difficult, for it involved matching classes to be taught on two

campuses with individuals from two campuses that wished to be involved. Even under the Consent Decree, when the UNC system had funds to pay for the exchanges and for travel costs among the members of the UNC BOG system, we had few exchanges take place for the same reasons. We were more likely to have exchanges when one needed an extra section or an entire class and the receiving University did not have a qualified faculty member. This happened occasionally under BOG, but not very often. We were able to have a few of our faculty teach a needed course at Shaw or Saint Augustine's and a few from those institutions who taught at NCSU under the Cooperative Raleigh Colleges Program. This was easier to arrange because the locations were convenient and the exchange almost always was on an overload basis and the faculty member received pay from the borrowing institution. No matching exchanges were required. The numbers were small and disappointing to those of us who were struggling to get a larger black faculty presence on campus. This procedure was suggested by many others, including students. Most could not understand why it wouldn't work, but it is difficult and costly even under the BOG system for the faculty member and their families to transplant themselves to another place for a semester or for a year. The reward to the individual was not adequate and most would not consider the value of the exchange to the individual as equal to that of Off-campus Scholarship Assignment.

One among many of our problems in hiring black faculty was that there was a scarcity of holders of doctorates among blacks in non-traditional fields and especially in the sciences, which predominated at NCSU. There were few African-American doctorates in Forestry, Engineering, Design, Veterinary Medicine, PAMS, Textiles, Business Management and Accounting, and in most of the fields in the School of Agriculture and Life Sciences. There were surpluses in no fields that I knew of. It was evident that we and all of the other doctorate grant-

ing institutions had to recruit vigorously at the graduate student level to increase the supply. Not much happened at first because recruitment of graduate students was always done at the departmental level. Graduate deans were reluctant, and most did not want to intrude in the hiring practice. After a long time we learned, as did a number of universities, that if we were to increase the numbers of African-Americans with doctorates in these fields we would have to develop a recruitment strategy at the Graduate School level for the entire university, and that this strategy would assist and encourage departments in their recruitment efforts. We needed a black presence in the Graduate School. Dean Stannett was very willing, and we came up with a one-half time position out of our own resources. Dr. Augustus Witherspoon was hired by the Graduate School for this purpose in 1979. I'm pleased that we finally were able to get a position which had been badly needed for some time. Recruitment of undergraduate students by graduate programs in many fields is not easy, and in these fields we even have shortages of US citizens with doctorates. The best students are recruited very heavily by industry, and their pay with a B.S. sometimes almost equals that of the beginning doctorate. For the best African-American students the competition by industry was even greater and the supply was short, for traditionally blacks had not majored as undergraduates in these fields.

In 1985, when Chancellor Poulton appointed an Advisory group from the Black Community, Vernon Malone responded: "N.C. State University is an outstanding university and there is no logical reason why more academically capable minority students do not take advantage of its offerings." I recall a similar meeting in 1974 when Mr. Malone told us that no child of his would ever attend NCSU. He told us how racist and red-necked we were and how badly we were viewed by black citizens in Raleigh. So over the years we did improve.

In 1970 there was some flack about Dr. Kelly's push to get courses taught in

Afro-American and Asian history. The History Department faculty asked the head to write the following letter:

At its regular meeting on May 20, 1970, the Department of History approved unanimously the following statement of understanding of departmental responsibility.

In a university, the determination of academic matters lies properly with the community of scholars who comprise the faculty. As part of this larger body, a departmental faculty constitutes the entity which should determine the academic program of the department. The right and responsibility of establishing the program or of formally initiating modifications are essential to the integrity of the department; outside infringements upon these prerogatives constitutes an erosion of its integrity.

Concomitant with the right to determine the academic program, basic prerogatives inhere in the departmental faculty as a whole, among which is that of deciding upon the fields of historical concentration which will be included in the department's academic program. Once the fields of specialization have been determined, the securing of appropriate personnel should be accomplished by a process which includes consultation by the department members with the department chairman by means of a regular procedure established for this purpose.

I was instructed to forward this statement to the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts with the request that he transmit it to the Provost of the University.

Dr. Kelly wrote the dean and asked, "What prompted this? Is there some hidden meaning? What about coordination with the rest of the University? Don't they have an obligation to discuss needs and approaches with colleagues in other disciplines?" A part of Dean Cahill's response follows:

I should have told you before, I suppose, but what brought all this about was our push into the area of Asian

History and our putting in an Afro-American history course. They blame it all on Greenlaw, naturally.

As do all Historians, these people think that there isn't any history except what they teach. And it is quite natural—people must believe in what they are doing or they don't do it very well, but it tends to obscure what isn't being done.

There are also some aging "enfants terribles" who seem to think that everything should be conducted under Rousseau's oak tree. For my money, all you get out of that is chiggers.

Anyway, I have acknowledged receipt of the communication and said I would forward it to you. So you keep it and we'll both forget it.

In 1971 the first African-American fraternity was organized on the NCSU campus. It was Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc. Today in 1993, we have three others. They are Omega Psi Phi Inc., Kappa Alpha Psi Inc., and Phi Beta Sigma Inc. In 1972 the first African-American Sorority was chartered. It was Delta Sigma Theta Inc. Today we have three others and they are: Alpha Kappa Alpha Inc., Sigma Gamma Rho Inc. and Zeta Phi Beta Inc.

In 1972 Provost Kelly informed those units who turned in recommendations for salary increases that, "As a top priority, we ask you to consider the salaries of all minorities and all women paid from 18141 funds in your school to determine whether their pay is appropriate on the basis of merit."

In the 1972-73 Annual Report Chancellor Caldwell reported that William Maxwell had been appointed Assistant Dean of Education. This was our first African-American appointee as an Assistant or Associate Dean of an academic school.

It was at about this time that the School of Liberal Arts proposed to either drop geography or its black politics course. Both were taught by temporary part-time faculty and geography had a larger enrollment. In prior years the funds had come from the Dean's reserves and now were committed to hiring a permanent faculty member in

another department. We decided to give them the extra funds needed to keep both courses going. The technique of saying we have no funds and will need to discontinue a project considered vital by the Provost was used frequently. In 1973 Dean Tilman wrote the Provost and asked for three new positions to hire three black faculty. Dr. Kelly asked me to find out how many vacant and uncommitted positions the Dean had. I reported to him that he had several. Provost Kelly wrote, "Does your request given in your memorandum of April 19 imply that you will hire blacks only if we give you new positions? If you were sincerely interested in hiring the 'three good blacks' you mentioned, could you not find some positions within your own school without help from this office?" I don't recall how we worked out a compromise, but we did not lose the three because of a lack of positions. In addition to trying to increase the number of African-American faculty, we were also very much interested in trying to increase the number of graduate students. Dr. Kelly responded favorably to an inquiry about our interest in participating in a plan to increase black graduate students. Dean Peterson also agreed. He said that our only reservations centered on the need for additional resources. "Our out-of-State tuition was increased substantially this year. We do want to locate and encourage more black graduate students, especially in the fields we offer." Although we could and did award black students teaching and research assistantships, we had almost no scholarships at the graduate levels which was a major component of the proposed program. It was not until the Office of Civil Rights approved our plans in the mid seventies that the state of North Carolina began to provide additional incentive funds which served as scholarship funds for the recruitment of black graduate students.

Our Affirmative Action Plan of 1973 was of course, a part of the BOG System Plan which had been submitted to HEW. HEW had informed us that a preliminary evaluation of the proposed Affirmative Action

Compliance Program had been completed and that for the most part the proposed NCSU plan was responsive to the HEW requests for corrective actions relating to Executive Order 11375. We were at that time preparing additional information requested by HEW before final evaluation of the plan could be completed. As all know, it would not be long before the Courts would rule that the plans of several states including North Carolina were not satisfactory. The letter came on May 21, 1973, which essentially said that the dual system has not yet been fully disestablished in North Carolina. It also said that "it will be necessary for this Office to receive an acceptable plan, in advance of the June 16 deadline set by the court. We therefore, must request the submission of a plan by June 11." The Board of Governors submitted its revised plan on June 8, 1973. It was not until much later that the courts finally ruled that our plans were satisfactory after being revised many times over several years and occasionally believing that they were approved and then not approved. In the intervening years we spent many hours revising plans and goals, but we continued to do those things that we had committed ourselves to do in the recruitment of staff, faculty and students. Although many people were involved in the preparation of NCSU's portion of the BOG plans over the years, it was a major responsibility of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and later, when the title was changed, the Affirmative Action Officer to prepare and coordinate NCSU's efforts. At this time we reported that we had 22 black faculty in all ranks. For a brief time in 1973-74, Mr. William Simpson served as Affirmative Action Officer between Dr. Clauston Jenkins who had been appointed as Equal Opportunity Officer in 1972 and Dr. Larry Clark who joined us in 1974.

On June 8, 1973, Provost Kelly wrote:

Our Affirmative Action plan calls for specific steps that will involve departmental administrations and then make them aware of their responsibilities. We shall ask our EEO Officer to see that

the report, Racism in Employment and its 'targets of opportunity' is distributed and reviewed in terms of goals. We will make certain that Mr. William Calloway (Director of the SPA Personnel Office) is also involved in this process. The approach of recruiting graduate students is obvious and is mentioned specifically in our plan. Success is difficult and we need faculty commitment on a broad scale. We shall ask our EEO Officer to call attention of other schools to a specialized recruiting brochure, and we shall also ask him to find ways of involving the Society of Afro-American Culture in such efforts.

On September 17, 1973, Mr. Lewis Bryson of the Atlanta Office of Civil Rights requested additional information. Chancellor Caldwell responded, in a letter of September 18, 1973, and said that "your letter was received on September 17 in this office. It requests certain information on our personnel and goal commitments." He said that we would try to provide the information within the time requested which was 15 days from the receipt of the letter. On November 10, 1973, Peter E. Holmes, Director of the Office of Civil Rights in HEW, wrote to Governor Holshouser in a 16 page letter that our "current submission falls short of complying with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." Mr. Simpson, the Chancellor, the Office of Institutional Research, Dr. Gehle and several others of us in the Provost Office, were inundated with attending meetings and the gathering of data for another resubmission. On January 29, 1974, we had a visit by several officials from HEW who were visiting, meeting officials and students and taking a tour of facilities over a several day period at the five predominately black campuses and at NCSU, UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC-Greensboro. I represented the Provost in those meetings at NCSU, and I was one of the guides for the campus tour. I thought that the visit was not a complete success but not a disaster either. We resubmitted another of our revised plans again on February 18, 1974.

After the Chancellor's staff meeting on June 3, 1974, I wrote to Dr. Kelly and said that Chancellor Caldwell reported several recommendations were mentioned at the BOG meeting on March 31, 1974. The note said:

- Several amendments to the State plan previously submitted to HEW are required. Items mentioned included:
1. The supply of Black professionals has to be increased.
 2. Efforts will be made to increase the number of Blacks in graduate degree programs.
 3. The General Administration will apparently establish a roster of Blacks and females that might be available for positions in the University system. We will probably need to provide names and resumes of such people to the pool in cases where we do not hire an individual.

On September 17, 1974, I told the Faculty Senate that a copy of the Revised State Plan for the Further Elimination of Racial Duality in the Public Post-Secondary Educational System would go to the Senate, the Library and the office of each dean. On July 19, 1974, Mr. Holmes of the HEW Office of Civil Rights wrote Governor Holshouser that The Revised North Carolina Plan was accepted.

In 1974 the first African-American woman to receive a Ph. D. from NCSU was Nanette Smith Henderson. Her degree was in Plant Pathology. In the fall of 1974 our enrollment of African-Americans had risen from 2% to 3% with that year's freshman enrollment being 5%.

Chancellor Caldwell influenced my beliefs and behavior concerning the need for changes and opportunities for African-Americans at universities very much. Larry Clark helped me to see that the issue was more than just integration which had come to mean to so many the merger of African-American culture into our Western European culture. He helped me to see that the need was more a matter of having many

cultures, rather than the dilution of one and its inevitable loss. Many people shaped my behavior as Provost, but in matters of race and gender, Caldwell and Clark were most influential. As the Assistant Provost handling the details of curriculum and academic personnel, it was good to have Chancellor Caldwell, Provost Kelly and me all singing the same tune.

When I became Provost, a part of my philosophy concerning race issues was that we should do what is right for moral reasons. There was no way that any rational person could fail to see that blacks had been denied equal opportunity and although the law supposedly gave them equal opportunity, this did not exist. It was our responsibility to see that this opportunity would no longer be denied. I believed in equal opportunity, but I understood that if we continued to consider only those same old values and criteria in selecting the "best" and did not provide opportunity to those capable of doing the job, little change would occur. For this reason I felt that we had to invest in those qualified and capable. In this under-represented area the fact that you were qualified, very good and black meant that you should be given a chance to succeed. This really meant that if the system could find two of equal quality it probably also meant that the black person had been under valued. I felt that this country could not survive if so large a portion of its population was contributing below their potential. For patriotic reasons and country survival value, the least we could do was to ascertain that at NCSU we would give blacks a chance. I learned quickly that playing on moral values and leaving matters in the hands of others to do the right thing frequently would not work. Many of the things which were accomplished while I was Provost was with the help of others. We were trying to do positive things, to be active and even pushy at times.

Each year when I asked deans to outline their needs in their requests for new positions, I reminded them that their requests should include positions "needed to meet your affirmative action guidelines for blacks

and women which cannot be met with positions to be vacated by retirements." In my letters of position allocations to deans or to other units, I always reviewed the progress of our efforts in meeting our affirmative action goals for women and blacks.

As we set up our affirmative action structure on campus under Dr. Clark's direction, we set up each school as a separate unit with additional affirmative action units in Student Affairs, Libraries, Business Affairs, University Extension and Special Units. Each had an affirmative action coordinator in the school or unit who reported to the dean or to other appropriate administrators and who was accessible to Dr. Clark. Each worked within their own units to develop goals of employees in the following groups of personnel: EPA Non-Faculty, EPA Faculty and SPA employees. Goals were set for race and gender. This plan then got all of the units and even departments or groups of departments to set their goals and make them a part of the program. We hoped that this technique would make our faculty in each unit feel responsible for reaching the set goals, and generally it did. In a few cases, departments or units set goals above those that we would have considered minimal, but in a few other cases we did have to ask a unit to reconsider their goals and to try to come up with a higher goal. Goals were set on the basis of the number of new doctorates in the field (or the appropriate terminal degree for the field) and was also based on estimates of vacancies to occur and on anticipated increases in faculty or staff in the unit. For SPA employees the goals were set on availability figure of personnel in the field using other manpower data.

In the minutes of the Faculty Senate in February the Good Neighbor Council reported that they endorsed the proposal of Dr. Clark's that a Race Relations Workshop be conducted here by Urban Crises, Inc. The first was held on February 27 and 28, 1975. I attended this first workshop. This group held workshops here for many years. Most administrators, student leaders and many faculty attended. C. T. Vivian, who

held these workshops, continues to come to the campus for a conference, a workshop or a meeting almost every year. Our affirmative action goals for July 1, 1976, were stated as 44 black faculty; in October of 1974 we had 17. The goal for women faculty was 114; in October of 1974 we had 74.

I found a note to Chancellor Caldwell from me dated January 7, 1975, about our newly submitted plans which read as follows, "The recent article in *The News and Observer* made it sound as if HEW, Atlanta, had rejected our Affirmative Action Proposal. Dr. Clark checked with Richard Robinson an attorney on the UNC BOG staff. The article misinterpreted Mr. Robinson. Our plans are still under review and have not been returned."

While HEW staff and the courts were at work and the litigation was going backwards and forwards, we felt a strong commitment to succeed or at least to make as much progress as we could. We proceeded, as did the other institutions of the UNC BOG system, with our affirmative action goals and continued to strive to give African-American students a chance to enroll and to succeed. A very special effort in this area was the University Transition Program. A substantial number of students admitted in this program have graduated from NCSU, and several have pursued their doctorates at NCSU and at other universities. We did take a chance and the graduation rate was relatively low, but I believe that our effort has paid off well. Another area was the extra effort in the admissions office expended in the recruitment of African-American students. Although we had other programs for helping these students to survive, it was obvious that not enough was being done. Many of these efforts are covered in Chapter One in Duties of Assistant and Associate Provosts and in Chapter VII in Undergraduate Studies and in Academic Skills.

In 1975, Dr. Clark proposed that we sponsor a conference on Minorities in graduate programs. He said that nationally blacks received 2.7% of the doctorates awarded in 1973. Of these 60% were in

education. "Thus, the prospects are not bright for any substantial number of blacks being available for faculty appointments in either black or white institutions in the near future unless graduate and professional schools develop a greater sense of urgency about this situation. I suggest that we here at NCSU give some attention to increasing the graduate enrollment of qualified blacks." The conference was to include individuals from North Carolina's predominantly black institutions, Pembroke State University and NCSU.

Although in most cases faculties encouraged their undergraduate students to go to other universities for graduate degrees, we encouraged our graduate programs first to convince blacks to go to graduate school. If it would help to increase the numbers who went to graduate school, they should recruit actively more of the black students to stay and get graduate degrees at NCSU. In a few cases this has led to our being able to hire the only new blacks in the nation in a particular field and they obtained their doctorates at NCSU. One example which was successful was the school of Textiles. Others who have doctorates from NCSU and who are now on the NCSU faculty were mentioned earlier in this section. Also in 1975, Dr. Clark reported that we increased our black faculty by four in 1974-75 and our non-faculty EPA by two, yet we had a net loss of 11 black SPA personnel that year.

On May 28, 1976, I allocated new positions to the Schools. At this time I was still not saying that a certain number of positions had to be filled by blacks or women. I did say:

As you are aware, we have made little progress during the past year in the employment of blacks and females. I hope that these positions, as well as other positions which are or will become vacant in your school, can be used to increase the numbers in these two employee groups. While we are not asking you to employ unqualified persons or saying that the positions cannot be used to employ white males,

we do expect you to make substantial progress in meeting your school's affirmative action goals. We ask you to review new appointments with this expectation in mind.

It was about this time that Dr. Clark suggested that he and I visit each dean each year in their offices to remind them of their goals and their progress or lack of progress in the hiring of both blacks and women. It was not that the deans did not know the goals and their progress in meeting them, it was to place a strong emphasis on NCSU's commitment, that we expected a strong commitment on their parts and that we expected success. On August 31, 1976, Dr. Clark reported that as of June 1, 1976, we had a total of 31 EPA non-faculty, 18 black full-time faculty members and 553 full-time Black SPA employees.

At the May 2, 1977, meeting of President Friday's Administrative Council there was a lengthy discussion of the Adams vs. Califano trial, and President Friday discussed a meeting with the HEW staff. In his remarks to the Board of Governors on April 8, 1977, President Friday reported that Judge Pratt of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia had, "in an order, directed the Department of Health Education and Welfare to invalidate the desegregation plans of North Carolina and five other states, approved by HEW in 1974, and to require these states to prepare and file with HEW this summer desegregation plans that will conform to guidelines to be prepared by HEW." This was a lengthy speech and it was followed some days later by specific details required for a new plan. This became a major activity for Dr. Clark and many others on our campus as they prepared materials for the BOG staff who had to prepare the new plan.

On July 2, 1977, the Governor received a letter from HEW saying that the revised plan must be submitted in 60 days and that the Office of Civil rights in HEW would then have 120 days to respond to the new plan. I recall

our distress with the short time that we had to get the plan in, and the fact that HEW could take twice as much time to study and to respond as we had to develop the plan. Early in September the plan Phase II was submitted. Dr. Clark wrote on May 4, 1978:

Provost Winstead and I attended a meeting of all Chief Academic Officers and Affirmative Action Officers called by Vice President Raymond Dawson and Mr. Jeffrey Orleans. We were informed that one of the items in the State Plan Phase II under current negotiations with HEW is the employment of faculty.

The statement goes on to say that there will be greater responsibility on each chief academic officer in developing and carrying our affirmative action plans. It also said, "The revised plans must be completed in 60 to 75 days after approval or disapproval of the State Plan II. The plans will be developed for five years ending on June 30, 1983."

On October 24, 1978, Mr. Ronald Butler reported to the Faculty Senate on the findings of a Special Task Force appointed by Chancellor Thomas to study NCSU's image in the black community. That report and the discussion can be found in the Senate's minutes of 1978-79 on pages 57-63. I will quote only a very few comments. Needless to say our image was horrible. "North Carolina State University is a very conservative institution and is viewed as racist and red-necked. We do not really know the black community; we don't communicate effectively. Our negative image may be hurting our enrollment of Black students, especially from Wake County. We enrolled only eight Black students from Wake last year. I know from experience that it can be very frustrating to apply for a job at this University. I interviewed for many positions for which I felt qualified, but I ended up in housekeeping. Did you know that there are still lounges on this campus where the maids and janitors do not feel welcome to eat their lunches, even though the room

is often empty. N. C. State is in the community, but not of the community. State's image to many blacks is still: if you want to be a farmer, go to State. There is a need to communicate our programs. State is constantly put down in the Black community. I attended NCSU for my master's degree and experienced behavior which justifies your image." The report prepared by this committee was distributed widely. Dr. Clark served on the Task Force. The task force recommended 16 specific changes, many of which have been implemented, at least in part, and some of these have exceeded the scope of the original recommendation. We had shown a video for several years that was developed shortly after Dr. Clark came to NCSU and it was now out of date. In the spring of 1979 another was developed which was widely shown on campus as a part of the image issue.

In 1978 Chancellor Joab Thomas held the first Brotherhood Diner and our honoree was Dr. Samuel Nesbitt. The guest speaker for the evening was Dr. Ozell Sutton from Atlanta, Georgia. Our Brotherhood dinner was not institutionalized until 1982 after Chancellor Bruce Poulton came to NCSU.

In 1978 we reported on a variety of new and current initiatives to increase the enrollment of minority students to the President and to the staff of BOG. I will list a sample of these.

1. Meeting with black students on campus to obtain suggestions and recommendations for increasing minority enrollment.
2. Inviting high school counselors from Wake and surrounding counties to a meeting to discuss minority recruitment and enrollment.
3. Interviewing marginal black applicants in cooperation with black faculty resulted in 53 recommendations for admission for the fall of 1978.
4. Concentrating minority recruitment on secondary schools that had a large number of black students.
5. Hosting 130 accepted students on campus for Pan-African weekend.
6. Utilizing black students as hosts/ hostesses for campus visits by black prospective students during the year.
7. Utilizing currently enrolled black students as good will ambassadors in their hometowns during school vacation periods.
8. Involve black faculty in recruiting.
9. Use of alumni in recruiting.
10. Invite all black high school seniors to All University Day and to offer the services of the admissions office to discuss future educational plans.
11. Involve the admissions staff and black faculty in the black community through church and civic visits.
12. Involvement of the black SPA staff in recruiting activities with an emphasis on Wake County.
13. Make tentative early financial aid awards to black student applicants.
14. Award a scholarship to one black and one white student from each Wake County high school. The objective was to encourage enrollment of academically talented black students from Wake who rarely came to NCSU and went where they could get a scholarship. Later we were able to get an additional \$50,000 for fifty \$1,000 scholarship awards to the best academically prepared black students who were accepted and who did not have another scholarship. This worked well in getting the best academically prepared students for a while, but it later developed that other universities followed suit, and we had to expand this, with the help of the schools and their foundation funds, to extend many of these to four year awards based on satisfactory performance.
15. The engineering MITE program was expanded.

16. We had a cooperative degree program with NCA&T in Food Science.

The peer student program was initiated first in SALS. Two upper-class black students were hired to contact currently enrolled black students and new students during the year and to advise and encourage them to seek assistance and to inform them where the assistance could be obtained when needed. It was later that this program was expanded by Vice Chancellors Talley and Stafford to a Peer Mentor program so that successful African-American upper-class students were mentors for all entering freshmen. It was at about this time that we began to add or expand compensatory courses in English, mathematics and reading primarily for those students who came with academic deficiencies. While one objective was to overcome deficiencies for the black students and to help them to succeed at NCSU, it turned out that they were needed by many of the white students too.

It was at about this time that I realized that the departments and schools would not add enough black faculty to meet our affirmative action goals without further encouragement. It was a disappointment to me to learn that Dr. Clark's and my encouragement to do what was right did not work adequately, but I now knew that units had, in their own minds, other goals of high or even higher priority. With this knowledge I finally had found a procedure that worked. People really worked hard to recruit for and to get the positions for their units. So I began the practice of continuing to encourage the filling of newly allocated and vacant positions with blacks and females, but I also reserved a set of positions each year from this time until I retired that could only be filled with blacks. In other words, if you could find a black faculty member who would come to NCSU you would get likely get an extra position. This was not completely open-ended, but it nearly was. While I did not set up a similar number of positions for women, I tried to make certain that we did not fail to hire a female faculty

member because of the lack of positions. This is described further in the preceding section on women. We were at this time making much better progress in most areas in finding female faculty. The number of black faculty in the national pool was still very small.

On March 16, 1979, I allocated a position to the Graduate school for an Assistant Dean for Minority affairs. We had decided to award the position when funds became available, so the Graduate School had already selected Dr. Witherspoon for the position at the time that I obtained and allocated the funds. Dr. Witherspoon was supposed to retain a research commitment in his department and it was expected that he would help the campus in recruiting and advise units on better methods for recruiting black graduate students. He was also to help the entire campus community understand better the concerns and problems of black graduate students. Dr. Witherspoon developed the agenda for the position and developed one of the outstanding networks in the nation for the recruitment of black graduate students to NCSU. He became the person that black graduate students went to when they had academic problems they could not get resolved elsewhere. He became a mentor to them for they came to see him about personal problems too. In this position Dr. Witherspoon managed the Minority Presence Grant Funds appropriated to NCSU via the BOG. He allocated these funds primarily as a supplement to other small assistantship funds to individual students and to students who did not have assistantships. We began to reward him primarily for his efforts in the Graduate School rather than for his contributions to the Department of Botany.

On May 21, 1979, Dr. Jenkins who had obtained a law degree from UNC-CH and was now our University Attorney informed Dr. Clark, Mr. Worsley and me that we would soon be involved in an affirmative action compliance review. He advised us to get ready for such a review. This always happened if an institution received a grant of

\$1,000,000 or more and this was to be our first one-million-dollar-grant-caused investigation. He said that based on the experience at other institutions, we could count on the entire process being hurried with resulting pressure on us to be able to respond quickly to reasonable requests for information. He said that at UNC-Chapel Hill which had recently undergone a similar review, they were requested to provide information within three working days. We then were given a list of items that had been requested there and proceeded to gather the information which indeed was requested later and with a short notice for compliance. We would never have been able to have generated this data on time without the advanced warning. Thank goodness we now can retrieve data about faculty much faster because of the computer. We later had many more grants of that magnitude. Most grants reviews at NCSU were reviewed with the Department of Labor. Except for the first review we had so many grants of that magnitude that we were rarely reviewed more than once a year, and thank goodness not even every year.

On June 12, 1978, HEW provisionally accepted the State Plan II for the Elimination of Racial Duality. On February 21, the HEW team, consisting among others of David Tatel and Mary Berry, came to NCSU. They were visiting all of the predominately black campuses and the NCSU, UNC-CH and UNC-Greensboro campuses as well as the General Administration. This was a very tedious and nerve-wracking visit. The group visiting us, for some reason, wanted to visit several buildings where there might be autoclaves although these were not on the original itinerary. We visited most originally scheduled areas but not all. We also visited several not on the schedule. Since the visitors were late in arriving, in several cases there were no persons around in the unscheduled areas to tell them what was going on in this or that laboratory. In Mechanical Engineering an undergraduate student was the only person present in the building. He was working on a senior project and did a

magnificent job explaining his project. I was proud of him and later told him, his department head and dean. I did the best job of explaining that I could. I later labeled this as the "visit to the autoclaves." It did not seem that the visiting team was here to see what we were doing and that their minds were made up already. Many conferences were held over the next two months between HEW and UNC. On March 26, 1979, the University was informed that HEW had rejected the State Plan. On April 25, 1979, after attending a meeting called by President Friday that Chancellor Thomas couldn't attend, I wrote the Chancellor saying: "The President indicated that Califano was scheduled to start deferring grants effective May 2, 1979." This was so very important to us for almost all of our research funds came from the federal government. "The University filed an injunction against HEW in the Eastern District Court at 4 p. m. on April 24, 1979. You will receive a copy of the 80 plus page action. If we do not win here, then the process will take the administrative proceedings route."

At a Faculty Senate meeting on August 26, 1980, I reported that we were well on our way to meeting our goals in tenure track positions. We had 26 black faculty with a goal of 36 by 1983. We had 124 females in the tenure track with a goal of 132. At the general faculty meeting I did remind the faculty that we had a net gain of only three new blacks and nine new females.

In 1980 Chancellor Thomas received the following letter related to the Race Relations Seminars from Elizabeth Wheeler who was Head of the History Department. Some controversy on campus was developing about whether they should continue. She wrote:

It is my understanding that there is some question whether or not the Race Relations Seminars conducted by C. T. Vivian will be continued. I was fortunate in being able to attend one of the two-day seminars in 1976. It was one of the most exhausting—at the same time the most valuable—experiences I have

ever had. Although it was four years ago the memory of that seminar has not dimmed. We were asked to return to campus and share our experiences with our colleagues. This I found difficult to do and firmly believe that everyone on our campus should have the opportunity to participate in these seminars. I am well aware that many of this campus concentrate on how far we have come instead of how far we have to go, and I also believe that we have not escaped the national backlash. In my opinion, this is not the time to relax our efforts. I strongly recommend that the Race Relations Seminars be continued.

And they were continued.

On April 24, 1979, the Consent Decree was issued by the federal court and the fight between The State of North Carolina, in so far as the UNC System was concerned, was ended. I did call for a number of new initiatives, but we had continued to do those things called for in our earlier plan and were thereby nearly on target to accomplish our goals. While progress was being made in all areas we were still not at the enrollment levels we had wanted and were working towards in undergraduate enrollment, nor were we moving as well as desired in the arena of producing more blacks with doctorates at NCSU. The entire country was not succeeding in this faculty production arena so while we were not achieving our goals for black faculty we were making progress. These goals always seemed to be just beyond our grasp. When we hired four or six new faculty it seemed that we lost two or three of those already present to better offers, not always in salary, but because of such things as working conditions and fringe benefits.

In 1982 we received a scare. We thought that the Federal Government was about to cut our federal funds for a lack of compliance with Title VI. It seemed that we were now on a list put out by the Office of Equal Opportunity in the Department of Education. It turned out that this was a mistake. It took a lot of time on the part of Henry Smith, the Dean for Research, and others to

get us off the no-awards lists of federal agencies. This was essential so that our grants for research would not be withheld.

In 1982 in a letter to Governor Hunt whose services we sought, I described that we, Dr. Clark and his staff and Media Services in SHASS, were about to make a videotape of interviews which would document the progress of Black involvement and enrollment at this University from 1956 to 1982. In 1982 Dr. Talley made a number of proposals that would help in the recruitment and retention of black students to the Chancellor. Many of these were adopted. Some examples were, "To coordinate admissions and financial aid efforts so that all eligible minority students receive prompt and maximum packages of financial aid." He also proposed giving upper-class black students a chance to live on campus rather than just being in the lottery. He proposed that we develop a Freshman Year Division on campus and to provide separate advisors for these students. This was the Chancellor's idea too. When it was studied by the schools the idea didn't fly. He also proposed to revise the current social and cultural programs available in the Student Center and in the Residence Life Division. He made other proposals which would have required us to hire more minority faculty and to assign them to functions with black students. These were not put into place for we could not have found the needed black faculty, and those that we did hire wanted to be part of their disciplines instead of being in some other unit. Almost all did have concerns about the progress of black students, and they gave their time and effort generously to help black students succeed academically at NCSU.

Vice Chancellor Talley was concerned that some persons on campus felt that Student Affairs was anti-black. I don't know where this came from, for back in the early and mid-seventies, when we were trying so hard to get some blacks hired among our faculty and EPA personnel, Dr. Talley took the lead and required that some positions be

filled by black candidates. He was the first administrator of a major unit to take such a stand. Dr. Stafford continued this effort when he replaced Dr. Talley.

In 1984 Dean Hamby wrote Chancellor Poulton and commented on the School of Textile's efforts to recruit black students. Some of the things mentioned included the following. Textiles was the first school on campus to supplement the activities of the Admissions Office to actively recruit black students. They also were the first to print a brochure especially designed for recruiting black students and this was done some time before any court action. It was done because, "We felt impelled to take a leadership posture and because the industry was in need of management development personnel." They had awarded two out of 16 of the North Carolina Textile Foundation's Merit Awards to blacks, and had graduated fifty-six blacks over the last five years. They developed a special program to improve advising and counseling and "to improve the atmosphere, academic performance, and thus retention of black students." He goes on to say that the recruiting of graduate students was still a problem. He said, "We have tried all of the ideas that have been suggested to us plus some of our own but with unacceptable results. We will continue with additional effort this coming year. The need for black graduate students is even greater than that for undergraduates."

On April 20, 1984, Dr. Clark reported on the undergraduate merit scholarships awarded by schools at NCSU. The numbers by school were as follows: SALS, 3; Design, 0; Education 10; Engineering, 31; Forestry had none designated for black students, but did award scholarships to blacks; Humanities, 0; PAMS, 0; and Textiles 9. Each of the schools did award other non-designated scholarships to blacks. The University had 50 such scholarships that were not earmarked for students in a particular school and were awarded to the best black applicants who had no other scholarships.

On April 24, 1984, Dr. Clark reported on progress in meeting the Consent Decree

goals to the Faculty Senate. The minutes read as follows:

Dr. Clark stated that it is our responsibility to try to increase black enrollment on campus to 10.2% of the student body by 1986. This fall we would like to have 515 black freshmen and transfer students. Out of 1000 black applications, 50% have a predicted GPA of 2.0 or higher and NCSU is trying to increase enrollment of the number of black students whose predicted GPA is 2.0 or above.

The following actions are being taken: a) rearrangement of financial aid, b) expansion of summer programs designed to help black students adjust to NCSU, c) adding one day to freshmen orientation for black students, d) use minority coordinators in each school in an attempt to preempt problems, e) direct course placement. A number of these actions are designed to build self-confidence, self-esteem, and identify strong support people for black students. The academic success of blacks has been improved by supportive individuals concentrating on long term goals, advising students on how to cope with racism, and helping them to network for a sense of community.

Several Senators expressed the need to improve the retention rate of blacks without lowering standards. Dr. Clark responded, "There is a need for workshops within the white faculty. The black student in most cases will not seek help unless it is a crises situation because of the stigma often associated with seeking help. Our white colleagues need to be aware of this and seek out black students who are in difficulty." He added that as long as NCSU maintains a 2.0 standard for graduation, the GPA computation under consideration will not lower standards.

It was in 1985 that we decided to try a new approach. We decided to lower our admissions guidelines for the University Predicted GPA for black students with the hope that if we provided them with more assistance with the compensatory courses

now in place and the summer Transition Program, that we might be able to have more of these students succeed academically at NCSU. We admitted a few black students with a UPGA below 1.5 and a few as low as 1.25. This experiment, needless to say, did not succeed, and we lost almost all of this lower echelon of admitted students. Thus we came to the conclusion that we needed to stick to our guidelines except for a few selected special student exceptions for admissions (see the Admissions section in Chapter Six). We agreed that we simply couldn't admit students at this level of preparation again. We simply did not have in place what the students needed to make them successful. Thus, we realized that we would not be able to use this strategy to make progress and achieve our goal of 10.2%. It did not seem that the population of students in the academic range required to succeed at NCSU was increasing in high school and the competition for their recruitment grew fiercer every year. We simply had too few large scholarships to compete for most of the most academically qualified black high school graduates. Our greatest hope to increase the enrollment of black undergraduate students was to increase retention of those already enrolled. We looked at the admissions criteria for the UPGA (we later called this the Admissions Index or AI). We knew that we admitted, on the average, black freshmen with slightly better academic credentials than did UNC-CH, but we flunked more and had more drop out, while UNC-CH graduated more. The reason that we knew this was true was that the staff at BOG told us every year when we had our Consent Decree conference on the numbers of black students admitted, retained, graduated and enrolled.

We began to try the new approach mentioned by Dr. Clark in his remarks to the Senate, about the minority coordinators to assist in student retention. In 1981 the School of Engineering did have a full-time EPA black coordinator in the Dean's Office who was working with black students and helping them to solve their problems with

some success. We had been struggling with ideas of how we might provide more assistance to black students, for our retention wasn't nearly as good as it needed to be. Then we began to establish, over time, a Coordinator for African-American Student Affairs in each school. The last school to get a coordinator was the School of Design, which had the smallest number of African-American students. Charles Joyner filled this position in addition to his other duties. This person in each school would get to know these students and assist them in getting help to solve their problems. We also hoped that it would provide an African-American professional whom the students would trust and come to with academic and other problems before these problems became acute and before the students left us. This goal was accomplished and engineering now has several persons who work in this area today. The group from the schools/colleges now meets frequently to share ideas, problems and solutions. Each coordinator reported to their school dean, but they also were called together by Dr. Clark. After Dr. Witherspoon became Associate Provost, he assumed the responsibility to provide advice and coordination to this group.

The first reference to the possibility of a new African-American Cultural Center that I noted was in a letter of November 25, 1984, from Chancellor Poulton. He also talked about the possible renovation of the building that was then used as a Cultural Center (the old Print Shop building).

In 1984 Dr. Jenkins, our University Attorney, reported on progress towards the Consent Decree goals. It looked as if we would not reach the goal of 10.2% black enrollment by 1986 at our pace of progress. Dr. Jenkins did present the results of our effort in a positive way. He said that our black enrollment had increased by 700% since 1972 and that we had an increase of 32% in our black enrollment and only 4% in white enrollment since 1980. He also said that NCSU had a larger black enrollment than Elizabeth City State University and greater than any private black institution in

North Carolina. In a few more years Chancellor Poulton would begin to say that we had the largest black enrollment of any institutions in the State except North Carolina A & T State University and North Carolina Central University. This was still true in 1993, but we still had not reached the 10.2 % black enrollment goal.

On January 8, 1985, Vice Chancellor Turner wrote Mr. Worsley requesting a one-half time position for a black coordinator to assist in the recruitment and retention of black adult students into the LifeLong Learning component of Extension and Public Service. Dr. Clark and I had advised Dr. Turner that this component had very few black students enrolled and that if we were to meet our goals enrollment of African-Americans in the Adult Credit Programs would have to be increased too. We had encouraged the hiring of such a person. The Chancellor wrote back to Dr. Turner and said that he (Turner) should find the money. Later that same year Dr. Turner developed a plan to try to market our adult offerings more effectively to blacks. When we next got some resources we did provide some funds for this purpose and Extension provided some. This effort continues. However, the desired enrollment of black adults has not been reached in this area of NCSU's activities.

On April 11, 1985, the Chancellor mentioned in correspondence with Dr. Turner that:

I have invited a group of nine or ten prominent black leaders to sit on a permanent advisory committee to North Carolina State University. Their charge simply stated is to provide us with feedback on the image of North Carolina State University in the black community and how that image could be strengthened particularly to enhance the recruitment of students, faculty and staff. The second part of their charge relates to how may North Carolina State University better serve the black community. Obviously your efforts fall primarily in the latter

category but would also deal with the first charge.

This is now called the Chancellor's African-American Community Leaders Advisory Committee. He continued and said, "By this letter I am asking that before you attempt to make your plans operational would you run them by Dr. Lawrence Clark, who is advising me in this effort, to make sure that they are consistent with the overall thrust that the university is making to the black community." The Chancellor and the Provost along with Dr. Clark had meetings with black citizens and advisory groups over the years. This action by Poulton institutionalized the concept and put it on a continuous basis.

The MSEN project is described in part in what follows, but it is a project started as an experimental project funded first by a grant first at NCSU, North Carolina Central University and UNC-CH.

The UNC Mathematics and Science Education Network (MSEN) then came into existence in 1986 after studies revealed the serious under representation of minorities and females in academic or college preparatory math and science courses. The program was developed by Dr. Lawrence Clark, Associate Provost at North Carolina State University, with the support of an appropriation by the North Carolina General Assembly. The MSEN Pre-College Program seeks to increase the pool of under represented students who graduate from North Carolina high schools prepared to pursue careers in mathematics and science based fields; increase the representation of minorities and women in academic college bound math and science classes in high school; and encourage students to consider careers in mathematics, the sciences, technology, engineering and education.

The Pre-College Program now operates from six centers in the state: NCSU, ECU, NCA&T, UNC-Charlotte, Fayetteville State University, and UNC-CH. The NCSU program offers services to

students in Wake and Johnston Counties consisting of a middle school program (six schools) in which students meet daily as a pre-college elective class in which they increase their skills in math, science, communication, and cultural awareness. Additionally, sessions are held which consist of school visits by community role models, field trips, and other activities to broaden the students' awareness. The high school program (four schools) consists of student involvement in Academic Chapters for Excellence which meets once a week after school for group learning sessions, tutoring, and the development of student leadership skills. Academic Centers for Excellence students also attend a week-long summer session on the campus of NCSU for exposure to math/science projects, computer training, problem solving exercises and accelerated English courses. Students also participate in Math/Science competitions that allow students to design their own projects and compare their work in a competitive setting thereby gaining valuable research experience and recognition by their peers and the professional community. All of these activities culminate in Recognition Awards given at the End-of-the-Year Banquet in May for Pre-College students who maintain at least a B plus average in required mathematics, science and English courses. Additionally, there are other aspects of the Pre-College Program that involve parents and teachers as participants in seminars and workshops, in service education, planning sessions and tutoring.

As of 1994 there were over 400 students in the MSEN Pre-College Program in the Wake and Johnston County Public School Systems with at least 600 parents in a support role. This program is an effective partnership among students, educators, university faculty, scientists, business leaders, parents, and government, demonstrating that when students are assisted in developing competencies, exposed to possibilities, and encouraged by a variety of role

models, they are able to achieve success and live unfettered by ignorance.

In 1986 the Chancellor proposed that each year I get a statement from the Deans of progress of untenured black faculty towards tenure. It had become obvious that in some cases they were not making progress and black faculty were so hard to find that it was necessary for us to do all we could to assure that no deserving person failed to make tenure. I began to get these annual reports, and found that the activities of several faculty would not meet the guidelines for promotion or tenure. For example, we found one faculty member in a unit that would never recommend tenure without substantial research activity. Yet the person had undertaken and volunteered for a number of worthwhile projects and his till was filled, yet one could see that he would not make it. I could not understand why the department had let the person pursue these activities to the exclusion of a significant research project. After the dean saw the report he recognized the same problem. We were able to get this person's assignments changed, and the faculty member did gain tenure. In other cases we were not as successful. In many cases we asked the department head to spell out in writing specifically what the faculty must accomplish to gain tenure. In most cases this worked, but in a few others it did not. At least we felt that we had tried and those faculty that we lost because they did not gain tenure were adequately informed soon enough to overcome their deficiencies.

In 1986 the NCSU Trustees approved the appointment of the first African-American to the position of department head. Dr. Don C. Locke became Head of the Department of Counselor Education. Also in 1986, the Council on African-American Affairs resubmitted a proposal made by the same group in 1984 which had not been acted upon. These included: "Establish a series of African-American Speakers with the speakers being nationally recognized for their area of expertise. Hold a series of leadership conferences and/or retreats for African-

American student leaders." This had been implemented by Student Affairs.

Develop an appropriate mechanism for increased interaction between African-American faculty and students. This will reinforce the students self image by providing role models for professional accomplishments. Identify cultural supportive activities in the Raleigh and Research Triangle communities and encourage students to participate. Develop a series of programs oriented toward Africa and its role in developing the cultural and social character of African-American society. Develop a series of programs oriented toward the problems facing the African-American family structure and potential solutions to these problems.

For a program based upon these activities to be successful, it must be recognized as a part of the overall educational process for African-American students. Thus, a heavy faculty involvement in developing the ideas and concepts for these programs is essential. However, it is not appropriate for African-American faculty to totally take the development of these programs while at the same time develop their professional careers for possible consideration of promotion and tenure. Thus, it is also important that appropriate staff be provided to develop, supervise, and control these activities. This staff must be coordinated by the appropriate University Official (or his/her designate). It is our opinion that such a program would best fit under the Academic Affairs part of the overall University structure.

Most of these were approved. At first the program reported through Dr. Clark and later through Dr. Witherspoon. After we obtained a Cultural Center, Dr. Iyailu Moses became its Director. The international activities have also progressed. We sent a group of 50 faculty and students first to Togo and to two additional countries in 1989. That was a great trip with interesting experiences for our students and faculty.

The excitement of the students as I saw them off from Raleigh-Durham Airport was unbelievable. I told them that they couldn't leave unless they were properly dressed, so I gave each of them a plastic Wolfpack pin to wear in their lapels. When they returned they all had many souvenirs, and they brought me back one too, a gold Wolfpack lapel pin made in Togo. While there they visited other neighboring countries too and learned the difficulties and the bureaucracy of moving from one place to another. They also learned about the freedom which we have to take pictures and to go where we wish, but which does not exist in some other places. Dr. Clark raised the supporting funds for this trip by getting resources from a number of sources, and each school contributed some funds. Additional programs with colleges in Africa are mentioned in Chapter Six in the discussion on International Programs.

On December 22, 1986, in a letter to Chancellor Poulton, Richard Robinson acknowledged receipt of NCSU's revised affirmative action plan. The letter also stated that the BOG did extend for two additional years the commitments concerning employment established by the Consent Decree through December, 1988.

On April 28, 1987, Dr. Clark responded to a request from President C. D. Spangler Jr. to provide him with efforts made at NCSU in the recruitment and retention of black students and the employment of black faculty. Among the things described were the C. T. Vivian Seminars, the African-American Symposium for all entering black freshmen, the African-American Coordinators, Leadership Conferences for Black Students, Workshops for Black Faculty, the African-American Colloquium series to give black faculty the opportunity to present topics in their own disciplines, the Academic Skills Program, the University Transition Program, the Chancellor's Advisory Council, and bringing in consultants to advise about the retention of black students and other minorities. Some consultants mentioned included, Alfred Pasteur, William Sedlacek,

Alexander Astin, Charles Nettles, and Jaqueline Fleming.

In 1988 Becky French, University Attorney, received a letter protesting a search in the History Department for a black faculty member for one of the positions which I was willing to allocate only if a black person was found and recommend for the position. The anonymous writer also said that ostensibly the department had been told that if they did not fill this position with a black they would never receive another position. Of course that threat was never made or implied, but it is quite probable that the dean confirmed that this position could only be filled by a black, which was true. Anonymous letters leave one with no way to combat false rumors. The advertisement for the history opening read as follows, "The History Department at North Carolina State University. Field and rank are open. Salary dependent on rank. The History Department has a special commitment to affirmative action. Minority candidates are encouraged to apply. Letters of application and curricula vitae" et cetera. This advertisement was obviously intended to mean that they wanted to hire an African-American. There were a number of persons on campus who objected to my allocating positions that could only be filled by a black or my allocating additional positions when a search turned up an excellent woman who was not the department's top choice. We did not require an additional affirmative action search for these additional positions. It is true that I would have given a second position if a department could have landed a second excellent black in a search. As I indicated earlier I used this technique because departments did not find many blacks without the reward of an extra position. I know of one case where a faculty member complained about my approach and gave as evidence that they had hired a black in his department without pressure. He didn't know that this was also a position that I gave the dean to give to this department to hire the first black faculty member in that department.

On April 27, 1988, we discussed additional needs, such as a better balance of black faculty to black students, an African-American Studies minor and a Racial Harassment Policy which would parallel the Sexual Harassment Policy. The Chancellor also reported that "Black students feel that they are not wanted on this campus." The Chancellor then said that there was no obvious solution except to promote an awareness of and concern for all students

In 1988 we adopted a revised policy on race relations. It read in part as follows:

Racial bias or harassment is a form of race discrimination in violation of Federal law and North Carolina State University policy, and will not be tolerated. North Carolina State University is committed to assuring equal opportunity and to opposing discrimination because of race, sex, age, religion, national origin, handicap or veteran's status. Faculty, staff, and students should be aware that violation of this policy could lead to disciplinary action.

North Carolina State University hereby affirms its desire to maintain a work and academic environment for all employees and a study environment for all students that is humane, fair and responsive. North Carolina State University wishes to maintain an environment which supports and regards career and educational goals on the basis of such relevant factors as ability and work performance. Conduct or action that is based on a person's race or color creates a hostile working/learning environment that prevents effective learning or work performance, and it is in opposition to a campus environment free of discrimination.

On April 25, 1988, Dr. Clark wrote: "If you look in depth at the concerns that the African-American students around the nation on predominately white campuses have raised, you will find that these concerns grow out of a deeper struggle for the search for their own perceptions of reality. They are searching for a true sense of their own identity and groping with their own concept

of humanity and fairness. In addition they are seeking a sense of acceptance and a feeling of belonging in environments that are alien." He also said:

Moreover I believe that we will discover that the African-Americans are participating in two different cultural realities simultaneously, and the complexity which is associated with this biculturalization will give a much better understanding of the African-American experience." He later said "The issue of African-American Studies illustrates the point that the students are not asking for a mere set of courses. This demand is interwoven with their search for their own identity and a positive self-concept. History then becomes the mirror through which they look to discover and know themselves and their possibilities. It is in this context that history, as a social science, and African-American history as a people-specific forum, contributes to the intellectual and political emancipation of African-Americans in five basic ways: (1) as a source of self-understanding; (2) as a source of understanding of society and world; (3) as a measure of a people's humanity; (4) as a corrective for racism self-indulgent myths and (5) as a source of models to emulate.

On June 9, 1988, a committee to form a minor in African-American Studies was established by Dean Toole with Dr. Clark, Dr. Witherspoon and Dr. Grant and others as members. The committee was chaired by Dr. Tom Hammond. The minor was established and was housed in University Studies (now Multidisciplinary Studies). Dr. Hammond continued to chair the program in 1993. I do not know whether it achieved all those goals that Dr. Clark spelled out, but it has contributed to our efforts at the University.

On February 29, 1988, I wrote to the Coordinators of African American Advising and said:

At the forum on Racism held Thursday night, February 25, African-Ameri-

can students raised several very pertinent issues which I feel should be addressed at several levels within the academic divisions. I observed also that because of time constraints there were persons still standing in line to speak when the academic portion of the question and answer session ended.

I am asking that you as African-American Coordinator in your college/school do two things in conjunction with your dean. First, draw together a cadre of students from a cross section of your school's African-American population including first year freshmen as well as the full range of your continuing students. (a) Then, meet with these students to identify issues relating to the experience of African-American students that they feel should be addressed, and (b) meet with other African-American coordinators and compile a list of such concerns to be forwarded to me through Dr. Clark's office.

Second, I ask that you plan ongoing meetings throughout each academic year with the African-American students in your school. These meetings should serve as a means of feedback and dialogue for you, your dean, and faculty.

It was obvious to us that most of the concerns and problems of students needed to be addressed at the classroom, at the department and at the school levels. Most of these issues were not all University encompassing. Issues needed to be heard more nearly in the environment where they could be resolved.

In 1988 on April 6, 1988, I wrote Dean Toole and said: "A black student told me that you teach Japanese, why not Swahili?" Toole responded, "Why not?" So we began to teach Swahili. At first we taught this language to fairly large sections and then to only a very few students. It is so difficult to keep knowledge of and interest in such an offering before the students when there are so many courses listed in the catalogue and in the schedule of courses.

On February 11, 1989, a Racial Harassment policy was adopted by the North Carolina State University Board of Trustees.

On November 4, 1989, I reported to the General Faculty meeting that we now had 64 African-American administrators and tenure track faculty, a net increase of nine over the previous year. Our goal for 1991 was 77. We had 213 women in this category with a goal of 248. This was sort of my swan song report and I said, "I wish to appeal to you for your assistance in helping us meet our goals in the hiring of African-American faculty and in the hiring of female faculty. We feel that many of our departments are quite committed to affirmative action, not only in the letter of the law, but in the spirit of the law as well. As we begin our second century of service to the people of North Carolina, we want to continue our efforts in being truly a People's University."

Dr. August Witherspoon came to the Provost's Office from the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Botany. I had begun to realize the need for additional help in the area of undergraduate affairs dealing with the performance and problems of our African-American students. This was in addition to that which Dr. Clark could provide for he had so many other responsibilities. I recognized that we needed this more than I had realized after I substituted for Chancellor Poulton at an airing of grievances that our African-American Students held one evening in the Stewart Theater. I did not know what to expect, and had anticipated that I was going to answer questions of what the Provost was doing to try to enhance the academic success of African-American students. The questions started out with: Did you know? Or why did you let? It seemed to me that the students had put together all of their real and some possible but not real complaints here at NCSU and directed them to me for a response. Some were those that I had been working hardest to solve. Others dealt with matters that were occurring or had occurred in one or more department or classroom and that I had never heard be-

fore. The ones which I remember that my answers seemed to upset the students most were: "Why didn't our Black Literature courses count in meeting graduation requirements for literature?" I did not know that they didn't and had never heard the complaint before. It turned out that the faculty in SHASS did not accept these courses for its literature requirement, but that the course was accepted to satisfy literature requirements in all other schools and colleges at NCSU. When I investigated this and found that CHASS did not accept the course for the literature requirement, I asked the Dean to try to make a change. He raised the issue within his college, but the faculty did not want a change and continued not to accept the course for that basic requirement. The course could meet humanities electives in CHASS. Another thing that upset them was that the data they had on black faculty was in error and I told them so. When I looked into the matter I found that someone in Institutional Research had given them data but had omitted from the totals all black faculty who had any administrative responsibilities, including assistant department heads and a number of other professors who had some part-time administrative duties. I recall the young man accusing me of fabricating the numbers because my own staff had given him the other figures which he thought were correct. Of course, we had worked hard on the recruitment and hiring of black faculty and while I would have liked to have had more success, I felt that we were doing better than any other predominantly white institution that I knew of. There were a number of other issues raised that might have had more progress made toward their solution if the Provost had a staff-person whose responsibilities dealt with a greater interface with African-American students. Chancellor Poulton and I had an additional meeting with these and additional students later in the same year. When the opportunity came, we were able to get the funds which were used to create the facilitator position. So in 1989 we established a position for an Associate Provost as Facilitator of

African-American Affairs. While not all of Witherspoon's duties dealt with African-American issues, most did. Any assignment might be given to this position on an *ad hoc* basis. In time the position responsibilities have come to include helping in the interview process of all associate professors, reviewing and making recommendations for faculty promotion and tenure, coordinating college dean reviews, and serving as liaison between faculty bodies and administration on academic matters. As the Facilitator of African-American Affairs, responsibilities included the University Recruitment and Retention Programs; the programmatic activities of the African-American Cultural Center; and a liaison role with African-American faculty and staff organizations and African-American student organizations. Witherspoon as a facilitator tried to bring greater sharing and exchange of ideas and successes among the Coordinators of African-American Student Affairs positions in each of the Schools and Colleges. He helped them to acquire information of successful activities at other universities. This position served as an ex-officio officer for the Chancellor's Advisory Council and the Chancellor's African-American Community Leaders Advisory Committee. Dr. Witherspoon also developed a course for all African-American Freshmen with similar objectives to those developed for the freshman course in Undergraduate Studies (see Chapter Seven).

He visualized and established the African-American Heritage Society which gives the students an opportunity to learn and to be positive about African-Americans' contributions in the various areas of knowledge. The plan was to see and learn about the scholarly contributions of a large number of African-Americans and to ensure that all African-American students had a link to their intellectual cultural heritage. Another part of this program was to bring in a significant number of today's African-American Scholars in addition to those who would visit the academic department of the University. Another major effort of Dr. Witherspoon's

was to see the African-American Cultural Center come into being. He worked on this effort for many years before he joined my staff. As Associate Provost he was to help plan the development of the academic component of the program of this center. The concept was to make available to the entire NCSU community a variety of activities that would bring an array of cultural heritage and current African-American activities into the lives and educational activities of our Black students. The plan was for our students of all races to become involved and thereby provide for and enhance the education of all. He saw this as a way that we could develop a better understanding of cultural diversity and to enhance and to develop closer relations for people of all races.

In 1988 at the Dean's council meeting, we discussed the newly proposed African-American Heritage Societies. Dr. Witherspoon's description and rationale follows:

The purpose of an organization of African-American Heritage Societies is to provide Afrocentric, research-oriented societies through which African-American undergraduate students become aware of the significant contributions and accomplishments made by black people throughout the world's history and to provide an arena in which African-American students begin to recognize and utilize the legacy of the prior contributions of African-Americans in their personal and professional development.

There is an obvious need among African-American youth to become more fully aware of the historical development of black peoples throughout history, and to have that body of information developed throughout Afrocentric perspective. Considering the limited attention given to African-American culture and history within present day integrated public school systems, it is highly likely that African-American students have not had significant opportunities to develop an

appropriate knowledge of African-American culture and history, nor are there adequate opportunities for recognition of and preservation of an African presence for these students within institutions of higher learning.

Further, today's African-American students in particular on predominately white college campuses have demonstrated a need to develop a sense of belonging that is not satisfied by mainstream student activities. While there is a need for these students to participate in mainstream activities, at the same time there is also a need to participate in activities which nurture the black student's identity and culture. There is also a significant need among African-American students, and this includes those at historically black institutions as well, to develop a wholesome sense of belonging to one's own racial group and to develop an appreciation of one's own racial identity. The opportunity for such interactions in the context of mainstream activity within the Eurocentric educational institutions is highly unlikely.

Additionally, African-American college students need to experience the sense of gratification derived from an investigation of their heritage and its application to relevant issues in their lives. An additional gratification factor is that the application of information learned may be translated to grade improvement through improved research, practical skills development in a particular field, and a sense of purpose which enhances a deeper desire to study and learn.

African-American students have a need to also develop a global perspective of the role of non-European countries in history and in present day socio-economic and socio-political affairs and to recognize the common relationships of black peoples in all parts of the world.

Finally there is a need to provide experiences for African-American college students such that enable them to recognize the deeper and more complex role of an educational experience offered at an institution of higher

learning than simply that of following a curriculum or developing career related skills. There is a need for structured events that broaden the scope of regular course related activities which research has shown to be a mechanism of motivation. The establishment of an organization of African-American Heritage Societies embracing the areas of science, history literature, oratory and the visual arts is proposed.

The African-American Heritage Societies would be established at each campus for the purpose of conducting on-going research, study activity and campus presentations. Participating institutions would cooperatively plan an annual conference in which each group would present some aspect of its investigations. Some specific objectives for each group would be to develop a mentor type atmosphere while designing and conducting projects, to improve student's GPAs and to expand graduate opportunities.

An organizational structure is needed on each campus so that a definite framework may be formed to define the work to be done within each group. It is expected that each group will operate autonomously, yet not independently of the umbrella organization's focus. In addition, there needs to be a means of connecting the work done at each institution through frequent communications and a yearly conference for presentations. Each university would require a faculty organizer for the overall coordination of the organization and at least one faculty or staff advisor for each active society. In conjunction with faculty or staff participation as advisors, discussion is needed to investigate some possible means of providing supplemental remuneration.

The organization was established through the efforts of Dr. Witherspoon and others at NCSU.

In 1989 I was surprised, proud and humbled to receive a plaque which was read and presented to me by Gregory Washington, which made it even more precious to me as he was a severe critic of mine earlier

for our not making as much progress as we should have. It read as follows:

Resolution of Commendation in Recognition of Leadership and Professional Service

Whereas Dr. Nash N. Winstead has served with excellence as Provost of North Carolina State University since 1974; and

Whereas in his position as Provost Dr. Winstead provided dynamic leadership; and

Whereas Dr. Winstead has strived diligently throughout his tenure to provide a climate within the University that is considerate to work, study, and research among people of multiracial and multicultural backgrounds; and

Whereas Dr. Winstead has shown unbounded dedication in his resolve to improve the relation of African-American students at NCSU and employment of African-American faculty and staff; and

Whereas Dr. Winstead has ably endorsed and promoted opportunities for African-American students to establish and maintain connection to their traditional heritage and culture, particularly through his support of the African-American Heritage Societies; and

Whereas 1990 will be his retirement year; therefore

Be It Resolved

That the students, faculty, and staff who participated in the educational excursion to West Africa, as representatives for North Carolina State University in developing study abroad programs in Africa, do hereby commend Provost Nash N. Winstead for his excellence in leadership and for his commitment to service.

Resolved this 6th day of April 21, 1989
African-American Heritage Societies
Dr. A. M. Witherspoon, Founder
Dr. Lawrence M. Clark, Advisor
Dr. Iyailu Moses, Executive Secretary

At the Brotherhood Dinner in 1991, Chancellor Monteith said:

I am proud that I can announce to you that NCSU has a new, operational African-American Cultural Center. Programmatically, it strives to enlighten students, staff, faculty and administrators of all ethnic and racial groups on the beautiful heritage and history of African-Americans. Not only of their outstanding contributions in America, but also their long history and culture before this nation was founded. Students research various aspects of African and African-American history and present their scholarly findings in local, state, regional, and national seminars. Two of our African-American students, Mr. Thabiti Anyabwile and Ms. Kristie Moore presented at the National meetings of the Society of African-American Culture Centers, held at Ohio State University the number one student paper on 'The Origin of the Concept of Afrocentric.' They found the concept, if not the name, dated back before the Emancipation Proclamation. It is this type effort that both enlightens all of us while at the same time promoting scholarly work within our student body. We expect great things from this experience on our campus. I hope that you will take the opportunity to join us at the dedication this spring, 1992.

In September 18, 1992, the Board of Trustees presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Dr. Witherspoon. The citation reads as follows:

Whereas, Dr. Augustus M. Witherspoon has been honored as an outstanding teacher, a learned psychologist, and a leader in community service; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon began his relationship with North Carolina State University as a graduate student and was the second African-American to complete a Ph.D. at NCSU; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon has served in various capacities, progressing through the ranks from instructor to assistant professor of botany to associate professor and full professor; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon was appointed assistant dean of the graduate school, then acting dean, and later as associate dean while maintaining his research and instructional responsibilities within the Department of Botany; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon is currently Associate Provost and Coordinator of African-American affairs at North Carolina State University where he has spent 24 years of his career; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon's life work has been dedicated to developing and establishing programs to guide his students' progress and ensure their success, making him an adoptive father, or "Papa" to many; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon is a citizen extraordinaire who has served on many committees devoted to solving vital issues within our community, including those related to the environment, education, and the arts; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon is recognized throughout the state and the nation as a warm, affectionate leader who does not compromise principles, and has been a superior model to everyone whose life he has touched; and

Whereas, Dr. Witherspoon approaches every effort, whether in education or community service with a tenaciousness that suggests that a mission must be accomplished if it is at all worth the struggle; and

Whereas, the life of Dr. Augustus M. Witherspoon is a noteworthy example of the dedication, strength, and commitment to excellence of a scholar and a true gentleman:

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Board of Trustees unanimously authorizes this citation of appreciation as a tribute to the service of Dr. Augustus M. Witherspoon to North Carolina State University.

In witness whereof and by order of the Board of Trustees of North Carolina State University this eighteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two.

Some additional activities that Dr. Clark was involved with that have not been mentioned in the preceding descriptions occurred between 1982 and 1992. Those that involved outreach included: (1) Petitioning the State Department of Public Instruction to make Algebra I mandatory for graduation from high school. This move would help African-Americans and others since Algebra I is the gateway in the college preparatory track; (2) Co-sponsored the African-American Parents' Educational Summit with Wake Public Schools; (3) Helped to establish, with the College of Physical Sciences, the Imhotep Program. In this program middle school students come to the university on Saturday to work in the sciences such as chemistry and physics. A similar program in the biological sciences now exists too; (4) Established the Saturday Program for Academic and Cultural Education (SPACE); (5) Established the Martin Luther King, Jr. Annual Festival. This program involves NCSU students, but it also brings many people in the community to the NCSU campus.

There were several internal activities which have not been mentioned that now exist on the NCSU campus. These include: (1) The Black Repertory Theater; (2) The Minority Career Fair; The number of African-American students with a 3.0 GPA or better has tripled; (4) We selected the first African-American dean. Dr. James Anderson is Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

In the fall of 1982 we had 1,398 black students or 7.4 % of our student body. In 1986 the number was 1,717 students and

9.4 % of the student body. In 1988 the numbers were 2,380 and 9.3%, in 1990 the numbers were 2332 and 8.7%, in 1993, 2488 and 9.2%. Although the numbers have grown somewhat the rate is slow and the percentage is slightly lower than the peak of 9.4% in 1986.

In 1988 we had 537 African-American freshmen, 524 sophomores, 417 juniors and 334 seniors. In 1990 we had 449 freshmen, 492 sophomores, 432 juniors and 395 seniors. In 1993 we had 482 freshmen, 491 sophomores, 491 juniors and 445 seniors.

This part of the story of the involvement of the Provost's Office and the Provost's staff ends as of June 30, 1993. So many of the problems discussed here continue to be only partially resolved. Most of the things which we, the Deans of the Faculty, and the Provosts, attempted are now in

place and are continuing. The persons who now serve in the Provost's areas of responsibility have the commitment to continue efforts to provide equal opportunity for all and to insure that African-Americans make up a larger proportion of those that NCSU serves. There will be new innovations, new ideas and new programs that come into being. There will continue to be trials and successes and failures. Until much larger proportions of African-Americans have the educational levels and competencies needed to share in the American dream and have those skills and the education needed to make contributions in proportion to their population, our efforts will not be adequate. There is much to be done, but NCSU will continue to try and to try even harder to make these goals become a reality.

CHAPTER FIVE

Other Administrative Matters

Budget Development

Caldwell said that for the formulation of annual and biennial budget requests the Dean of the Faculty was to be responsible for receiving and analyzing the recommendations and data of all on-campus and off-campus units of the College proper, excepting the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Agricultural Extension Service, the Department of Athletics, the Budget Office, and the Office of Foundations and Development. "All proposals and recommendations requiring adjustment in the *academic* budget during the fiscal or budget year must be reviewed by the Dean of the Faculty for recommendation to the Chancellor." This general guideline was followed until the system of budget requests was changed shortly after William Turner became Business Manager in 1962. At that time written requests were made on the format prepared by the Business Manager. The Provost and the Business Manager (Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business) have shared a common Budget Office and staff since the Office of the Dean of the Faculty was created. This Budget Office which reports to the VC for Finance and Business did the appropriate analysis of the requests on what was to become known as Continuation or Base Budgets and Change Budgets (formerly A and B budgets). The Change Budgets were prepared on a biennial basis. The Provost continued to make a thorough review of all requests and, with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business, led the questioning following the presentation by the College/School deans or other unit heads to the Budget Committee. The Provost along with others at the Budget Hearings then made recommendations to the Chancellor for priorities among these requests. Later, under Chancellor Poulton the Chairman of the Faculty Senate,

the VC for Research, and the VC for Extension participated in the budget hearings.

The system was changed under Caldwell and Kelly so that the Provost also reviewed all budget requests except those from Athletics and other auxiliary enterprises. After Chancellor Poulton arrived, Mr. George Worsley and the Provost were appointed as a special review committee to review all budget proposals from all units supported in-full or in-part by receipts. This included several units in Student Affairs such as Residence Halls, the Student Center, Food Services and Health Services, as well as Athletics. I felt that Worsley and I were depended upon with the help of the Budget Office staff to be certain that these budgets were soundly balanced for receipts and expenses, and appropriate for the unit. It was not until the arrival of Chancellor Poulton that we had formal hearings on the Continuation Budgets. Prior to that time, requests on the continuing budgets were received by the Budget Office, and were reviewed with the help of the Budget Office by Mr. George Worsley and me as the two chief assistants to Mr. John Wright and Dr. Kelly. We then made recommendations to our supervisors who made recommendations to the Chancellor. We continued this practice until we became Vice Chancellor and Provost respectively, then we reviewed requests, recommendations, and needs that we knew of with the Budget Office staff and made our recommendations to the Chancellor. As I indicated, this process changed to a different process under Chancellor Poulton. While we both continued to make recommendations, they usually were at this time not arrived at jointly in advance and by our mutual agreement. Dr. Poulton preferred that we make independent assessments and recommendations. While we followed this in general, we still got our heads together from time to

time. I exercised less influence on the continuation budget under this process than previously.

I exercised less influence in the allocation and development of non-personnel components of the newly appropriated funds than under Thomas and Caldwell. This was associated in part with the late date that we received our allocation of new appropriations and the rapidity required for a response. I was given an opportunity to influence the priorities in the change budgets and felt that I did influence the decisions made by the four Chancellors to whom I reported. The Change Budget requests from the deans were usually very large. Requests for new funds for program improvement and new programs were likely to be as much as ten or more times greater than our most ambitious hopes for appropriations. Of course this meant that requests which were not near the top in priorities were not likely to be funded. For a number of items, we merged requests from the schools to a more reasonable level as a single University request. Such items which we merged from schools were usually the program improvement types, and included technicians, extension, research, and in every year equipment and computers. This route could not be used for academic teaching positions so I had to read the proposals carefully to be certain that we deleted these from the requests which we forwarded. If teaching faculty positions were gained this way we would lose an equal number of positions from the enrollment increase appropriations. These positions always came by a formula based on FTE students/FTE faculty and new positions came as enrollments increased and is described in the section on Budget Allocation later in this chapter. We could and did gain new supportive funds and secretarial and technical positions via this process. It was possible to get other types of technical, administrative and support positions by the change budget program improvement process; however, they came faster with the enrollment increases. During most of Shirley's, Kelly's and

my terms it seemed easier to get new program funds than it was to get funding increases for program improvement or cost-of-living adjustments.

One of the interesting factors has been how much additionally you had to do in certain areas in the preparation of the Budget. It has not been at all unusual for us to have to submit proposed equipment lists with our proposed budgets. In 1953-54 the Budget Bureau required a list of equipment that we might purchase along with a justification for each item before they allocated equipment funds to the campus. This was before the \$5,000 minimum for equipment purchases came into being. They obviously would not and they did not allocate nearly enough funds to buy much of the equipment on the list. While I was Provost it was not unusual for us to have to list all major items of the equipment with our change budget requests too. We did not get nearly all of the requested equipment, but the lists outlined our dreams and needs and it was surprising how much we acquired by other means outside appropriated funds, ranging from grants and contracts to outright gifts of equipment. At first the previously described process continued under Hart. Monteith now gives more responsibility to the Provost in the budget development process. Hart and now Stiles seem to have more responsibility in both budget development and budget allocation than Shirley, Kelly and I had under Bostian, Caldwell, Thomas and Poulton.

Budget Allocations

The responsibility of studies and recommendations for the assigning of faculty positions was allocated by Chancellor Bostian to Dean Shirley. In 1956 Dean Shirley, in the first allocation of faculty positions after his appointment as Dean, was clearly advising the Chancellor, and the Chancellor wrote the letters of allocation. At this time the Chancellor had permission to fill all EPA positions with a salary level under \$4,000, except for those at the rank of instructor and above. For

these he had to get the permission of President Gordan Gray.

In 1957 the campuses had to send a report to the UNC System which showed teaching loads on a course by course and instructor by instructor basis. This information was then sent to the Board of Higher Education and was used in considering requests for new faculty positions, and at that time requests were forwarded to the BHE on a departmental basis. At one time Dean Shirley said that recent statements by the Director of the BHE did not give him much confidence that sound judgment would be exercised in the evaluation of these figures. He said, "I should prefer to send him nothing statistical since he insists that all educational statistics are false. But this is a matter with which, I assume, we will have to live." Later that same year he wrote: "For a guy who has absolutely no faith in educational statistics, he is surely barraging the newspapers with figures from the new forms."

In a letter of February 13, 1957, Shirley wrote Bostian that the Advisory Budget Commission was more generous in its recommendations than the Board of Higher Education, and as a result NCSU got more faculty positions. There was one difficulty, for Shirley said, "I am not certain that these additional positions have been placed in places of most urgent need, and I should hope that some review will be given locally to allocations of the additional personnel." The FTE faculty to FTE student ratios were 1/13.38 in 1956-57 and 1/12.06 in 1957-58 which reflected an increase in positions. By 1961-62 the ratio had increased to 1/14.4. I do not know exactly when the budget requests and the appropriations for academic personnel stopped having to specify positions for specific programs. I do know that Provost Kelly received new instructional and associated supporting positions, and they could be allocated using the priorities determined at the NCSU campus. By then it was only in special cases that the Legislature specified personnel placement in the academic appropriations as it did for the Col-

lege of Veterinary Medicine. Such placement was usual in Organized Research and Organized Extension budgets, but with time these were usually, but not always appropriated with more flexibility in personnel assignments. Special bills for SALS and Forest Resources were usual in research and extension areas. Another example was when Chancellor Poulton was responsible for an appropriation made for Biotechnology, and another for the appropriation on four distinguished professors in Science and Engineering in the late 1980's. These were appropriated for the objectives requested of the Legislature; however, we could allocate these to appropriate departments within the guidelines established by the Legislature.

In 1970 the faculty to student ratio was at 1/13.7. It had been at this level for several years, but I did not find the precise year that this ratio was adopted by the Legislature. It was at about this time that Dr. Kelly described a faculty member's teaching load as from 9 to 12 hours per week with only a few faculty over this. In the 1971-72 Provost's Annual Report to the Chancellor the ratio had been changed by the Legislature to 1/14.5. We had tried that year at the request of the entire campus to get both the teaching faculty ratio and the SPA formulas improved. It happened that this budget request was not received well by the Legislature and the teaching formula was raised from 13.7 to 14.5 and the SPA formula was made less favorable too. We could ask for new SPA positions in the B Budget or, as it later came to be called, the Change Budget request. This did hurt us badly in faculty positions. Fortunately we had a big enrollment increase that year, but we lost a total of more than 80 faculty positions. The enrollment increase positions reduced this loss to a net loss of 26.2 positions which had to be recalled from academic units for reversion to the State. It was this horror that caused me to begin to allocate temporary positions to avoid having to let persons go in the future due to similar circumstances. This practice of allocating temporary positions, while it had its disadvantages, did prove to

be extremely helpful in my last year and during Hart's tenure as Provost when there were so many budget cuts and reversions. It was after the mid-eighties and after we obtained several special positions from the legislature that Mr. Worsley was able to get the University Professor positions, the Biotechnology positions, and the professor positions that came funded at \$250,000 each and a few others placed into the 1310 line. These helped to raise our average salaries a little and helped to reduce our budgeted faculty formula to 1/14.3. Of course I was helping as much as I could, which mostly was moral support, to get this accomplished too.

In 1970 Provost Kelly wrote to Dean Peterson who had raised the issue of more teaching assistant positions. He said: "We have tried to obtain teaching assistantships in almost every B Budget request with essentially no success. We do not attempt to obtain teaching assistantships in our A Budget because one full-time teaching equivalent for a teaching assistant counts against our faculty/student ratio as much as one faculty FTE, yet the money is only one-half as much per position." The B Budget at this time was the program improvement and new programs budget. After I became Provost there was no need to try to get TA positions or teaching positions, except for an item like the Veterinary College which was not included in the formula, by any route except through enrollment increase funds, for these positions always were a part of the enrollment driven formula for FTE teachers to FTE students. Teaching assistants occupied these faculty lines. It was possible to hire as many TAs as the salary in the position allowed, based of course, on the stipend levels of the graduate students.

One of the goals that Worsley and I had was to get the existing department heads, assistant heads and assistant deans off the 101-1310 Budget Line. At the time when the 16 campuses were all made a part of UNC System, these administrative positions were in the same line as those of teaching-departmental research positions. Since these new

positions came into the formula for enrollment growth but one could obtain only a very few administrative positions out of this budget increase, we moved the positions occupied by department heads, assistant heads, and assistant deans into the line for non-teaching positions. This resulted in an enormous benefit to us later, but it lowered our average faculty salaries a little. Another goal was to get an assistant dean for instruction and an additional administrative position for research in each school. It took us a number of years, but this was accomplished slowly for the several schools that did not have such positions. These were created out of enrollment increase funds in the non-teaching category. This was accomplished with the approval, consent and encouragement of Caldwell, Thomas, and Poulton. During Hart's term when the State reduced NCSU's budgets annually there was some loss of administrative positions. So there was considerable erosion of Worsley's and my accomplishment.

At first, position allocations were recommended to the Chancellor and the Chancellor would write the letters. Later these were written by the Provost's staff for the Chancellor's signature. During the early portion of Caldwell's tenure, the letters for position allocation were signed by the Chancellor. When I joined Kelly's staff, Kelly was writing the position allocation letters and signing them after obtaining Caldwell's concurrence with the allocation plan. While I was Provost and Assistant Provost, the procedure was for the Provost to develop an allocation plan based on requests from the deans. The Provosts also used their own assessment of needs based on a number of instructional factors including credit hours, contact hours, and the number of majors at the various degree levels. Actually, I always checked with the Chancellor before and after I made my plans for allocation to be certain that I had included any promises he had made to deans, too. With the long Legislative sessions, it became very important to have developed a plan, by priority, so that the allocation letters could be written as

soon as we learned what the new appropriations were likely to be. As soon as the appropriations bill was passed and after Mr. Worsley gave me an estimate of the number of positions we were likely to receive, I got on the phone and called the deans to give them what they were likely to get so that they could round up a few new temporary faculty for the fall semester. We always had more students to teach in the fall than in the spring semester. Mr. Worsley's estimates were always close. That was the only way we could have the positions in the hands of the deans in time to make hires for the fall semester. I then wrote the letters formally allocating the positions after we were formally informed by the administration of the BOG. At times this formal notification could be only a few days before the fall semester started. We always felt that we needed more positions than we had.

In 1988 Poulton wrote to Karen Helm stating that I had recently sent deans a letter asking them to submit requests for new positions, but I had not asked them to relate these to the biennial plans submitted the preceding spring. At this time he asked Helm to relate the requests to those goals. It turned out that they did relate with the goals of the schools. The organized research goals and teaching goals were in general agreement, but not always identical. A major objective of mine was to ask the deans in these letters to make requests for new positions, and to identify how they would meet affirmative action goals for both African-Americans and for women. Positions were allocated to help to meet these two campus priority goals. We considered teaching loads, credit hours and contact hours produced at the graduate and undergraduate levels, and the numbers of undergraduate majors and graduate majors at the Masters and the Ph.D. levels in making our allocations to units. Advising was a necessary part of the teaching function and positions were needed for advising too. I used a formula developed by Dr. Kelly and a faculty committee as a guideline for position allocations. Except for affirmative action goals and very

unique opportunities that a school might have to acquire faculty in a deficient area or an area planned for expansion or development, positions were usually allocated on a catch-up basis using this formula. Positions came under review for possible reversion to the Provost when the existing faculty were rated at over the 20% level for the University campus based on this formula. In the formula, a Ph.D. major counted about 16 to one undergraduate, and a master's student was weighted 5 times more than an undergraduate student. This was intended to reflect that a graduate student takes considerably more individual faculty time. A NCSU goal included a plan to increase the proportion of our student population at the graduate level. Our goals were always greater than the resulting graduate enrollment.

In reallocating faculty lines to schools it was frequently necessary to allocate some positions at less than the current salary in the vacated position. When we made new hires, departments frequently had lines that were salaried at a level too low to even secure an assistant professor in some fields. This was especially true in fields such as accounting, business, engineering and the computer areas in several schools. In these programs new hires at the assistant professor level were more expensive than the average salary of all faculty lines which was the salary level of the new positions that came by enrollment increases. For these reasons I had to maintain some reserves that could be used to help units have a salary at a level necessary to hire a new assistant professor in these fields. I frequently added these recalled funds to the new positions or to the temporary positions so that the needed sums could be recalled during the coming year as needed to upgrade salaries for positions. This was also frequently necessary when we made a major professorial hire. We allocated most of the new positions at the assistant professor level. This procedure continued under Hart.

Besides the allocation of instructional-departmental research positions (those in the 101-1310 line), I allocated those EPA

administrative types and SPA supporting types of staff positions that came within the enrollment increase funds. For this type of need I made certain that the Budget Office had in hand my most needed list of support EPA and SPA position needs and opportunities. We had to make an almost immediate listing of position titles, job descriptions, and salaries needed for each position in these categories to the General Administration when we received our allocations from the Legislative appropriations. In this case the Chancellor usually had some needs for these positions too. It was through these funds that we got the associate dean positions referred to earlier, and the African-American Coordinator position in each of the schools. We always had several alternatives worked out in priority order to be ready on this short notice. I had the list of faculty position allocations made out and approved by the Chancellor. The General Administration would call the Budget Office to say the formal allocation letter was on its way (usually by personal messenger), what the resources were by budget line, and what the turn-around deadline would be for getting our planned uses of the new appropriations back to the staff of the BOG for their approval. This deadline applied to all of those funds used for items other than for the formula faculty positions in the instructional-departmental research budget. I always had to provide the departmental assignment of these allocations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at a later date.

With enrollment increase positions came staff support positions for SPA positions. At one time these came at a ratio of about 6:1. During Kelly's term, with the support of the Chancellor and the President, a request was made of the Legislature to make this a lower faculty to staff ratio. This was made at the same time as the request to reduce the faculty formula. This was a mistake, for they changed our ratio to 8:1. This hurt very much. While it was not retroactive as the faculty positions were, we did not lose existing SPA positions, but we

did have new positions at the new rate. This support figure was for all of the new technicians and clerical positions in the departmental offices, the dean's offices, as well as those to supply support positions for the faculty's needs. All had to come out of the academic affairs enrollment increases. Thank goodness it was possible to request additional support for these positions from the change budget too. As a technical university we had great need and demand for technically trained staff. Except for those in new programs, these came slowly in change budget requests. We always were in short supply. Many of our new support staff came to us via grants and contracts. Obviously these latter positions went to support the programs that received the grants and those that did not get grants or have organized research budgets were even more deficient. I did not consider the number of those soft money positions when I reviewed the status of SPA support in making allocations to units. As mentioned earlier it was necessary for these positions to be in the hands of the Budget Office when the Legislature left town. The Budget Office would have in the Chancellor's hands for mailing to the General Administration the requests by budget line, SPA position level and a job description within just a few days and rarely as much as a week after receiving the allocation of funds.

Resources to provide adequately for laboratories and computers were lacking during all of Hart's and my tenures as Provost. To partially overcome this difficulty, in 1983 we instituted a computer course and laboratory course fee. Students would pay a fee of \$15.00 per course with a maximum fee of \$30.00 per semester for two or more such courses. While we had course fees of various types and amounts per course many years ago, these earlier fees had been incorporated into our tuition. It was with some difficulty that we (the schools and the university administration) reached consensus to ask the Board of Governors for this amount. Some felt that this was too much to ask the students to pay, and others felt that it would not provide enough funds to meet the

growing additional costs. The latter complainants were correct, but we did not think that we could expect to get approval for a larger fee. These fees were approved and although we had discussed the fees broadly all during the preceding year, it appeared to be another "summer strategy" to the students. One of the things that departments had difficulty understanding was the mechanism of disbursement of the fees collected. Most departments would calculate the number of students in laboratory and computer classes and expect \$15.00 per student in fees. The problem was that they forgot the maximum that a student had to pay was \$30.00. In most of our fields of study students were registered per semester for more than two laboratories or courses that used computers. Fees were prorated on the amount collected and the numbers enrolled in the eligible classes. Under these circumstances no unit got \$15.00 per student. These funds were inadequate, and after a very short time we began to try to get additional fee increases, but it was not until after I retired that the fees were increased.

In 1958 the Business Manager objected when Dean Shirley allocated more faculty positions than he deemed wise. The appropriations were made at that time on a two year cycle by the Legislature because the Legislature met every other year, so for the second year of a biennium the budget was set. In this case, as is true every year, the appropriated budget included income from student tuition as well as the base state funded budget. The Legislature appropriates both receipts from tuition as well as state funds. Mr. Vann was concerned that Dean Shirley had obligated more funds than the tuition was likely to generate. Shirley had used an optimistic rather than a conservative estimate. Shirley had to tell the deans that some of these allocated positions were on a contingency basis for use after the tuition income was established. The enrollment exceeded that projected and Shirley had more tuition funds to allocate. If this happened while I was Provost we would have gone to the State Budget Office to request

that we be permitted to use the extra tuition income. Having the Legislature appropriate funds on a biennial basis was a great help in planning for resources and for resource allocation. In the case cited, Shirley had allocated positions in January for the next fiscal year which started in July. On the years that the Legislature met, they went home in April even at the time I joined Dr. Kelly's staff as Assistant Provost. As the years went on the Legislature met for longer and longer times each year. Then the Legislature began to come back each year but for a short time in the second year of the biennium. In this approach the second year was usually a shorter session than the first year's sessions; however, they began to come to town later in the spring. During most of my tenure as Provost we would not know what our appropriations would be until late July or often in August. This made allocation difficult for the fall semester, and meant that we had to take chances on hiring some temporary faculty and to make several one-semester and one-year appointments on a contingency of funds basis. Fortunately in Raleigh and the Research Triangle this was possible, but it was an undesirable practice. This late ending of the Legislative session was an additional reason why I allocated temporary positions to schools. I felt that I did not wish to face a financial exigency in case such an occasion should arise again. I also gave a cushion that provided a few more resources if we were to take bold or new initiatives. One of the things I disagree with my predecessors about was that they liked to hold on to some positions for allocation in the second term of the year or to take care of emergencies. From time to time the Budget Bureau or the Governor would freeze all hiring, and any uncommitted funds would revert to the state. This was done under the provision that the state cannot operate in a deficit. In some years this was true, but in many other years it was done to insure that there would be a budget surplus. These funds would be used for one shot purposes to meet political obligations or for some project of the Governor's or the

Legislature's. The largest enrollment of the year was always in the fall semester, so in 1974 I allocated all of the positions available so that they could be used at this busiest time. Some positions were allocated temporarily on a fall semester basis so that I could change allocations for the spring if necessary to take care of unforeseen needs. It was a surprise to most of the Deans when I first started the practice. It shouldn't have been, for I told them in advance of the procedure that I was using. They quickly learned that there really were no extra funds in the Provost's pockets to be handed out after the beginning of the fall semester. This was a good practice, for the schools and departments could plan, to the extent possible, for the wisest use of the funds that they had, and they had them all. Another thing we learned was that equipment and travel were other lines of the budget that got frozen quickly, and often Mr. Worsley, with my aid and support, frequently tried to get the units to plan for their equipment needs in the spring and to have their purchase orders written so that they could be submitted soon after the new fiscal year's funds became available. This of course had come to mean well after July 1, when the fiscal year began. For some units this deviated from their way of doing things, and we in academia hate to change the way that we do things. Of course for others it was a practice that they already followed in planning; however, they were not accustomed to getting the orders in so quickly. Whatever the circumstances, it is better to change than to lose those dear funds which are in short supply anyway. So they did learn, and at times the hard way, to plan ahead and to proceed quickly. While I advised strongly about these supporting fund allocations, these were determined and allocated by the Chancellors.

During Dr. Kelly's tenure, after I started working with him, and with my encouragement and instigation, he established the practice that all vacated positions were to be returned to the Provost for reallocation. While deans already had the authority and could reallocate positions, reallocation was

very difficult for them politically in their schools. In most cases the positions did go back to the schools from which they came, but some reallocations were made to places of greater need. The University needed the ability to move positions more readily, and this was the easiest way that I knew to do it. As I was called on to help some schools have more funds in faculty lines to make new hires, I frequently had to take funds from those positions allocated on a temporary basis to the schools. As positions were vacated I could occasionally recall some of the funds to rebuild those lines back to an appropriate level. This was a wonderful practice and it gave me and the school deans some flexibility. I am grateful to Kelly for starting this practice because it would have become a difficult practice to have started in the later years of my tenure when reversions of funds to the State were very common. I did not find the precise year that this reallocation procedure came into being, but it was in practice in 1971.

During most of my tenure the indirect cost recovery (overhead) funds from grants and contracts provided some resources to units as well as for certain administrative costs. These were allocated primarily by the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Chancellor; however, the Provost had some say, and participated on a committee chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Research along with the Vice Chancellor for Extension, the Graduate Dean, and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business. This committee considered those funds for allocation to the schools. Unfortunately the disbursement of the overhead funds were 5% to the BOC, and 30% to the state for most of my tenure. However, during the terrible years of budget reductions in 1990, 1991, and 1992, the procedure changed. During these years we not only had to under-spend our budget to provide reversions and to cut the next year's budget drastically, in some of these years we could use only two-thirds of the salary of vacated faculty or other position lines. The state also took 50% of our overhead funds. Fortunately there have been some changes

since that time. We now return 20% of the overhead funds to the state, and continue to give 5% to the BOG. There have been some budgetary changes that have provided more flexibility in the use of appropriated funds. We do not now have to operate under as strict budgetary line restraints, but we are required to make a specific and substantial amount of reversions to the state each year. Much of these funds come from personnel lines, but we can now use funds from vacant positions for purposes other than to hire EPA against EPA lines and SPA against SPA lines. This provides no change in the budget, but within a budget year funds can be used more flexibly. Oh, but it would have been wonderful to have this flexibility before I retired.

Creating New Administrative Units

In December of 1959, Dean Shirley described the process for getting approval of new programs at NCSC to the Faculty Senate. This was in relation to the two new schools (Liberal Arts and Physical Sciences and Mathematics) that were soon to be proposed to President Friday and to the Board of Trustees of UNC. All degrees also would have to be presented to the Board of Higher Education for approval.

When the Chancellor proposed the two new Schools in 1960, everyone in administrative positions seemed supportive. The affected faculty were tremendously pleased. I did see in the files I searched that a committee was appointed, but according to Shirley the two schools were a part of NCSC's long range plan. In meetings of the Administrative Council there was much debate about whether to go for one school or two separate schools simultaneously. After the decision was reached to go for the two schools separately, a committee of Shirley, Hickman (Dean of General Studies) and Peterson (Dean of the Graduate School) was appointed to write up the proposal for the two schools. There was mixed interest in including the biological sciences in Physical Sciences and Mathematics, but consensus in these meetings was to limit that proposal to

the physical sciences and the departments of Mathematics and Statistics. Diary notes of meetings for the planning of the schools were kept by Shirley. They included meetings with the department heads of the affected groups. Some faculty in other schools expressed reservations, for they felt that there would be some loss of resources to their schools. They were especially concerned about the proposed School of Liberal Arts which, according to some, would change the nature of North Carolina State College. Of course it would, but they did not want the College's nature changed. In spite of these reservations by some, Caldwell had overwhelming support from the faculty and the Administrative Council for the two schools. The proposal for a School of Physical Sciences and Mathematics was proposed first, according to gossip at the time, for two reasons: 1) At that time there was serious doubt that the BOT would approve a school which included the liberal arts and the social sciences because of duplication with UNC-CH. The argument used most was that strength in the basic sciences and mathematics were essential for our development of nationally competitive programs in the applied science fields and engineering. Of course at this time the system had not come to realize, as they did in a few more years, that the same arguments would be made that the humanities and social sciences were essential and valid for undergirding strengths in the other fields of study at NCSC. 2) It would provide for a deanship for A. C. Menius. The proposal was approved by the general administration of UNC and by the BOT for PSAM to become a school on July 1, 1961. Chemistry and Statistics came from the School of Agriculture, and Physics and Mathematics came from the School of Engineering. Shirley said, after he had developed the proposal for the budget for the PSAM Dean's Office: "and they even have a budget too." At this time the Dean of the Faculty had no budget and operated out of the Chancellor's budget.

In a few more years the School of Liberal Arts was finally approved. It came at a

time when the Consolidated University recognized that all of its constituent colleges should offer degrees in the basic humanities and social sciences. They also realized that this would provide stronger educational programs for all of the undergraduate students. That story is described in considerable detail in the section on Courses and Curricula in Chapter Two.

Departments were created in a variety of ways. Many arose by splitting an existing department which had covered diverse disciplines or scholarly areas and each had now grown to be of sufficient strength to separate them into departments. Faculty in both groups usually supported such a move. Examples are Microbiology, which moved from a recognized faculty in Botany to departmental status. Another of this type was Speech (Communication) from English. Others were formed from diverse groups of faculty from several departments with common interest. Examples include: Genetics from Statistics, Crop Science, Zoology, and Botany; Food Science from Horticulture and Animal Science; a single department of Economics by merging Agricultural Economics and Economics in 1964 (from two schools); Biochemistry from Botany; Chemistry, Animal Science and Microbiology and Toxicology from Entomology, Statistics, and with several adjunct or associate faculty from NIEHS at the Research Triangle Park; Biochemistry; Veterinary Medicine and Wood and Paper Science. In 1965, Rural Sociology and Sociology were merged. Both the Economics and Sociology departments continued to be under the administration of School of Liberal Arts and SALS. Computer Science was created by moving individual faculty from a large number of departments from at least three schools. These types of departments always have faculty support, and frequently the delay or impediment is administrative unwillingness to create another administrative unit. Some academic units or fields are developed and added to an existing departmental unit because they are small and administrators do not want to create more small departments. At times the

faculty don't fit or wear very well together. An example was Social Work, which was at first in Sociology and which later moved to the Division of Multidisciplinary Studies. Several departments in Education were merged into a new department called Occupational Education. This merger was not generally desired by the faculty. Agricultural Education would later move from the Occupational Education department in the College of Education to a new department in CALS. This department is now called Agricultural and Extension Education. Another plan discussed at about that time was for the merger of Curriculum and Instruction and Mathematics and Science Education into a Department of Secondary Education. This idea had so much faculty opposition that it never got proposed formally, but it was discussed and debated for some time. Another department which had multiple fields and which has become quite strong is Marine, Earth, and Atmospheric Sciences which merged geology from Mineral Industries in the School of Engineering with the newly created fields of meteorology and marine sciences. Faculty in the Marine portion of this department came from Engineering and SALS. The faculty all appeared to be delighted to come to the new unit. Departments and curricula don't disappear often and when they do, there is usually faculty and student opposition. Examples were the Engineering Operations B.S. degree, which had become almost identical to that of Industrial Engineering's undergraduate degree, and Engineering Mechanics. In this later case the faculty were transferred to two other School of Engineering departments, Civil Engineering and Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

The Provost or Dean of the Faculty usually is consulted and has to prepare or have others prepare the documentation necessary for obtaining the approval of the President and the UNC Trustees, and in later years the NCSU Trustees, the President's Office and the Board of Governors. This means that he ascertains that the issue is adequately documented and sup-

ported. He makes certain that the Chancellor is fully informed of any controversy and is also in support of the proposal, and that the UNC Provost and later the VP for Academic Affairs is informed and expects to receive the proposal. He makes certain that it is presented in the desired format and in shape for the Chancellor to sign a covering letter with adequate copies. He prepares and presents the proposal to the appropriate NCSU Trustee Committee for the Chancellor, and as all good staff do, he prepares the report of the Trustees' committee chairman for his report at the Trustees meeting. One thing that was learned early by Shirley was to make certain that any degree title changes that were to occur with the creation of a new unit or with a unit's name change were submitted at the same time. This was practiced by Kelly, Winstead and Hart. It solved many problems later. I recall asking the proposers a number of times if title changes were to be made when degree name changes did not accompany departmental name changes. They almost always were intended to change too.

In 1978 we created a department of Educational Leadership and Program Evaluation. In this case we requested it of President Friday and the BOG. Initially it required no new resources and was handled by the transfer of appropriate faculty from other units in the School of Education. It was the area of expertise of Carl Dolce, the Dean of Education, and his tenure was here. When he left the Dean's Office, he went to this department. It would probably not have been approved if it had dealt only with Educational Administration, with its public school and higher education tracks, which was one of the degrees transferred to the new department. I think that the program evaluation component of the department helped enormously because that was a feature which was not usually visible in most universities and in the other UNC campuses' Educational Administration graduate degree programs at that time. It was the first in North Carolina, and helped that program to become nationally recognized. In this case it

was the Dean who wanted to see this department created rather than the faculty, which was usually the driving force for the creation of new administrative units, but the faculty were also supportive of this new department.

In the same year we transferred the program in Engineering Graphics to the Department of Occupational Education. I don't believe that this was widely sought by the Engineering Graphics faculty, but they were not happy in Engineering which wanted to be rid of them. They did not really fit there, and they usually did not have engineering degrees. This was a very good and wise transfer for both the long run and the short run. I moved a group of faculty into an administrative framework where their status was appreciated and recognized, and it gave another unit with too few credit hours a way of earning a lot of them. Another change which came a little later was to transfer a few positions, unfilled on a permanent basis, from the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Mathematics and Science Education to teach several of the compensatory Math courses. The faculty in Math did not really like to teach and manage the courses, and they were taught mostly by Math's graduate students and a few temporary employees. These TA's were needed to teach other beginning courses in Math so this also turned out to be a very good decision. This provided Mathematics Education with a course that they could experiment with that was equivalent to the courses that their undergraduate students would teach in high school after they graduated. I gave Mathematics Education a high credit hour delivery course and resources needed to pay teaching assistants. I admit that I was the generator of this idea after hearing of complaints and needs from both departments.

There were a number of new departments and administrative units created as we grew and became more diverse in our programs, and as others were merged or were transferred from one school to another. I will not attempt to catalog all of these and have described only a small number. Others

that should be mentioned were the beginning of the Institute of Biological Sciences which was later abolished, and the movement of Recreation and Parks Administration, (now Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management) from the School of Education to the School of Forest Resources in 1967. An important name change that has not been mentioned was the change from the School of Agriculture to the School of Agriculture and Life Sciences in the early sixties. The Psychology department was at one time in both Education and SLA. The faculty wanted to change and to be in only one school. When given the choice, they voted to be in the School of Education. This School would later change its name to Education and Psychology. Another Department that gained national stature grew out of the Department of Extension Personnel Development in SALS in 1965, and came to be joint with the School of Education as the Department of Adult and Community College Education. The old SALS component of this department has now returned to CALS and joined with Agricultural Education in the new Department of Agricultural and Extension Education. The addition of Product Design in the School of Design was one of the early programs approved under Shirley. It was to become an important addition and dimension to the programs in the School of Design. This Department would later be split into the Departments of Visual Design and Industrial Design. There was considerable controversy across campus, but not among the faculty in Visual Design when they changed their name to Graphic Design. In 1988 the College of Textiles, which had made many departmental changes over the years, became the college with the smallest number of departments. It now has only two departments, the Department of Textile Engineering, Chemistry and Science and the Department of Textile and Apparel Management.

In the sixties there was much talk about the need for a School of Veterinary Medicine in North Carolina, and we all assumed that when it came it would come to NCSU.

In the meantime several veterinarians had been hired by the Agricultural Research and Extension Services, in the Animal Science and Poultry Science Departments. By the late sixties it had become evident that there would be such a school in North Carolina. The questions now were where and when? During this period there was some effort to have it established at NCA&T. There was also a study by the Southern Regional Education Board that was sent to each member of the Legislature and to many others including all newspapers, radio and TV stations that said that there was no need for more veterinarians. Finally it was evident that a school would be established in North Carolina and that it would come to NCSU. We first asked for and got resources to expand our veterinary efforts in SALS which were needed, and we created a new Department of Veterinary Science with Terrence Curtin as the new Department Head. One of the department's functions was to begin to plan for a school of excellence. Caldwell and later Thomas said that this program was not to be created at the expense of our other programs, and that if we were to start a school, it was to be one which could compete with the nation's best veterinary schools. The planning was superb, and when the appropriations came they were sufficient to enable us to have a truly outstanding school and an excellent facility even if it did leak in the Dean's office when it rained! I cannot say that it did not take some resources away from other programs, for I don't believe that a university system can look at the funds that go to one campus when such a major new venture is started to meet State needs, without there being some lessening of new resources that might have gone to other programs. While the Provost was not the dominant planner, I did spend many hours reading the plans, listening to proposals and making suggestions in the planning for the new school. I am proud of the effort and do consider my time well spent, for this was one of the worthy contributions to the programs at NCSU made while I was Provost. The credit for planning

really should be given to Dean Curtin and that group of wise and dedicated faculty in the Department of Veterinary Science who made the plans to create what has come to be truly a great College of Veterinary Medicine.

One unit that was desired by the faculty, the departmental administrators and the University administrations for many years was a School of Economics and Business with the appropriate departments. In the sixties, with the persistence of Dean Brooks James of SALS, the Department of Agricultural Economics, which was nationally recognized, was merged with the Department of Economics, which had a few excellent faculty but which was not nationally recognized and had no graduate programs. The merged department reported to both SLA and SALS. This merger made it possible for the faculty in the two units to participate in graduate programs, for the Ph. D. in Agricultural Economics which was soon retitled as a Ph.D in Economics. This was a good merger for us at that time and soon we had a strong economics faculty. Early in the seventies we added degree programs at the undergraduate level in both Accounting and in Business Management. We also added a Master of Science in Management (an interdepartmental and interschool program which was a unique degree) in lieu of another MBA program which existed everywhere.

We hired a senior faculty member who was nationally recognized and was to help us develop a strong business program. Provost Kelly began to meet with this new faculty member to discuss ways to improve the program. The idea at that time of the Economics Department's faculty and of the school and university administrators was to have a separate school at some time in the future. I don't know all of the reasons, but I believe that the faculty viewed Dr. Kelly's approaches as improper in that only one faculty member was included and that the others were not being adequately involved in the discussions. I also understood that this new senior professor's ideas of what the

program should be differed from that of most of the other faculty in the department. Soon this professor left NCSU, and the idea of a school became dormant. After Thomas came, the idea was resurrected. Before Chancellor Thomas left NCSU to return to the University of Alabama, there were meetings with the Chancellor, the Deans of SHASS and SALS, and the faculty in the Department of Economics and Business, which had become the largest department on campus in the size of faculty, in credit hours generated, and in the number of undergraduate student majors. Most of the undergraduate majors were in Business, and a large number were also majors in Accounting. Smaller numbers majored in Economics and Agricultural Economics. A number of plans had been drawn up by the faculty which were not acceptable to the two deans or to the NCSU administration. After a meeting of the Chancellor and the two deans with the faculty of the department, the whole idea was again placed in deep freeze. I did not attend the meeting for I was out of town when it was held. I recall that the deans and the Chancellor were shocked at the chilly atmosphere and the heated discussion of the meeting. Over the years of Poulton's tenure, a number of attempts to start a new school were begun but never quite brought to fruition. During this time there had been a very serious proposal drawn up by the faculty which would have attempted to maintain a governance structure of the proposed school that was amazingly similar to the existing departmental governance structure. Many of the faculty in business and accounting told us they were very opposed to the proposed plan. Neither of the two deans liked the plan, and we in Holladay Hall felt that most of the weaknesses that we found in the department's administration would remain. These weaknesses were not associated with individual administrators in the department but with the problem of such diverse programs and such a large faculty really continuing to operate as if they were a department even if they called themselves a school. I must say

that the two department heads during this period of time, William Toussaint and Dale Hoover, were superior administrators, and if they, along with a series of excellent assistant department heads, had not been so dedicated and competent, the department would have collapsed a lot earlier.

Poulton came up with a strategy to create a Division of Economics and Business with four departments. Agricultural Economics would report to the Dean of SALS and the Departments of Economics, Business Management and Accounting would report to the Dean of CHASS, as an interim step towards the creation of a school. The units would all participate in the existing graduate programs. The Division was created. It was to have four departments in the Division. We had believed that the steps toward the creation of a separate school and the departments was an accomplished fact and was informally approved by the UNC administrators. Some departments, but not all had been formed. When Monteith became Interim Chancellor, we found that this was not an accomplished fact approved informally by Dr. Dawson. He sounded as if he had never heard of that plan. We then formed a committee of the NCSU faculty, mostly from business, to make a study of our undergraduate Business Management degree program with our NCSU administrative intern Dr. Joanne Rockness, as our liaison to the committee. After receiving the committee report we brought in outside consultants. Both of these two studies suggested many weaknesses in the Business Management degree program. We were told that we did not have an adequate faculty for accreditation of the degree when and if a new school was established. Both Hart and I began to add positions for business which would rectify this deficiency. Around this time Robert Clark replaced Hoover as Head of the Division of Economics and Business. We were hoping that we would in the not too distant future begin to look for a new dean. I did not go through the usual search procedure when Clark was selected as Interim Head, but attempted to find the most

satisfactory candidate to assume the position who also was satisfactory to most of the faculty. We also had to find someone who would take on some hard and very difficult administrative tasks and who would give up a few years in their academic careers. Several names were suggested to me. No one that we interviewed who would accept the position was a unanimous choice of each of the four faculty groups. The majority of at least one group of faculty objected to each person who was willing to be considered. In selecting Dr. Clark we did make a very wise choice to carry us from this topsy-turvy time until we would finally get the four departments established. At about this time the UNC system was embarking on a long range plan which would include plans for new administrative units and new degree programs on each of the 16 campuses. This planing started while I was Provost, and was submitted under Hart. In 1992 a School of Management was approved and Robert Clark was appointed as Interim Dean. A search was started and Richard Lewis was appointed as the new Dean. I mention this administrative unit's history as I knew at least one side of much of the story, for it was the administrative unit that was not only most wanted but took the longest time to create. More controversy about this unit occurred on campus than when the School of Liberal Arts was established. While I was Provost, I discussed the matter of establishing this college with the deans of the remaining schools/colleges. All of the other colleges in the University wanted to see this school created too. I had wanted to see this school come into being during my entire tenure as Provost, and thank goodness it now exists. Its present structure has a different and probably a better focus than any of those proposed earlier.

I have not mentioned most of the administrative units that came into being since Shirley first became Dean of the Faculty. I have given a number of those which illustrate the procedure for change and many of the types of changes that have taken place.

Procedures to Select Academic Officials

I checked with Chancellors Bostian and Caldwell on the procedures that they used in selecting Shirley and Kelly, and for the selection of school deans. Both said that they consulted broadly with those that they needed to talk with. In the case of Shirley this meant with members of the Administrative Council. For Kelly this meant that Chancellor Caldwell got nominations from those consulted, and the two who recommended Kelly were D. B. Anderson and Walter Peterson. Both of these had taken leaves from NCSC to work with the National Science Foundation. They had worked under Dr. Kelly there. Chancellor Caldwell did bring Dr. Kelly to the campus for an interview. Both of the Deans of the Faculty had to be approved by the UNC Board of Trustees Executive Committee. By the time of the search for Dr. Kelly's replacement, there was a traditional committee of faculty and administrators appointed by Chancellor Caldwell to nominate candidates for the Provost's position. The procedure that was used when I was selected as Provost as well as those used for the selection of Hart and Stiles were developed by the Faculty Senate in 1970-71. The Senate's proposal also described the procedures and the constituency of school dean search committees. In 1971-72 and 73-74, these procedures were expanded to include the selection of assistant and associate provosts and deans, department heads and certain other academic officials. These procedures can be found as modified later in the *Faculty Handbook* of 1988 and will not be described here.

In 1955 one search committee for a department head consisted of three other department heads and two faculty members from the department, one of whom wished to be considered for the position and who resigned from the committee. I recommended three persons for the position to the dean. The dean forwarded one name to the Chancellor (no copy to the Dean of the Faculty). There was no record that either the Dean of the Faculty or the Chancellor

interviewed any of the nominees. In 1956 Bostian had correspondence with Acting Provost Whyburn about the appointment of a committee to select the Department Head for Physics in the School of Engineering. Bostian said that he would prefer to have the Dean of the School of Engineering to appoint the committee, but he would work closely with the dean in the appointment of the committee and see that the dean did not serve on it. Dean Lampe appointed the committee and this one had several faculty and a few other administrators. This procedure was followed for many years for department heads with varying numbers of members and varying numbers of faculty from the affected department, until the Senate proposed in 1974-75 that at least 50% of the committee come from among the faculty with one-third of the members selected by the faculty in the department. The Chancellor or the Dean of the Faculty (Provost) has continued to approve the membership of the department head search committees. By the time I became Provost the Chancellor had already delegated this responsibility to the Provost. In the years of Shirley's and the early years of Kelly's terms there were many department heads appointed with one recommendation and no evidence of an interview, and without mention in the associated files of a committee or its makeup. In 1960 there was difficulty in attracting candidates for the Head of the Chemistry Department because of the perception that we could not develop an outstanding department in the new School of PSAM and that the UNC chemistry faculty would direct the department from Chapel Hill. That was the view of one person who was a candidate after he visited the Department of Chemistry at UNC, and he withdrew his name from consideration. The committee of two faculty from the Chemistry Department and three others from outside PSAM requested assurances that we really were prepared to build an outstanding faculty before they contacted other nominees.

In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell approved a committee for a Head of the Department of Landscape Architecture with only one landscape faculty member.

On November 17, 1958, President Friday appointed a committee to select a new Chancellor to replace Bostian. The files do not indicate how he appointed the committee or with whom he consulted. The committee membership consisted of five members of the Board of Trustees, five members of the NCSC Alumni Association and five members of the faculty. He continued to appoint faculty to the search committee which recommended Thomas. By the time the searches for Poulton and Monteith occurred, the Faculty Senate elected the faculty members.

The committee that was appointed to select a replacement for Shirley for the Dean of General Studies consisted of four deans, another major administrator, one department head and two faculty. I did not see a letter of appointment, but I saw the recommendation which said that the Selection Committee recommended C. A. Hickman. It included only one recommendation.

The first time that I saw the appointment of a search committee which had many faculty was for the appointment of the Dean of the newly created School of Physical Sciences and Mathematics. In this case the committee was appointed by Chancellor Caldwell in the morning. It met, and it recommended A. C. Menius before noon. Committees were usually appointed to search for school deans after this time. In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell appointed a committee of faculty to search for a replacement for Dean Hickman for the School of General Studies. It consisted entirely of faculty and was chaired by a faculty member from the affected school. In 1960 the Dean of Design worked out a procedure and a committee for a search for the head of Landscape Architecture with Dean Shirley. Yet the Dean wrote to the Chancellor who then approved the committee and the procedure.

In 1961 Shirley served on the Search Committee for the new School of Engineering Dean. It was not the usual practice for the Provost to serve on committees for the selection of a dean. I later served as chairman of the committee which nominated Jerry Whitten as the replacement for Garrett Briggs as the Dean of PAMS. I also served as the chairman of the committee which nominated Thomas Stafford as the replacement for Banks Talley as Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs.

On February 26, 1962, Dean Brooks James proposed a new Institute of Biological Sciences with H. F. Robinson as its head and as Assistant Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. I saw no evidence in the files of consultation with the faculty, but there was some discussion with the heads of the biological science departments who in turn reported back to Dean James their faculty's interest and concerns. It was not at all usual in those days for units that were not departments to have a faculty committee appointed to study the matter.

The procedure, since these early committees, has been for the Provost to approve the committees recommended by the dean for those positions reporting to a dean, and for the Chancellor, upon recommendation of the Provost, to appoint the committees involved in the nomination of Deans and Vice Chancellors. In 1966 that procedure was followed, and Dean Fadum made a recommendation to Kelly for the new Head of the Chemical Engineering Department. The Chancellor of course wrote the letter of appointment.

Before I became Assistant Provost, I did not know that Dr. Kelly had a position for Assistant Provost, called at this time Assistant Dean of the Faculty. No committee was appointed. Dr. Kelly asked me to come over and have a cup of tea and discuss things that I had done and learned while I was on leave as an Ellis L. Phillips' Intern the prior year at Indiana University. I had about three visits, and he asked me if I would like to come to work with him. We discussed what I

might do, and I joined him on July 1, 1967. I later learned from a friend, Robert Maier, who later became VC for Academic Affairs at ECU, that he had come down for an interview with Caldwell and Kelly for this position. He said that he told them he was looking for a VP for Academic Affairs position and was not interested. Earlier in 1964, I was called over to Dean H. Brooks James home one Sunday morning. Dean James said that he and Directors Roy Lovvorn and Ed Glazner had been looking for a new Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences to replace Dr. Robinson, and they wanted me to fill the position. I had known the position was vacant, but had not applied for it and never thought I would be considered for it.

The general practice came to be that searches for all administrative positions would have an appointed committee. Before this time we probably could not have afforded to bring in all of the candidates for an interview. These in time came to be known as nomination rather than search committees. They were to make nominations, and in most cases were required to make three. Sometimes the administrator receiving the nominations would accept fewer, but rarely just one. As mentioned earlier in the 1970s, the Faculty Senate recommended a new set of procedures for the nomination of academic officials. The first recommendations had a number of flaws in the eyes of the Deans, so a Conference Committee was formed to reach consensus on modifications. Everyone agreed that we probably did need more faculty input and that procedures needed to be less variable from school to school. The Conference Committee's recommendations were adopted and can now be found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Over time we came to accept some additional parameters that were not spelled out. The first was that these committees would be made up of more faculty than administrators. The committee would also consist of a majority of its members from the affected administrative group. We also had

at least one-third of the membership elected by the voting faculty from that group. After the arrival of Chancellor Thomas, I began to review the proposed committees for department heads and other administrative positions in schools and to give approval. I was looking for the 50% representation of faculty from the administered group and in some cases to suggest membership from closely related groups. This practice began on September 11, 1979. There are still a few administrative positions in schools not covered by these guidelines. In almost all cases the deans have come to use these procedures for those positions too. In 1979, Chancellor Thomas said that the interviews with so many prospective department heads were beginning to wear him out and were taking too much time. It seemed that it was getting very hard to get these candidates scheduled with the chancellor. It seemed that most departments brought in three candidates, and several departments had more than three interviews. It was agreed that I would interview all department head candidates that were brought to the campus and that the school would bring back to the campus the preferred candidate to interview with the chancellor. This practice also was adopted by Chancellor Poulton.

It seems that about every four or five years the issue of department heads or department chair comes up. In 1978 this was a big issue again. After a review of the schools it seemed that there was major interest in having chairs rather than heads from the Humanities and Social Sciences, with Agriculture and Life Sciences, Forest Resources, and Textiles opposed. In the other schools there was varied interest. In 1983-84 the Faculty Senate appointed a committee to study the Heads vs. Chairs issue, and we did not make this change. Later when Poulton came, the Periodic Review and Evaluation of Departmental Programs and Leadership at five-year intervals was established. While this did not establish a formal term of five years, it did begin to look more like a term because we reported the review to the NCSU Trustees

with the indication that the head would be continued, that we were involved in a new search, or that we would begin a new search. The faculty have varied opinions of what the role of a chair would be. At present many departments involve the faculty heavily in the decision processes and in others they are minimally involved in departmental governance.

In 1984 it seemed that the reviews of department heads by the school deans, in the eyes of many of the faculty, were frequently beginning to include too little faculty consultation by the deans and too little about the quality of the department head's leadership. So many of the faculty throughout the university began to raise the issue within the Senate and with the school and university administrators of more faculty involvement in the administration of the reviews, and also of more faculty involvement in the administration of the departments. At such times the issue of Chairs versus Heads always comes up. It was at this time that a new recommendation for faculty participation in School and Departmental reviews came from the Faculty Senate. A few of the recommendations were not acceptable as proposed to the school deans and to many department heads. A conference committee was appointed and revisions were made which were acceptable to the deans and to the Senate. We did not get a recommendation to move from heads to chairs. It was at this time that Poulton wrote me saying:

This is to confirm our discussion on the appointment of deans and department heads.

First, new appointments in either position will be made with the understanding that an evaluation of the school or departmental leadership is to be made within five years as the basis for a decision concerning a continuing appointment in the position.

Second, because this stipulation was not made as a part of the appointment of most of our current deans and department heads, we agreed that the regular letter or reappointment will

indicate simply that the administrator will be evaluated in five years. Copies of such letters from deans to department heads will be sent to the provost's and chancellor's offices.

In 1989 concern was expressed to the Chancellor and me by several faculty that we were going outside for too many department heads. John Riddle expressed it in this way. "In the last six or so years, the process for the selection of Department Heads has undergone a number of changes, largely for the common good. The process is more open and the limit of five years before a review improves the faculty morale and the quality of leadership." He goes on to say that it seemed to him "that the ratio of heads who come from the outside appears to have increased against those who come from inside." This was a true assertion. He went on to say the personnel in many nomination committees, "feel that the administration prefers outsiders and secondly, a 'Savior' from beyond is easier for a search committee to sell because departmental groups do not need to work out internal accommodations." He also discussed the fact that outside heads frequently soon returned to the faculty as a professor and thereby occupied a faculty position in their field which might not be in the area that would serve the best interest of the department. It is true that the turnover among heads had become more and more frequent. It was a tough job as John knew, and few persons wanted to stay in the head position until retirement. He said, "If there is a shortening of department heads' terms, many of those selected on criteria based on administration have most of their active careers back in the ranks for research and instruction." Perhaps some of the reasons that we were getting more from outside the university were those Riddle suggested. Another reason was that with affirmative action we forced most of the searches to be open so that all persons interested or nominated could be considered, especially minorities and women. Departments also frequently saw this as a means to get an additional faculty position

in their department. The Chancellor had begun to require his approval before a search had begun if we were to limit it to internal candidates only. This was not intended as an administrative wish for outsiders but was to assure affirmative action. I know of many searches where I found the internal candidate to be very acceptable and even the best candidate to me, yet they were not chosen or recommended, or were not the first choice of the committee or the dean. In most cases we were looking at very good people and the external candidate had also appeared to be very good too. It did seem to me that there was a bias from the committees at times against internal candidates. There were a few times that I would not give the unit an extra position for I felt that they were overly enriched with faculty positions at that time. Hence an internal search was required. In others there were very acceptable minority and/or women candidates in the department for consideration by the committee. However, in the vast majority of cases we did open searches. John was correct in his assumption that we were selecting more department heads from outside and that heads were staying in the position for shorter periods of time. In reality this was true for almost all academic administrative positions. I recall one meeting of NASULGC when the audience was asked to stand and then sit down as they called out the number of years we had each been in our positions. When less than five years was called over one-half of the audience had sat down, after ten years there were only three of us standing. One had ten years, I had 14 years at this time, and one person had 22, but was to retire at the end of that year.

One other related issue was the review of academic officials. The process was started for department heads during Caldwell's and my tenures and has changed somewhat in procedure over the years. The Dean reviews were recommended by the Senate in 1977, and they were approved by Chancellor Thomas. The first reviews were of SALS, PAMS and Textiles in 1977. The

reviews of the deans were held by the Chancellor and the Provost. Later during Poulton's tenure, the VC for Research joined the review team. At first we did a written report of the dean's reviews and let the results of the study be kept in the Faculty Senate Office for review by all that wished to see the report. Of course, the dean who was reviewed got a copy. The Provost always wrote the review and shared it with the Chancellor for his additions or modifications. In 1978 the Senate proposed a change from Periodic Review of Departmental Leadership to Periodic Review and Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Departmental Programs and Leadership. This recommendation was accepted, and program and leadership became a component of both the department heads' and the deans' reviews. A number of changes were suggested in the process for the department head reviews, but the deans did not agree with these.

For the department heads the dean of the school arranged for the review. A departmental committee could be used, or deans could interview faculty directly, or in some cases both approaches were used. The deans then developed the report that they made to the faculty. The dean then sent a copy of that report or a synopsis of the department head's review to the Provost and Chancellor for their consideration, acceptance, or for further discussion. These reports always had a recommendation from the dean that the department head be continued or not continued. When we first reviewed program and leadership of the School of Education, the faculty wanted to use a questionnaire which they developed to be filled out by all faculty. They used a committee to administer the questionnaire. We agreed that it was an excellent idea. We did give Dean Dolce an opportunity to add questions that he felt were important. That started a process whereby the Faculty Senators from a school, or a committee of four current and former senators in those schools which had less than four senators, would develop a questionnaire to be reviewed and modified and usually a few questions were added by the

school dean for his/her review. Dr. Downs or I then worked out a compromise if there were disagreements about the questionnaire. I don't recall any major disagreements between the deans and the faculty over the questions. Usually the dean accepted the questionnaire with his additional questions added. It was at this time that a faculty senator told the UNC attorney in the BOG administration about our process. At that time the UNC attorney wished to review our procedure. He found them acceptable, except for the provision that the reviews could be put in a file for review by the faculty. We were told that was not legal and that we could share the findings but not in writing and not the results of the questionnaire. In our reviews of deans we also had meetings with department heads in a group, an open meeting for all the faculty, and a meeting with the other administrators from the school. Following the completion of the review, in a meeting with the faculty of a school, I verbally reported about the overall findings that we had found. I also gave a summary orally of the overall results of the questionnaire and the scores of the five questions with the highest and the five questions with the lowest scores. The questionnaires were received from the faculty by the Faculty Senate committee and were run on the optical scanning equipment of the Computing Center. The results were then prepared by these senators for us. Each questionnaire also had room for written comments. Comments received were summarized for me by the senators, but the originals were sent to me too. The Chancellor and I read all of these. I shared the summary and the questions except for those that might be identified with a specific person with the school dean. Reviews for department heads varied from school to school somewhat and at times slightly from department to department depending on the dean and the faculty's wishes. Deans were to recommend to us that the head be continued and if there were conditions imposed. In most cases we concurred with these recommendations. The reviews were

to be held after five years tenure for deans and for department heads. Hart also followed this practice. There were several times that department heads decided they did not want to go through the review and announced well in advance that they were stepping down as head. Others have left the positions even earlier than five years. With the more frequent changes of the heads or deans it is possible for a unit to go for more than five years for a review.

A summary of the results of the reviews for schools and departments were also shared with the Trustees, and it was indicated to them if the dean or head would be continuing in the position. While the faculty were most interested in a leadership review, these were to be for both leadership and programs. After consulting with the Chancellor, I wrote back to the school dean accepting the report of the dean for the departmental review. The first report accepted for a departmental review was for Biological and Agricultural Engineering. Since I retired, some faculty have told me that in a few occasional cases (I heard of none of these cases while I was Provost) some deans have not followed guidelines on the department head's review processes.

As Provost, I maintained a record of the reviews of the school deans and worked with the school deans to prepare a schedule for the review of the leadership and programs in their school. Dr. Downs maintained the list of departments and heads and maintained a record of their review status. He also prepared each year the letters that went to the school deans to remind them of the dates when a department head review should be made. He also worked with the senators who prepared the questionnaires that were to be filled out by the faculty in the schools for the dean's reviews. Later after Dr. Witherspoon joined the Provost Office, he assumed the role performed by Dr. Downs of maintaining the list of department heads and sending out to the deans the reminders of the departments that should be scheduled for review during the next year.

In the searches for faculty members, different departments used different procedures. Unlike when I was appointed without a visit to the campus, a visit by the leading faculty prospects came to be the expected thing. Usually the prospective faculty member presents a seminar and meets the faculty in a variety of ways. They are interviewed by a lot of administrators including someone from the Provost's Office. Departments then seek faculty input and make a recommendation for appointment to the department head, he to the dean and the dean to the Provost. Upon concurrence of the Provost and approval of the proposed salary, an offer is made to the candidate, contingent upon the approval of the Trustees and the BOG if tenure is to be awarded. If the offer is accepted, appointment papers are prepared in the department, sent to the dean and to the Provost who prepares the recommendation to the NCSU Trustees.

In 1984 Chancellor Poulton added an additional point to the approval of searches for academic officials. He indicated that to ascertain that the most qualified candidates are selected to fill administrative positions at the department head, director levels or above, search committees must be approved as in the current practice by the Provost or appropriate Vice Chancellor. Waivers which were being requested more frequently, would not be approved for Dean or Vice Chancellor positions. For other positions, a waiver may be approved only by the Chancellor and only in clearly justifiable circumstances, as when: 1) In academic departments, the department head retains his or her faculty position and the creation of a new salary line is not justified. 2) A clearly superior internal candidate may be promoted and a search will be conducted to fill the resulting vacancy.

Space Utilization and Allocation

One of the first assigned activities that Dean Shirley did was a classroom utilization study for the Board of Higher Education. This study included each classroom and the number of hours it was used each week and

the hours of the day that the classroom was used. Soon these studies were done annually by Institutional Research with the help of Student Affairs. Such studies were continued each year, and as computerization became available, they became much more complex.

Shortly after the first Board of Higher Education study, the Budget Bureau of the State hired a consultant to do a space utilization analysis. Shirley wrote to Caldwell and said, "In my best judgment, the report is tremendously disappointing; as far as being of any help either to this office or to a campus planner who must carry on the work started here, the report is not worth the paper it is printed on. Fundamentally, the report is meaningless because it fails to take into any account the dynamic nature of education. It poses a completely static situation which must assume that everything we are doing now is perfect and that no improvements in any way can be brought to pass. I suspect that this report is nothing more than might be expected when an industrial consultant firm, without any educational experience, tries to give all the answers. It appears that the results may get a classroom building for us, which we need, but I hope that the acceptance of the building space will not tie our hands on its design or its use."

Chancellor Caldwell assigned additional responsibility to the Dean of the Faculty for space allocation and planning. He said that the "Dean of the Faculty has the responsibility of assuring the best use of space on campus available for instruction and research. Accordingly, he has authority (1) to direct the allocation and reallocation of existing space, and (2) to stimulate, develop and review requests for additional academic space for recommendation to the Chancellor." In the exercise of this authority he was required to consult with and obtain the concurrence of the Business Manager with regard to fiscal implications and other elements bearing directly upon the responsibility of the Business Office for construction and maintenance of College property. Part of this directive was to reduce the authority

of the then Business Manager who seemed to report more directly to his superior at UNC than to the Chancellor.

The Provost's Office continued to perform the reallocation of space vacated by the completion of a new building on campus, but it was not a factor in setting the priorities for the decisions for new campus construction. I know that usually neither Kelly, Hart nor I were consulted before a decision was made on the priorities for new construction. Shirley reallocated the space to be vacated by units moving to new space after receiving requests for the space from units on campus. He got the approval of the Chancellor before making the allocations, of course. Studies to accomplish this function were handled first by Mr. Simpson, then by either Simpson or me, and later by Dr. Downs for the Provost.

When Kelly and I were Provosts, we considered this function to be very important. Our studies of vacated space were similar to those of Shirley's. We did this in 1970 for Tompkins Hall. At first it seemed that no one wanted this space; however, Liberal Arts was delighted to get it to relieve crowding in Harrelson Hall. In 1970 we were also considering the need for reassignment of space in Kilgore. It was quite likely that these studies would have meant that the Department of Horticulture would have received the space, which they did receive anyway. We were well into the hearings of other units and for Horticulture when Chancellor Caldwell wrote Dr. Kelly and said, "I wrote the attached memorandum in March 1965, and have not modified that position." This was in response to Kelly's concern when Dean James wrote him a memorandum saying that he did not feel that Agricultural Experiment Station appropriations could be used for the modification of space for other units. This following is what had happened.

In 1965 the Chancellor had written about Kilgore Hall, "The purpose of this memorandum is to freeze that space, placing it under the direct control of the Chancellor for allocation. It is necessary to make

this ruling now in order to forestall any unwise planning which may otherwise take place for the use of that space." He was referring to the space to be vacated by the School of Forestry when it got its new building. He sent copies widely but had not sent a copy to Kelly.

Inadvertently, however, I included an item in the capital improvements program for 1971 under the Agricultural Experiment Station which would provide for the renovation and equipment of the vacated forestry space for the Department of Horticulture. The purpose of this memorandum is to revert to and re-emphasize the purpose of my 1965 memorandum. The purpose and essence of that memorandum was simply to assert that every vacant space on the campus is needed by many departments and that any which occur must be reallocated in the light of all competing needs. I await with interest your recommendations regarding the space in Kilgore in which I am sure you will take account of all alternatives.

The Chancellor as usual had not informed Kelly of the capital improvements request. I then understood some of the animosity of the School of Agriculture and of my friends in Horticulture towards Dr. Kelly, for they had clearly understood that the Chancellor had already assigned the space to them. Now it appeared that the Provost was trying to take it away. Provost Kelly had us discontinue our studies of other space needs in relation to Kilgore Hall, and he recommended to the Chancellor that the space be assigned to the Horticulture Department.

In 1971, the Field House at old Riddick Stadium (which had housed the Recreation and Parks Department which had been transferred from the School of Education to the School of Forestry and was to become Recreation Resources Administration and was now housed in Biltmore Hall) was assigned to Business Affairs, for the Provost's Space Committee did consider administrative needs too. In 1972 the Provost wrote the

Chancellor concerning King Religious Center which was to be vacated and the space in Leazar Hall which had recently been vacated as a dining hall. The issue was whether his Space Committee should consider the needs of the community when non-academic space was vacated too. The Chancellor said that he had made promises for King and for portions of Leazar. He said, "So let the principle you requested stand approved but for the time being King and Leazar do not come to the Space Committee." In time a part of Leazar was assigned to the School of Design. Other portions were used by Business Affairs and other units for administrative purposes. Much later when Chancellor Poulton received permission to use lapsed salaries and other funds to make a major step to improve our instructional computing facilities and equipment, Mr. Worsley and I made a study of the facilities in Leazar Hall and recommended to the Chancellor that some of Design's space and some of the Administrative space assigned to functions which reported to Mr. Worsley be reassigned to the Department of Computer Science for computing laboratories.

The Provost became involved when there was a change in function or a reassignment in spaces that were already assigned to units. He also had to approve the requests for changes in the function of existing space and later for all renovations in space. Until this later function was assumed by the Provost, changes in function usually occurred when there was a desired renovation. Then it was too late to review the request for a change in function. When Shirley first began to reallocate space this was a hard function to perform, for the classrooms and other spaces were all assumed to be owned by a specific unit and if they wished to use the space for other functions they felt entitled to do so, no matter how much of the time a classroom might be used by other units. Even the assignment of classes of other departments had to be approved by the owning unit at this time. So if you began to use one of your departmental classrooms very little, then of course your unit would

look to that room for needed space for other functions. It was the classroom that was usually earmarked for elimination, and as we were growing rapidly in enrollment, we now needed to retain almost all of these as classrooms. It was much later that a position was added to the Registrar's Office to handle classroom assignments. At first this position used very careful approaches to get the maximum use out of the available classroom space. Units that had grown enormously over the years, such as Computer Science and Economics and Business, often might have none to very few classrooms assigned to them while others of long existence and declining enrollments might have a surplus. Therefore, teaching of their classes at the popular hours would be limited for the group of units who owned few classrooms. At any rate the Provost had to preserve the classrooms although he was only peripherally involved in classroom assignment.

On May 10, 1972, the Provost wrote a memorandum on "Classroom Assignments" which modified the priority exclusiveness of classrooms by the departmental owners. The new policy was as follows:

1. The present policy of reserving priority rooms will be adhered to until the initial printout of class registration.
2. If a class that was scheduled to be taught in a priority classroom has not materialized at the time of the initial printout of class registration, and a department cannot justify the holding of this classroom space through the add period, the classroom can be released for reassignment to another class by the Department of Registration and Records.
3. If the tentative enrollment is less than 50% of the seating capacity of a priority classroom, the room may be reassigned to another class with a larger tentative enrollment. In the event that a class is moved from a priority room, every effort will be made to reschedule the class in a

room suitable to the instructor of the class.

4. These considerations do not apply to laboratories or classrooms containing equipment purchased by funds from the proprietary department, provided the equipment cannot be readily moved or locked up.

This was a very important and major breakthrough and had the support of the Faculty Senate.

Later Chancellor Poulton reassigned the space function to Institutional Research; however, approval continued to be required by the Provost for any change in function. Some confusion existed about who had responsibility for studies and recommendations to the Chancellor for the reassignment of existing space. At a budget hearing, requests from CHASS and PAMS called for equipment for activities in Withers Hall, a building that had been submitted to UNC for inclusion in NCSU's Capital (a major building renovation or new construction) Budget Request. The Chancellor asked who had approved this allocation of space. I had never heard of it. In fact the Provost's Office had never, until this time, been involved in the decisions of what was to be included in the Capital Budget requests, and I did not even know that the building had been submitted in that request. Neither dean had discussed the matter with the Provost and had assumed that the approvals had been made since they knew that the request had been forwarded to the UNC system. My usual procedure, before making an assignment, had been to issue an announcement that space was to be vacated and to invite applications for the space from interested units. It had been assumed by Institutional Research that those two schools would get the space since based on their continuing studies these two schools needed the space worse than others. The Chancellor then assigned space reallocation to a committee composed of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business, and the Vice Chancellor for Research. Dr. Larry Gracie from Institutional Research would do the

research and staff studies as needed for this trio in preparing studies and making allocation recommendations to the Chancellor. We made a study and did submit our proposal, after study, for the reallocation of this space. It was almost identical to that planned earlier and it was approved by Chancellor Poulton. It is of interest that space in Withers Hall has been reassigned, but the funds from the State for renovations had not been funded when Hart's term as Provost expired in 1993. Because of the inability to get renovation funds, several changes have been made in the original assignments because the space without renovations was not always suited for the earlier assignments. We also recommended the use of space in Nelson and Clark Halls after the movement of the College of Textiles to its new facilities on Centennial Campus. The first proposal for space reallocation made by my replacement, Dr. Hart and associates for the use of space to be vacated in Patterson by Economics and Business did not get accepted as presented to Chancellor Monteith. It was returned to them for further study after one of the deans protested the proposed allocation vigorously. A new proposal was made and accepted, although I understand that neither of the participating deans were very satisfied with the newly proposed allocation. The reallocation of the space to be vacated by Economics and Business in the Hillsborough Building was accepted. Dr. Downs acted for the Provost on space modifications and helped to redesign the Facilities Modification Form and Procedures. Coordination of this process was transferred by Chancellor Poulton in 1988 to Dr. Larry Grove in Institutional Research, but the Provost's Office continued to approve all request for academic space including all request to modify classrooms or to change classrooms to other functions. Since classrooms were too small, these requests were rarely approved.

In 1958 Shirley and Vann had a disagreement over the use of classrooms by groups not affiliated with the University. It seemed that Shirley granted the use to some

group denied in prior years by Mr. Vann. Mr. Vann's concern dealt with insurance, security and maintenance. In this case Shirley clearly made the statement that he had responsibility for use and assignment of the classrooms and that he had made the assignment under previously agreed upon guidelines. This responsibility for assignments to outside groups, student and other university groups for meetings in classrooms got passed on to Student Affairs (Registration and Records) along with the responsibility of scheduling of the classrooms for courses. Departments continued to sponsor and to hold seminars and other meetings at night and at other times when classrooms were not in use for teaching courses. This was coordinated by Student Affairs. It became the policy that we would not let persons from outside the University schedule meetings in classroom space unless it was for a conference or a meeting sponsored by a unit of the University and approved by Student Affairs. Fortunately we soon had a Student Center and later a Continuing Education building which could be used for most of these purposes. These facilities reduced the need for classrooms except in unusual circumstance such as a national meeting of an academic organization which met from time to time on our campus in the summer. Some of these were also held in the Student Center, the McKimmon Center and at the Faculty Club. These latter two had the benefit of adequate parking space.

Committee on Committees

In 1960 Chancellor Caldwell said that the Dean of the Faculty would recommend to the Chancellor, after consultation with officers, deans, department heads, as appropriate, the faculty appointees to all regular committees and boards. He was to consult with the Chancellor on the naming of any special committees. Prior to the creation of the Committee on Committees, Provost Kelly would consult with the school deans, chairmen of committees, and others for the appointment of members to committees. When I joined Kelly's staff, Mr. Simpson and

I became the chief resource persons for committee membership. When others proposed members, we were expected to know responsibilities, the number of members a committee should have, and the constituencies that should be represented on the committee. The Provost sent the prepared lists for the Chancellor's approval. This practice continued until the Faculty Senate proposed the Committee on Committees. This became effective in 1968.

The Committee on Committees was to provide for broader input from the leadership of the Senate in the appointment of committees. Membership was to include the Assistant Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the past Chairman, the present Chairman, and the Vice Chairman of the Faculty Senate, with the Provost as Chairman. This did result in adding an additional level of knowledge and undoubtedly expanded the representation of different faculty members on University committees. Mr. Simpson became the staff person who met with the committee and kept past records of all faculty who had served on University committees and on which committees. He took the prepared lists of proposed members and reviewed these with school deans for suitability for serving for that particular year. He also checked with the Provost's Personnel Office to make sure that these person would be on campus the next year. He called those proposed to be the committee chairmen to assess their willingness to serve. He also scheduled the meetings of the Committee on Committees.

Later we developed a computer readable questionnaire to determine interest of all EPA personnel in serving on each of the many University-wide committees. Mr. Simpson handled the distribution of the questionnaire, got the completed questionnaires run on the administrative computer and provided each committee member with a print-out listing faculty interest (by committee and alphabetically by faculty member with departmental and school assignment shown). It also showed us how many years a person had been on a specific committee,

for an interest of the Committee on Committees was to change most committee members after a service period of from three to four years. Mr. Simpson also called each committee chairman and the administrator who served the committee as a staff person or the vice chancellor to whom the committee reported, and inquired about the participation of each member during the past year. This process enabled us to utilize faculty interest and definitely expanded the number of different faculty who served. We also increased the turnover of members on committees. Because of my early involvement on committee appointments as Assistant Provost, Dr. Kelly would not let the Committee on Committees meet when I could not be there, or if I was late to a meeting he never let the committee start its business until I arrived. When I became Provost, Dr. Downs and Dr. Clark rotated membership each year on this committee.

One additional charge to the Committee on Committees was to review the charge of the committees each year, to review all proposed changes in responsibility that might come from the committee or from others, and to make recommendations in the charges to the committees to the Chancellor. Mr. Simpson then prepared these recommendations and a listing of proposed committee members for review and acceptance by the Chancellor. Mr. Simpson did all of this and prepared the letters of appointment for the Chancellor's signature. After Mr. Simpson's retirement Dr. Downs assumed Simpson's responsibilities to the Committee on Committees.

In 1988 the Faculty Senate decided to take a serious look at the ex-officio members of the committees who should not be eligible to vote. A proposal of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee of the Faculty Senate was that all ex-officio members of University standing committees have voting privileges except those ex-officio members who were representing the administrative office (i.e., Chancellor or vice chancellor to whom the committee submitted its recommendations).

This proposal was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the Committee on Committees and approved by the Chancellor. A copy dated April 22, 1988, has been placed in the Archives. It may also be found in the Provost's files. This document lists all the ex-officio members of standing committees and lists those who vote and those who aren't eligible to vote. For example, the Associate Provost representing the Provost on the Courses and Curriculum committee would not be eligible to vote. In this case Simpson, Downs and I had never voted on issues anyway, but on many committees similar representatives had voted earlier.

Although it was stated that the Dean of the Faculty would serve on all committees, the Provost served on: The Committee on Committees, the Retired Faculty Committee, the Liaison Committee, the Administrative Council, the Deans Council, the Faculty Senate and was represented by staff on a large number of others but not on all of the University's standing committees.

In 1964 there were a number of people who indicated they had not known that they were rotated off of the committee. So for several years the Provost wrote all those who were not reappointed and thanked them for their service. After a few years this method of informing was dropped, for the Committee on Committees changed the process, and we sent a questionnaire to faculty and other EPA employees requesting their desire or preferences to serve on committees, and we began to systematically replace members after three to four years of service on most committees. We still had complaints from individuals who said that we kept the same persons on committees and that they never got selected. The effort to limit the terms to 3 to 4 years helped; however, we still had committees that very few seemed to want to serve on and others that hundreds wanted. There were more persons too, who served more frequently from the smaller schools, especially Design, for we had a need on many committees to have each school represented.

Institutional Studies and Planning

We have done long range planning forever in one form or another, I suppose. Shirley frequently referred to the formal and extensive Long Range Report of 1957. There have been many other specific studies which involved the Dean of the Faculty or the Provost in planning activities, projections and plans for new degree programs, schools, departments, growth, and enrollments.

Institutional Studies were done in both Student Affairs and in certain facets of the University's budgetary and physical plant activities by the Business Office. Many studies were done in the Dean of the Faculty's Office by utilizing different but, in time, each member of the Provost's staff. They were done at first under Shirley by Kenneth Topfer. Except for personnel matters these were done under Kelly, at first by William Simpson, and after 1967 by both Mr. Simpson and me. In 1970 we had been given a position by the Board of Higher Education, and Dr. Clauston Jenkins was hired as Coordinator for Institutional Studies and Planning. He left the University in 1973 and was replaced by Dr. Marvin Gehle. Both of their responsibilities are described in more detail in the section in Chapter One which handles the duties of Assistants to, Assistant and Associate Provosts.

In 1974 the UNC system began to undertake the most comprehensive Long Range Planning ever done by the UNC system, at least since 1955. This was to be updated at frequent intervals and to be redone at least on a five year cycle. Important portions of this were the "Mission Statement" for each campus, enrollment projections for each campus and a cataloging of current and proposed new degrees and of new and existing academic and other units, including centers and institutes. Associated with this were some major new budgetary definitions for personnel. It was just before this time that Mr. Worsley and I helped to get the department heads and the assistant and associate deans categorized as other than in the "Teaching and Depart-

mental Research" faculty lines which counted in the student/faculty formula. Dean Jackson Rigney was appointed to head up and coordinate the NCSU long range study and plans and to prepare the report. For this purpose he reported to the Chancellor and for his International activities he reported to the Provost.

In 1976 when Gehle left NCSU, I felt that the position could accomplish more if it were combined with the other positions in Institutional Research that were reporting to Vice Chancellor Talley in Student Affairs. We were all developing data bases that were not integrated, and at times even in different computer languages. So the position was transferred along with the secretary. This meant that we were now using the same programming languages in the two units and our data elements became more compatible. Eventually, along with Business Affairs, we came to have an integrated data base at NCSU.

In 1984 Chancellor Poulton felt that Institutional Research (IR) would be more sensitive and responsive to his needs if the unit reported to him. So it began to report to him. It was in this same year that Dr. Richard Howard was hired as Director of Institutional Research. The data that he was responsible for included: students, personnel and facilities. I don't know whether IR was more responsive, but the Chancellor required much more data generation and reports than had been the practice of earlier Chancellors. At first my staff felt that the unit was not as responsive to our needs after this transfer, not because of reluctance to work with us, but because the IR staff was overloaded. Almost as soon as Monteith became Chancellor he required Institutional Research to report to the Provost.

In a short while, but after I retired and after Richard Howard the Director of Institutional Research left NCSU, Institutional Research and the Planning Office, which also was established under Chancellor Poulton and had reported to him since its beginning, were merged under the leadership of Karen Helm. Helm had been in that

position since it was first established. Over the years the Provost had worked closely and collaboratively with the Planning Office which had consisted of Helm and a part-time clerical position for most of this time. Helm was given a number of other and, at times almost full-time, assignments from time to time. So the planning function did not get as much attention as it needed during these periods.

In 1992 the Offices of Institutional Research and University Planning were merged in order to reduce duplication of effort and to provide better support for institutional assessment which was an emerging function. The new Office of University Planning and Analysis (UPA) reported to the Provost. In 1993 UPA's responsibility for facilities data was transferred to Vice Chancellor Worsley in order to consolidate all space-related planning and management functions. UPA is now responsible for insti-

tutional research, planning and assessment. Since the mid-1980s, UPA and its predecessors have achieved the following:

- a) development of an on-going strategic and operational planning process that is tied to budgeting;
- b) integration of student personnel, financial, and facilities data bases and development of electronically transmitted extract databases for campus users; and
- c) development of student outcomes assessment plans in every academic department.

The newly combined unit was assigned by the Chancellor to report to Provost Hart. The combination of these two units under the leadership of Helm and its reporting to the Provost has demonstrated that it was a very wise move.

CHAPTER SIX

OTHER UNITS AND ACTIVITIES

Computer Center

In 1959 Shirley advised the Chancellor to appoint a College Computer Committee. The Computer Committee was appointed by Caldwell with J. A. Rigney as chairman. At this time the computer was managed by the Statistics Department. This was a first step by the college administration to affirm that computing was a college-wide activity. On February 4, 1960, Dean Lampe wrote the Chancellor that funds were needed to put UNIVAC I into operation. There were no other details in this memorandum. In 1960 the UNC Board of Trustees approved a purchase of a UNIVAC computer for NCSC. A UNIVAC Solid State 80 Computer from Remington Rand was ordered on August 22, 1960, for NCSC. It had a discount of \$265,000 and a net cost to the College of \$220,000. On March 23, 1960, the Computer Committee made a report and recommended that the Dean of PSAM (Menius) not the Dean of the Faculty (Shirley) be the agents responsible for a proposed new Computer Department and the appointment of a person as Head of the Department and Director of Computing. This meant that campus-wide computing would report to the Dean of PSAM, and it did for several years. Caldwell directed Shirley to draw up plans for a Computer Department. It was not to be an instructional department, but it was to be a college-wide service department. In 1961 Caldwell wrote to Mr. Graves Vann, the Business Manager, indicating that when the order for the UNIVAC was canceled (with no indication why) he understood that the plans for the use of overhead funds for the purchase of the computer was also dropped by Mr. Vann. He indicated that while negotiations with IBM had not been pinned down, that a grant proposal was to be sent to NSF, and that the need for overhead funds would continue and would be no less than \$190,000. On June 16, 1961, it had

been learned that the NSF proposal for that computer was not funded, but the Chancellor requested permission to go ahead with the approval process for a basic or minimum installation of an IBM 1410 Data Processing System. Required approvals included UNC, the Advisory Budget Commission and the State Department of Administration.

On July 29, 1960, the Chancellor sent out a memorandum that defined more specific policies concerning the use and payment of computer time by departments to Deans, Directors and Department Heads. At this time we had an IBM 650. A key item in the memorandum was that all uses were to be paid for, except for 20 hours per week allocated for teaching and for unsponsored research. At this time the Agricultural Experiment station paid for 20 hours per week. It was stated that program development and writing was the responsibility of the user, but laboratory staff would give general guidance to users in writing programs. The laboratory staff could help more, but the laboratory would be reimbursed for such writing of programs. The use of the various machines in the Computing Laboratory required additional payment. Computing was to be done at this time on a first come first served basis. The memo reminded the deans and department heads that research proposals that planned for use of the computer should include specifically budgeted funds for this purpose. Caldwell said, "We have operated the computer center to date without State funds, and we desire at present to continue to operate on this basis knowing that ample funds can be obtained through grants if proper charges are billed and paid." Although computer usage was growing, it is evident that we were really innocents at this time about how important the computer would become in research, teaching, extension and administration at NCSU.

In 1961 a special committee was asked to look at how NCSC's computing needs could best be met, and it recommended that the existing computing facilities and activities be separated from the Department of Statistics but kept in the School of PSAM. It was just before this time the Chancellor requested through the President that NCSC be permitted to buy an IBM 1410 Data Processing System. This would replace the IBM 650 which was overloaded. In the meantime the UNC system had obtained a UNIVAC 1105. NCSC's computing needs had been described in the justification for this equipment. These needs had been described in the justifying of its purchase as an asset to NCSC, but in reality, according to information in several memoranda, it was incompatible with the NCSC's IBM equipment. On the NCSC campus the purchase of the 1105 had been viewed with suspicion and fear that this equipment exceeded the UNC system's needs so much that we would be slowed appreciably in the acquisition of equipment and facilities to meet needs for the development of our computing capability and capacity. Shirley wrote that NCSC would be expected to "pull Whyburn's chestnuts out of the fire."

On September 25, 1961, the Director of the State Department of Administration rescinded our request for the purchase an IBM 1410 computer, but it did approve our revised request for renting an IBM 1410. This began a process for us of renting or lease-purchasing computers frequently on the NCSU campus. We were able to stretch our resources and to get more powerful equipment this way than we could have through purchases with the funds in hand.

In 1962 Shirley recommended that David Mason replace Rigney (now assigned to off-campus activities) on the Computer Laboratory and the Computer Advisory Committees as Chairman. Also in 1962 the UNC System's Computing Center was placed under the responsibility of the UNC-Chapel Hill campus administration. This was an important development because each cam-

pus could now develop its own computing equipment rather than having a UNC-wide computer center.

On June 15, 1962, Chancellor Caldwell announced that we had a grant from NIH which provided for the next four years for approximately 50% of the usage of our computer operation and including all of the analyses performed by the biological sciences faculty. He then said, "To put it another way, NIH has made this grant with the understanding that all computer work in the Computing Center on the high speed machines required by the life sciences at State College is being underwritten." In 1962 the Computer still resided in the Institute of Statistics. A major grant for computer equipment was funded for Statistics to support computing, and discussion centered around whether the purchase should be for digital or analog equipment.

In 1963 the Computing Center was moved from the west wing of the cafeteria, (Leazar Hall), to the basement of Nelson Hall "for the next two years." Of course it stayed there many years. The Computer Laboratory Advisory Committee proposed, among a number of other recommendations, that we request state funding for 50% of the total budget of the Computing Center. The Chancellor responded: "Unfortunately, funds for such an undertaking are not available at this time. However, it is hoped that sometime in the days ahead additional consideration will be given to gain support for this request." In 1964, \$60,000 from lapsed salaries or other reversions for instructional costs was requested from the State Budget Officer to help fund the Computing Center for 1965.

In 1964 there was a request to network the National Register Records Center with the 1410 in the NCSU Computing Center. This national scientific manpower records program began to use the NCSU computers on December 7, 1965. This led to a tie with this NSF activity for many years until the Register moved back to Washington from Raleigh.

In 1964 there was a plan to exchange the 1410 for an IBM 360. On April 1, 1964, Darrell Shreve was listed as Director of the Computing Center. I saw no notes of his appointment or resignation. Later that same spring of 1964, David Reid became Acting Director of the Computing Center, and T. W. Della became Acting Assistant Director. On May 1, 1965, Paul Edwin Lewis became Director of the Computing Center and Professor of Mathematics.

In 1965 the School of Engineering had an IBM 1620 which it had obtained earlier from a grant from NSF. James Ferrell was the Director of the Engineering School Computer Facility. They announced in their planning report of March 9, 1965, that they would use the 1620 for one additional year and replace it with a remote console for operation with the campus 360.

In 1965 very serious planning was under way to develop a Research Triangle Universities Computations Center. Dr. James Ferrell, a Professor of Chemical Engineering at NCSU, was the chairman of the committee which planned for and fathered TUCC. This innovation provided for NCSU's computing needs at reasonable costs, mostly on IBM equipment, almost until the date I retired. It was a resource that provided large mainframe computing over many generations of computers for UNC-Chapel Hill, Duke University, NCSU and the Research Triangle Institute. Many others used this computer less frequently. I shall not discuss the operation of TUCC, but our Director of the Computing Center, the Business Manager (or VC for Finance and Business) and the Chairman of our Computing Center Advisory Committee played major roles in the further development and in planning the programs of TUCC. They served as NCSU's representatives on the TUCC Advisory Board. The Provost was much involved since the recommendations from TUCC came through the Provost to the NCSU campus. On November 12, 1965, Dr. Ferrell became the first President of TUCC and was on leave from NCSU. We were all fortu-

nate that he served in this role for he got TUCC off on a very sound basis. In 1966 NCSU got a grant of \$500,000 for participation in TUCC. A draft of the By-Laws of TUCC dated December 15, 1965, was circulated and studied on the three campuses. They were approved with minor changes early in 1966.

In a memorandum to Deans, Directors and Department Heads in 1966 Dr. Kelly addressed the relationship of TUCC to the NCSU campus. He stated that we had a Computing Center on our campus under the direction of Dr. Paul Lewis who reports to Dean Menius for administrative matters with a campus-wide Computer Center Advisory Committee. Their role was to serve as an advisory group on policy matters relating to computing and to act on any appeals from the decisions of the Director regarding scheduling and other computer activities involving teaching and research activities of the faculty.

When established at NCSU, the Administrative Computing Services reported through the Director of the Computing Center. Academic and administrative computing used the same computer and much of the same systems and operational staff for computer operations. It was decided that the Director of Computing would report to the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean for Student Affairs and the Business Manager and that they would run Administrative Computing Services together. Since the needs of the Dean of the Faculty were of a lower priority than those of Business and Student Affairs at this time, the Dean of the Faculty would chair the group. This group came to be known as the Troika. Later after Chancellor Poulton came, the administrative computing function was instructed to report to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business. This function now reports through the Director of the Budget Office to that Vice Chancellor.

On September 1, 1967, The Chancellor approved the appointment of Dr. Kevin Jones as Acting Director of the Computing Center, reporting to the Provost. Policies

and Procedures for University Computing were described in a memorandum from the Chancellor to the Deans, Directors and Department Heads on May 3, 1967. They were as follows:

The Computing Center is established to serve the computing needs of the entire University.

The Computing Center Advisory Committee has campus-wide responsibility; however, this Committee serves as an advisory group on policy matters relating to computing and the Computer Center. Further, it reviews all requests for acquisition of any digital computing facility on this campus and makes recommendations to the Chancellor with the view of maintaining adequate support for the Computing Center and equitable distribution of such equipment for teaching, research, and service users. Also, the Committee acts on any appeals from the decisions of the Director of the Computing Center regarding scheduling and other computer activities.

I. General Responsibilities of Computing Center

In order to clarify University computational policy, the following areas of responsibility are assigned to the Computing Center:

1. Operation and maintenance of all equipment on the NCSU campus associated with the TUCC complex. This includes all terminals on this campus tied to the central facility in the Research Triangle.
2. Review periodically the use and maintain liaison with computing installations on the campus not directly associated directly with the TUCC complex. Provide and maintain appropriate computer software necessary for efficient usage of the computer facilities.
3. Provide technical information to support training, research, and business applications on the computer.
4. Furnish key punching services for faculty members who use the computer in research projects. Within the limits of the budget, this service will also be provided for graduate students.
5. Maintain appropriate controls over the work done in the computers to insure efficient operation within the limits of the Computing Center Budget.
6. Maintain proper accounting and statistical records for financial and budgetary purposes.
7. Handle all pertinent communication with the staff at the central TUCC facility and be responsible for all contacts with IBM and the telephone company regarding installation and maintenance of equipment.
8. Determine appropriate 'rates' to be charged for computing facilities. These rates may vary according to usage and basic operating costs.
9. Until a department of Computer Science or some other academic mechanism is established, the Computing Center shall accept responsibility of training and instruction in the basic computer languages within the limitations of available personnel.

The memorandum goes on to describe operational policy in terms of remote terminal management and programming. It describes procedures for obtaining computer time, Computer Center Information Services, the facilities and the financial support of University computing. Among the financial support items was this statement: ASince computing on the scale planned for NCSU is very expensive, it is very important that every proposal for research requiring computer usage include requests for funds to support this computation. The staff of the Computing Center is available to help make cost estimates for computational programs. Since this last directive did not bring in the needed soft money resources, in 1972 it was required that all proposals that included computing

needs be routed through the Director of the Computing Center for review and approval of its requested computational funds. In time, since the persons with grant support often tried to use departmental computational resources first, the Computer Center had to establish a more rigorous system to make certain that grant funds were used to pay for computing. When the Computing Center was transferred to the Provost, an academic Department of Computer Science was created and Paul Lewis became the Acting Head of Computer Science at this time. Kevin Jones became the Acting Director of the Computing Center. In 1968 Jones became Director.

On June 20, 1968, the Provost wrote to the deans and department heads indicating a policy change in computer usage. He stated: "Since the inception of an electronic computer center on the University campus in 1956, it has been the policy of the University to provide computing services for as many activities as required whether or not the activity had funds available. It is the desire of the University to continue this policy. However, increasing demands in the University's computing capacity make it necessary that the policy concerning unsponsored computing be modified." This meant that the Computing Center moved to a system of accounting for the non-paying projects. It also began to give paying projects a higher priority to encourage the use of these funds. The process was to divide the funds which supported non-paying projects by departments and to establish accounts for the departmental users. The users then had to acquire an allocation from the department before using the computer. This system with many modifications continues to be used.

In 1968 the equipment that could be classified as calculators were discontinued from the practice of requiring the Director's and the Chancellor's approvals for purchase.

In 1970 Dr. LeRoy B. Martin was appointed Assistant Provost and Director of the Computing Center. Dr. Kelly said:

The principle role of the Assistant Provost will be to assist the Provost in the review, planning, and coordination of the growth and the development of the over-all data processing capability of the University. Through appropriately designated managers, he will be responsible for the general management of computing and data processing service activities, for rate setting, for the control of computing equipment and personnel to staff computer service activities. Whenever possible, he will provide assistance to departments in defining and achieving their computing needs.

The memo stated he was to assist in presenting proposals for the purchase of equipment to the Advisory Committee. It stated:

He will attempt to insure that a well rounded presentation is made from the standpoint of costs, budget capabilities, cost-benefit advantages, alternative facilities, and impact on the general computing capacity of the University. He will also be responsible for the operations of the office of Administrative Computing Services which is dedicated to providing systems analysis and programming services for the Office of the Provost, the Business Office, and the Division of Student Affairs. In this function he reports to the Provost, the Business Manager and the Dean of Student Affairs.

In 1971 at the request of the Computer Advisory Committee, a change was made to have the Assistant Provost serve as an ex-officio member of the Advisory Committee and to have him make the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for computer purchases to the Provost instead of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

In 1972 the procedure which came into practice for the purchase of major computing equipment was complicated. A faculty member had an idea or a need and the department head approved it so a purchase plan was proposed. If funds were available

the plan then went to the school dean or his agent for approval for the plan and for the use of funds. The plan then went to the Assistant Provost for Computing and he sent it to the University Advisory Computing Committee. The Committee or the Assistant Provost might make suggestions to the unit about modifications or alternatives. If they recommended approval, the Provost then would approve of the purchase and send the letter drafted by the Assistant Provost to the originating dean or VC. The proposal then went to the NCSU Purchasing Department and then through channels to the State Purchasing Office. Here it usually got sent to a computer group in the Department of Administration and if the equipment was to be used for business transactions, it was also reviewed by the Auditor's Office. This was a long and cumbersome process and the faculty protested vigorously about the length of time required to make a computer purchase. Others said that the State seemed to have confidence in NCSU's on-campus process and that NCSU's requests got approved more frequently downtown and the approvals came faster and with less difficulty than other campuses. At this time all computer purchases had to go through the on-campus process. It was soon after this that we decided that dumb terminals should be exempted from the on-campus review. To my surprise I found in the files that I was still approving some dumb terminal purchases in 1976. These approvals were discontinued before the end of 1976.

On July 1, 1973, Dr. Martin's title was changed from Assistant to Associate Provost for University Computing.

In 1974 the University Systems Analysis and Control Center (USAAC) was transferred by PAMS to University Computing and began to report to Dr. Martin. At that time we did not have full-time persons associated with this center. We established a Faculty Advisory Board from the among the users. Later we also created a position for a Director of USAAC. In May of 1975, a system of procedures for acquiring USACC services and facilities by NCSU faculty and staff users

was established. An announcement of the facilities and services available through the University Systems Analysis and Control Center was made. The project, was described as follows:

A project was undertaken at North Carolina State University to determine the economic and technical feasibility of establishing, as a part of a computer network, a centralized computer system to monitor laboratory equipment and experiments on a time-shared basis. The goals of this project were to determine the effectiveness of sharing data acquisition resources and to determine the practical extent to which a computer network can bring the computing power of a large scale system into research and educational laboratories. This is an interdisciplinary agency on the NCSU campus which provides access to small scale special purpose computer systems for faculty and students. USACC also provides computer based analog and digital data acquisition and analysis for various laboratory sites.

This facility served many specialized users for many years. In time it had several names and during Hart's tenure it was transferred to the College of Forest Resources as the Computer Graphics Center.

On January 17, 1975, the 370/135 was installed, and by early 1977 we were considering several IBM or IBM compatible computers for a replacement. Because of the speed and capacity and price, we did in time get the ITEL AS-4. This computer in turn would be replaced with a larger IBM model.

In 1976 we dropped the title of Director of the Computing Center from the title of Dr. Martin and made Richard Usanis, Director of the Computing Center and Leo Buckmaster, Director of Administrative Computer Services. Both continued to report to Dr. Martin. In 1983 Carl W. Malstrom replaced Dr. Usanis. Martin continued on the TUCC Board.

On September 1976, a memorandum which superseded the 1967 Policy and

Procedures for University Computing was issued by Chancellor Thomas:

The Provost, as principle academic officer, has the responsibility and authority over utilization, acquisition, and allocation of all computing resources. The University Computing Council, consisting of top administrators, assists the Provost in developing broad policies and effective use of available resources. The University Advisory Committee for Computer Affairs is a University Standing Committee which makes recommendations to the Provost on all computing matters.

The Associate Provost for University Computing assists the Provost in reviewing, planning, and coordinating growth and development of computing capabilities.

This memorandum describes the responsibilities of the Computing Center, the funding for computer usage, TUCC, USACC, and special-purpose computer installations.

It also describes the acquisition of computing facilities.

Any proposal for the acquisition of computing equipment or terminals must be approved by the appropriate dean. It should then be forwarded to the Chairman of the University Computer Advisory Committee for Computer Affairs and to the Assistant Provost for University Computing. Guidelines concerning acquisition of computer equipment were established by the Provost on October 11, 1971, and may be found in the manual 'Guidelines for Proposal Preparation and Application Procedure' which was distributed by the Vice Provost and Dean for Research. After approval by the Provost, equipment could be acquired following the regular procedures of the Purchasing Department.

Since many proposals for data processing devices ultimately lead to increased need for large scale computing, every effort should always be made to secure funding to support use of the Computing Center-TUCC complex.

As is evident, we were still thinking of computing more from a centralized than from a distributive manner. However, we were not as rigorous and were beginning to encourage more and more distributed computer purchases. By 1978 we had delegated approvals for minicomputers, microprocessors or peripheral devices that cost less than \$2,500 to the dean with a copy to go to the Computing Center for inventory purposes.

On December 13, 1983, a special committee appointed by the Chancellor reported on its Study of Computer Literacy and Accessibility at North Carolina State University. This was a very important study. It made 35 recommendations. Its findings were that both faculty and students in most areas were not as literate as the demands of their fields dictated. This report was a base for many years of efforts by units or groups of units to improve and advance literacy on computers. It also led to a major attempt to make personal computers accessible to the faculty. A large number of PCs were purchased so that most faculty could gain access. It also led to further literacy studies in many units.

In 1984 Henry Schaffer became Assistant Provost and later Associate Provost for Computing. By this time we had reached the stage that personal computers had become so efficient and cheap that we realized soon there would be a computer on every faculty member's desk. By June 30, 1993, this was almost true. Most computing on campus was now being done on the PC. So during the eighties we had moved from a centralized large mainframe type of environment in computing to a networked distributed type. By this time approvals for computers required by the Associate Provost for Computing included only those things whose purchase required approval from State governmental offices.

In this environment networking became increasingly important. It had become very important earlier when we had moved the Computing Center from Nelson Hall to the Hillsborough Building. At this time any computers south of Hillsborough Street had

to go by telephone line to the telephone company units downtown and were then sent back to the mainframe computers in the Hillsborough building. This increased our telephone bills and the associated costs for computing for all units on campus substantially. It became imperative that a line be laid under Hillsborough street to connect the computers on the campus to the mainframe just across the street. The mainframe computer in the Hillsborough Building was our connecting link with TUCC. At this time we were connected with TUCC via telephone lines. It was a major improvement in service and speed of computing when we connected to TUCC via microwaves.

In time the State purchased a Super Computer. This was located at the Microelectronics Center of North Carolina in the Research Triangle Park. Linkage and access was through our on-campus Computing Center. When the Super Computer first came, only a few faculty, students and staff could use it. Today it is used by many, and calculations and functions can be made that were only dreamed about a few years ago. Today most large number crunching projects use this facility, and far more are using it than was visualized when we went all out to get the funds appropriated for the facility. We knew that it would be important in the future but not so important this soon.

Most computing in 1993 was done on the PC, which can do much more than was ever dreamed when the Computing Center was a responsibility of mine, at least by me. I knew very little about computing, but I soon learned that there is a jargon that the computing types used to frustrate and confuse the remainder of us. I also learned that if you persisted you could get a report, even verbally, which you could understand. This sometimes required considerable persistence. Martin and Schaffer were great in interpreting this jargon for me. Hart's relationship to and understanding of the jargon was better than mine. I found this part of my job somewhat frustrating for in

one year's budget we obtained only a part of the funds which I was told were essential for us to have an effective computing service. This scene repeated itself every biennium under Kelly, Hart and me. We now seemed to be even further behind than we were before, but we continued to make progress and to improve. It caused creative genius and great ingenuity and imagination on the people involved in this operation for us to get as far as possible on an inadequate computing budget. Sometimes we even went in better directions on less money. The resource needs in the area cannot be satiated.

In 1988 Duke and UNC-CH decided they no longer needed TUCC. This was a very bad time for NCSU. We did not have the immediate resources to replace the lost computing capacity. We had gotten more computing for the dollar through TUCC than through any other mechanism. Although times were hard and State budgets tight and were soon to start declining, we began to look at a variety of ways to overcome our large scale computing deficiencies. It was just before this time and before I retired, that the VAX became more and more used on campus. At one time it looked as if every unit on campus had one or two or were going to get their first VAX. Too, the PC had become a far more powerful instrument, and the VAX units on campus plus the increased computer literacy of the faculty and their use of more powerful PCs made the deficiency of the loss of TUCC less a tragedy than we first thought. Many of these PCs were networked to the VAXs and to other larger mainframes. We owe Henry Schaffer, the Computing Center and Administrative Computing staffs a great many thanks for taking us through those trying times.

By this time networking had become as important as the computers. Many years ago Dr. Leroy Martin and Mr. Charles Braswell, Director of the Physical Plant and their staffs began to plan to network all of the campus buildings. This was a slow pro-

cess because it came from wise use of existing funds and without a special networking appropriation, and was of course encouraged by Mr. Worsley and me. We had several extremely competent persons led by Samuel Averitt involved in developing and carrying out these plans. It started with coaxial cable and today utilizes fiberglass cable. The Physical Plant and the Computing Center budgets covered the costs of getting the cable to the buildings, but it was the responsibility of the academic unit's budgets to get the wiring done inside the buildings. Today I understand that the wiring is complete to all buildings and that most faculty are connected through this method rather than through modems and the telephone lines.

I neglected to mention the numbers or the names of the computers, mostly IBM types that we had in the later years as our main resources for centralized computing in the Computing Center. For most of this time the administrative and academic computing were done on the same mainframes with the same maintenance and supporting staff for the mainframe. This enabled us to stretch our resources further than most universities and to get reasonable service to both areas.

Another area I did not mention earlier was the almost desperate need that we had for computers for the students for instructional purposes. Departments received allocations from the Computing Center and accounts for instructional computing. For many years the Computing Center maintained computer laboratories for student uses. Later with the advent of the PC and our inability to get the resources to maintain enough large computer laboratories, plus the problem of space to house these laboratories, the schools and departments began to develop their own computer laboratories and to equip them with PCs networked to VAXs, or to other larger computers. With the ever increasing power of the PC and the associated requirements of computing in classes, we could stay just a little behind in meeting our computing needs by leaving this to the schools and trying very hard in

the change budget process and through computer class fees to get additional resources for these activities. When Chancellor Poulton first came to NCSU, our laboratories in Computer Science taught basic computing to almost all students, and they had insufficient laboratories. Chancellor Poulton with Worsley's advice and help undertook a mission to get Governor Hunt to let us use a large amount of lapsed salaries and other funds that we would have to revert to the State to devote to the development of a laboratory in the east wing of Leazar Hall. The space was taken away from the School of Design, with some anguish for Design administrators, students and faculty, but the resources to purchase and sort of catch ourselves up came through that massive effort. While others were involved, Poulton deserves much of the credit here. To help with the funding of instructional computing, we instituted the lab fee for classes which used the computer. These funds were then sent back to the units to help pay for the costs, but they were not adequate. Later Engineering was able to charge a \$100 computer fee for each student. I understand that since 1993, other computer fees have also been increased. Fee increases are not easy to impose because they require approvals beyond the NCSU campus.

In 1993 William E. Willis replaced Schaffer as Associate Provost for University Computing. Malstrom continues as Director of the Computing Center and Buckmaster as Director of Administrative Computing.

Library

One of the first assignments of responsibility to the Dean of the Faculty was the Library. In 1958-59 Dean Shirley appointed the Library Committee. This practice changed and the Chancellor began to appoint all committees, but the Dean of the Faculty made or reviewed the recommendations for academic or faculty members on all standing committees. The Director of the Library was formally placed under the Dean of the Faculty for management purposes on

October 23, 1964, and reported to Dean Kelly. When I was appointed Assistant Provost in 1967, the Director began to report to me (technically it still reported to the Provost).

In 1964 Chancellor Caldwell reported that the Consolidated Council had agreed that the Librarians at all of the campuses would be EPA personnel and that they were to have the status and privileges of faculty. This had been partially in practice at NCSU but did not include some privileges such as off-campus scholarly assignments. Cahill, in supporting the issue on status for librarians, sent the following statement to Dr. Kelly: "It should be recognized that the librarian's own job is a full time counseling and teaching responsibility of a special kind. Teaching shall be interpreted to mean the kind of teaching, either group or individual, direct or indirect, that a professional librarian does." When I became Provost I indicated that the librarians and other EPA personnel on permanent appointments were eligible for off-campus scholarly assignments as were those employees with faculty rank. It was not until April 12, 1990, that we were able to make the TIAA-CREF retirement option available to librarians.

I recall that in 1972 the library staff wanted us to permit fines to recalcitrant faculty members. Most faculty were very good about the need for sharing the Library's resources, were considerate of others and returned books when they were due. They sometimes kept books out by renewing them for several years if they needed the books for a class or a constant reference, especially if there were no others who needed the books. There were a very few faculty, however, who weren't so considerate. The decision was not to impose the fines, but in this one case a faculty member had books that others needed and had tried to check out. He would not return the books or make them available to others. He received several reminders from the Library staff that the books were overdue and were needed by others. Dr. Kelly suggested that another reminder be sent. After several

additional reminders the books had not been returned seven months later. As Assistant Provost I talked to the faculty member, and he told me that the university should provide him with these books and that he had no intention of returning them. Incidentally he had 27 books checked out that had been overdue for years. This posed a real dilemma because we wanted to retain the very liberal lending policies for faculty, but we could not permit our library holdings to become inaccessible to others. Dr. Kelly again got into the act of trying to get the books back. In the end we decided that we would garnish the faculty member's wages for the replacement cost of these books. We told Director Littleton to tell him this, and the books were returned. The faculty member wrote Dr. Kelly and said that he was returning the books since he didn't need them anymore. This was the worst example I recall of overdue books, which is rather miraculous for such a large University with so many students and faculty.

While our library has many collections, it is very well known for its entomological collections among others. These entomological collections set a precedent for the library to make other collections. In 1956, the Z. P. Metcalf family was thanked for the Metcalf collection which contained much taxonomic data as well as Metcalf's collection of taxonomic notes, his books and journals. This is an unduplicated world resource. Again on October 28, 1958, with Shirley's strong support, President Friday gave approval to purchase another major entomological collection, and he permitted the library to spend its own funds for additional materials in the entomological collection. This was a precedent setting decision, and in the years while Kelly and I were Provosts we could make such a decision at NCSU, if we had the resources, without having to get the President's approval. In later years Clyde Smith's notes, descriptions, and library on aphids, which is another world taxonomic resource was added to the entomological collection. Clyde Smith as well as the Metcalf's heirs gave their materi-

als to the library. They are now housed in the Special Collections portion of Archives.

When the Triangle Research Libraries Network was formed, the Provosts became members of the governing board. Most of the work of the network was done by the TRLN staff, by the staff of the libraries at Duke, UNC-CH and NCSU and by the Directors of the three campus libraries. The Law and Medical Libraries at the other two campuses are also members. The Provosts of the three institutions were important members of the Executive Committee of TRLN and each served as chairman on a two-year rotating basis. I was chairman for one term, Hart also served. Since before I had become Provost there had been close collaboration between the three campuses in library activities including circulation, accessibility to each libraries' resources and collaboration in the purchase of specialized journals and other library materials including monographs. The first proposal that I found in the files involving collaboration in collections was in a letter from President Eden of Duke University on February 2, 1953. After Susan Nutter became Director a survey was conducted to determine the number of unduplicated resources at the three universities' libraries. It was amazing to me to learn how many unduplicated library resources we had at each of the three universities, excluding even the specialized libraries in medicine and law. TRLN expanded this cooperation to include the addition of technology and the computerization of library resources. It became possible to review the library holdings of the three universities initially from central sites on each campus and in time from personnel computers on faculty's desks. Both Hart and I are proud of the development and use of technological resources and data bases at NCSU libraries while we were Provost.

An area which I considered very important was to have the Associate Provost for University Computing and the Director of the Libraries cooperating closely with each other. We never had enough resources for either function, so it became imperative for

us to collaborate and to stretch, not duplicate resources. This has worked amazingly well for NCSU with Directors Littleton and Nutter (William Horner and John Ulmschneider) and with Associate Provosts Martin, Schaffer and Willis. Each uses the same networking system and both units have been mutually supportive. It is essential that both know, even in the very earliest planning stages, what the other is dreaming about in computerization and for the campus. Since the earliest days, the library and academic computing have been blessed by having persons on their staffs who enjoy cooperative endeavors, were very imaginative and very competent. They have been frequently asked to discuss these collaborative ventures by other universities and at national meetings.

One of the things which each Provost learned quickly and appreciated much was the skilled, competent and dedicated librarians and service staff in the libraries. They rendered great service to the students, faculty, staff and all others who used the Library without adequate resources or numbers of employees. They were exceptional and exemplary employees of NCSU. One employee, Mary Elizabeth Poole received the Watauga medal. I recall attending staff meetings with the Libraries' EPA staff and Ms. Poole never stopped working during these meetings even while I, the Provost, was making a report.

A major step in service came when the library was able to open its stacks to the undergraduates as well as to the faculty and graduate students. This had to wait for several years until the new or middle tower of the current library building was completed (not the last addition). This addition also made much more study space available to students including space in the stacks. It also facilitated increased use of the library by students. This increased use was associated with four developments. The first was that the resources were now readily available and accessible to students. The second was that the faculty felt that they could and should now expect the students to use the

libraries more. The third development was that the library staff was dedicated to assisting students to learn how to use the libraries resources. The fourth was that the librarians were now able to arrange the libraries' resources to make them more usable. Two other changes that the students did not like, but which were essential, was the policy which prohibited the bringing of food and drinks into the library by users. To accomplish this the door to the food service operation in the basement or the Erdahl-Cloyd wing had to be closed. The other unpopular decision was the closing off of all entrances-exits except the one facing the brickyard in the latest addition to the central tower.

One thing that is emphasized in Dr. Littleton's *The D. H. Hill Library, An Informal History*, is that there were inadequate resources for the libraries from the day that the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts opened its doors until today. Over the years the files were filled with requests for increased library funding from the Directors, the Library Committees, the faculty and the students. With every visit of the Visiting Committee of the UNC Board of Trustees there was a special plea from the faculty and the NCSC/NCSU administrators for better library funding. An exceptional year for the library was in the 1961-63 biennium when we got a \$259,000 increase for the library. Increased library funding was a constant high priority item in the budget requests under Kelly, Hart and me. In most years our campus asked for more library resources, but they were frequently and usually combined by the BOG and included in the all-UNC system library requests as one item for all campuses. In some other years the system would indicate that they would prepare the library requests for all campuses and that we should not ask for additional funds for the NCSU libraries. When the BOG was created, a formula for library funding came into being. This was a great help to us, but its problem was that it took the base library budgets as they existed at that time with no compensation for prior inadequate budgets. Under these guidelines

and when appropriations came for this line, distribution was by the BOG formula, but these increased resources did not enable us to make headway in catching up for past deficiencies. The formula did bring us more resources for the NCSU libraries than we got before the creation of the Board of Governors. In those years when we could ask for more resources, there were so many requests, and it seemed that the total funds appropriated were so small that the academic schools received the largest portions of these limited increases. The libraries always got some but inadequate increases. When there were reductions in State appropriations in the late 1980s and early 1990s we argued that the library was at a crucial time facing extraordinary inflation and cuts should be minimal. These cuts were less on a percentage basis than those faced by schools and other units but were still severe and larger than we wished.

The first note that I found in the files of support from overhead funds (indirect costs recovery funds from grants and contracts) for the libraries was for 1954 at a rate of 0.7% of 1% of the overhead collected that year. At that time the Libraries reported to the Chancellor. When I was Provost they got \$65,000 per year from overhead funds, but I was not sufficiently persuasive to get that sum increased in spite of the fact that overhead funds were increasing. When the State of North Carolina began to collect a larger portion of the overhead from each campus the prospect of increases became even more difficult and unlikely. I understand that under Monteith and Hart improvements and increases were made in the overhead allocation to the library, the library's change budget requests and especially in the allocation of funds from appropriations.

I have not given nearly the time deserved to this portion of the Provost's History. Each of the three Librarians have had positive relationships with the Deans of the Faculty and Provosts with whom they collaborated and worked. These were Harlan C. Brown, I. T. Littleton and Susan K. Nutter. Fortunately Dr. Littleton

has written a more complete history of the NCSU Libraries *The D. H. Hill Library, An Informal History, 1887-1987* which was published in 1993.

Archives

In the early years of the University, records were kept on a more or less haphazard basis. Some were kept and some weren't. During Dean Shirley's tenure a decision was made that a more structured method of retaining records was needed. Stuart Noblin, a faculty member from the History Department, was employed on a part time basis to establish a method for keeping records of the College and to start a system of receiving and maintaining records. Soon after Dean Kelly arrived, Dr. I. O. Schaub, an emeritus employee (a former Dean in the School of Agriculture), assumed the function on a volunteer basis. In 1965 Maurice Toler became the first full-time Archivist. He was professionally educated and trained and had prior experience as an archivist. The position reported to the Dean of the Faculty and Provost through Mr. William Simpson during both Dr. Kelly's and my tenures as Provost.

The Archivist arranges the transfer of non-current University records to the Archives, schedules the disposition of records not requiring permanent preservation, examines and organizes records that are transferred to the Archives, makes records available to researchers, and answers inquiries relating to the history of the University.

The records in the Archives include correspondence, reports, minutes, journals, ledgers, charters, scrapbooks, maps, photographs, and both video and audio materials from all academic, non-academic and administrative units. In Archives there are also published and unpublished histories of university colleges, schools, departments, and programs. University publications in the Archives include: the *Agromeck*, the *Undergraduate Catalogs*, the *Graduate Catalogs*, the *Student Handbook*, the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Handbook for Teachers*, the *Adviser's Handbook*, *Faculty and Staff Directories* and the *North*

Carolina State Magazine. Faculty and student records are also included in the Archives. The Archives has a complete set of issues of the *Technician*, our student newspaper. Some issues are so fragile that they can only be viewed on film.

I have made extensive use of the records from the directories, catalogs, and files of the Provost's Office, the Chancellor's Office, the Faculty Senate's Minutes, and other files from time to time in this report. My most important resources were Maurice Toler and Edward Hodges who were the staff in Archives in 1993. The Archives has had two masters graduate students majoring in Archival Management as Graduate Assistants funded by the Alumni Association for a number of years. This has been an important method of providing additional personnel resource for Archives. These Assistants have also been helpful to me.

In 1989 the Archives was transferred to report to the Director of Libraries. The Archives are housed in the D. H. Hill Library.

University Studies

On July 1, 1970, the Division of University Studies was formally begun. It was created out of the Department of Social Studies, which had been started many years earlier and which taught courses required for accreditation by the School of Engineering. The creation of the Division was stimulated by the fact that these courses were no longer required for accreditation in the School of Engineering, and the Department of Social Studies provided an existing faculty that enabled NCSU to implement some novel and experimental ideas in undergraduate education. Improvement in education had been a major concern of Kelly's while he was at NSF. This concept was in large measure Kelly's, and Caldwell was much interested and excited about the plan too. A draft of a release written by Kelly reads as follows:

A new dimension in education will begin at NCSU on July 1, with

the initiation of a Division of University Studies.

Geared to urgent problems facing the human society, the Division will offer elective, interdisciplinary studies in such areas as food and population, man and his environment, poverty and race, liberty and order in societal change and other problems which beset modern man.

Utilizing faculty from the present Department of Social Studies, which will be modified and become part of the new Division, the Division University-wide in nature, will be administered through the Office of the Provost.

Faculty expertise from schools throughout the University will teach the courses in University Studies. In addition, outside authorities will be drawn from other institutions.

Dr. John Lambert of the Social Studies Department will be Acting Head of the Division of University Studies. He will lead a core group of faculty from Social Studies who will plan and coordinate offerings of the new division.

Students at any level from freshman through seniors will be eligible to study in the division on a purely elective basis. It is hoped that the interdisciplinary nature of the studies will offer students an in-depth exposure to society's problems, thereby helping to make other studies more relevant.

A committee representing the eight schools of the University will aid in directing curriculum policy for University Studies. Members of the committee chaired by Dr. Carey Bostian of Genetics, are: Robert Burns, Design; Dr. Carl Dolce, Education; Dr. Eric Ellwood, Wood and Paper Science; Dr. Reinhard Harkema, Zoology; Dr. Abraham Holtzman, Politics; James Klibbe, Textiles; Dr. Worth Seagondollar, Physics; and Dr. Robert Truitt, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

The first course, UNI-301 Man and His Environment will be offered in the fall of 1970. Faculty teaching the course will include Dr. Arthur Cooper, a plant ecologist; Dr. James Wallace, an environmental historian, and Dr. Donald

Shriver, an authority in ethics. A second course, UNI-323 The World Population and Food Crises, to be taught during the Spring Semester will be taught by a plant pathologist, a sociologist, a crop scientist and a philosopher.

Four current social studies courses which will be reshaped during the coming year are included in the curriculum for the Division of University Studies. These are: "Science and Society" SS 301 and 302 and "Contemporary Issues" SS 401 and 402.

Present faculty besides Dr. Lambert in the Social Studies who will form the core of the division include Dr. James Wallace, Dr. Edward Ezell and Dr. Robert Clack. Currently associated with the department of Social Studies Dr. Robert Metzger will join the Department of Philosophy, and Dr. Robert Elliot and Professor Edith Sylla will join the Department of History. Instructors with the Division of University Studies will include Robert Cornish, Robert Hoffman, Clayton Stalnaker and R. Taylor Scott.

The Division has continued to develop new courses around issues of current interest and importance. The idea was that courses would be taught utilizing professionals from the fields and that they would be team taught. As the course was taught, the issues addressed in the course would be taught using the concepts of the several disciplines of the instructors and would not consist of a team of teachers teaching their specialty for a few days or a couple of weeks and then another teacher taking his/her turn to teach the next segment. We wished to have the students understand how each discipline looked at each issue covered by the course. Such courses were more expensive and much more difficult to organize, teach, and manage. For this reason many other departments, who looked at credit hours generated, thought and said that the Division was treated too generously and had too many faculty lines. Others complained about the Division getting favored treatment from the Provost and wanted the unit to

report through a school. We did provide it with faculty lines so that the resources were available to buy faculty time on a release-time basis from other departments to teach these interdisciplinary and team taught courses. The plan was that we would add few if any new courses that would be taught by a single faculty member. Several faculty in schools proposed new courses that they would like to teach in University Studies. Many of these courses were very interesting and sounded as if they would be excellent educationally for our students, but University Studies did not develop them unless they could be taught by a team of faculty. In addition courses that were discipline specific were to be taught by the appropriate disciplines. Both Provost Kelly and I did protect and make certain that the Division had sufficient resources to survive. If we had not and if we had placed it in any school at this early time, I believe that it would have floundered, been neglected or even have failed. Another concept was that courses after they were developed and taught for a period of time might be transferred to departments, and other courses would be dropped when the subject was no longer of current interest.

The Advisory Council was a great idea and was most helpful to the Division and provided a group of faculty without vested interest to bounce ideas off. The Council also provided a committee which could function comparable to a school courses and curriculum committee to oversee the new courses that were being developed. It was used as a committee to review credentials of division faculty proposed for promotion and tenure. While the Council was of great benefit to the Provost it was most helpful to the faculty in the Division.

One of its first charges was to institute a search for a new head of the Division. Among the qualifications required were the following: "Because the aim of interdisciplinary courses is to present students a complete, objective and unbiased comprehension of problems of society and the intellectual discipline for their solution, there should be as much assurance as possible that

the Head of the Division will take a broad attitude of scientific objectivity towards the problems of society without becoming a zealous advocate of some particular solution." It went on to include needed characteristics, "as a man of good judgment, temperament, undoubted integrity and with a proper sensitivity to the correct scholarly, non-political role of a public university." It also stated that "the individual should show evidences of a desire and a competence to experiment with innovations in organizing and developing interdisciplinary learning including sharp departures from a conventional lecture-type organization." We were always fortunate enough to find individuals who fulfilled these expectations in the persons who became Head of the Division.

When Kelly asked for the resources to accomplish this effort, Caldwell wrote on February 13, 1970, "I am authorizing you, therefore, to utilize the Department of Social Studies which means its personnel, and budget, as the core instrument for planning, financing, and managing the interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, all-university course offerings. It is my judgment that this department plus justified support funds should be lifted out of the School of Liberal Arts and given a fresh status and mission." He said that the new unit would be responsible to the Provost, and would be subject to the curriculum policy direction of the Advisory Council. He went on to say:

It is not at all a part of my thinking or intention that this new effort will attempt to take over responsibility for any courses that are not truly interdisciplinary. The value of the department will require only a fraction of the twelve positions in the department should be filled with permanent staff. The majority of the positions in the department should be left open for the purchase of the services of faculty from the other schools. Although this program has an experimental character in that we do not know precisely how it will do it all, I do not regard it as a trial run. We must enter it with earnestness of purpose.

The departmental Secretary Laura Schenk and the following budget for non-personnel items were transferred to the new division. This was the whole budget of the department while it was in the School of Liberal Arts although the dean did help out almost every year with additional funds: Travel \$209.39, Supplies \$519.29, and telephone and postage \$477.90 for a total operating budget of \$1206.58. Provost Kelly thought that this was too small a budget so he asked me to work with George Worsley to come up with more supporting funds. Mr. Worsley agreed that when we came up with the precise number of faculty lines he would make certain that the division got an appropriate budget that was proportional to that of the other departments in the SLA. A. C. Barefoot said, "It is appropriate to pay homage to Mrs. Schenck, for she was the administrative glue that held the division together. She was the one who remembered all of the deadlines for course submission, classroom assignments, budgetary activities and other faculty responsibilities. Without her the work of the division probably would have floundered."

Prior to the development of this concept for the division, many ideas were floated around of what to do with the Department of Social Studies. There was much concern on the part of the faculty about what would happen to them. In one of the sessions held by Cahill with the faculty of the department one member asked: "Can the Chancellor move lines without the authority from anyone else?" Dean Cahill answered, "Ayes the machinery, as well as the precedent for doing that exists on this campus." Dr. Kelly also had conferences with the faculty. The discussions are found in the Provosts' files for 1971-72; however, the memoranda dealing with the subject go back as far as 1965. As these discussions were going on Dr. Lambert wrote a memo to Dr. Kelly:

Subject: Naming the 'baby.'

1. Fred Cahill has suggested that we call 'it' a Center for University Studies, which I personally like since it is what

it will be and should have enough dignity to merit outside money.

2. Using US as a course prefix also is acceptable, but the thought of running on a US 301 or a US 401 should promote urgent revision of at least two Social Studies offerings!
3. But if the acronym CUS is to be it, clearly we cannot have the officer in charge called a 'head' for that would make him 'HOCUS' and, since the Provost would be his superior in the chain of command, the Provost would be considered the 'POCUS.' What we might need is some sleight of hand at this juncture, but no focus-pocus.
4. Right.

It was signed and was followed by the notation that the typewriter was worn out and a new one was needed. It probably was, for some keys were difficult to decipher and the print was barely legible. I wondered if Lambert (and I would not put it past him) had put on an old ribbon before he typed the note.

The plan eventually adopted for the division was to maintain a number of vacant lines that could be used to hire faculty from other NCSU units or to bring in visitors from other universities to teach in these courses. Dr. Kelly delegated the responsibility to me to approve the funds to be reimbursed to the home departments of the participating faculty. I wrote my first letter of concurrence on a release time salary on September 10, 1970. The proposed salaries had been agreed upon contingent of my approval before they were proposed to me. I continued this practice over the years after I became Provost. It was very rare that I did not concur in the proposed salary of a visiting professor or for the release time for a NCSU faculty member. The chancellor, the provost or another person on campus who knew the individual wrote and made the offer for distinguished visitors who were to come to campus to give one, two or more lectures in a course. If a visitor was hired for a semester or longer the appointment fol-

lowed established practices. The chancellor, after writing to a few of these individuals, was concerned about the amount of money some of these distinguished individuals charged for just one or two days visit and for a couple of lectures. Chancellor Caldwell could not be labeled as a big spender in any area. Some truly outstanding visitors came to lecture in the interdisciplinary courses.

In the fall of 1970 Provost Kelly and several faculty were trying to get Albert Carnesale interested in the position of Head of the Division. Dr. Carnesale was on leave from the University as a member of the U. S. SALT Delegation then meeting in Helsinki, Finland. In March of 1971, he was offered the position. At first he did not accept the position and the committee continued to look at many others both on and off campus. After a long search Dr. Carnesale accepted the position and became its first head on July 1, 1972.

In the fall semester of 1970, *Man and His Environment* had 60 students enrolled and the *Urban Crises* had 350 students enrolled to take that course. The first spring semester both *Man & His Environment* and *The World Food & Population Crises* were to be taught. The unit had planned for 150 students in the former, but 240 enrolled. They made adjustments including bringing in extra chairs to teach 200. In the latter they expected 60 students and 93 enrolled and were taught.

In October of 1974, Dr. Carnesale left NCSU to accept a position at Harvard, so a search began for a new head of the Division of University Studies. Although Carnesale had remained in the position only a short time he had helped the unit to move toward the goals outlined earlier. On Dr. Kelly's retirement on June 30, 1974, he said how much he was pleased with the accomplishments of this very innovative program which he had nurtured.

Clayton Stalnaker became Acting Head after Carnesale's departure. In his annual report in 1974-75 Stalnaker used the prolog of Charles Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities* as a retrospective glance at the state of the Divi-

sion in that year. To him it seemed that when Carnesale had announced his departure in the fall of 1974:

It was the best of times, it
was the worst of times, it
was the spring of hope, it
was the winter of despair,
we had everything before us,
we had nothing before us.

But when writing his report in June of 1975 Stalnaker said that the "Division indeed has everything before us. The prospects occasion real hope."

After a search, Dr. A. C. Barefoot, a faculty member in the Department of Wood and Paper Science became the Head on July 1, 1975. Barefoot commented about the Division when he was becoming Head:

Indeed in conversation with the Provost Nash Winstead and others, it was clear that the hope was real; but, survival as a viable academic unit was still to be secured. In that sense location in the Provost's office was to be a protectorate, but the Division could expect no major increases in funding or mission until the unit itself had proved its merit to the University and could be moved to a school with a permanent status. At that time there was no school that seemed appropriate or willing to house the interdisciplinary unit. Indeed there were openly heatedly stated antitheses to the idea of interdisciplinary studies and courses among other departments and faculties. There was the openly stated support, not just from the Provost, that made it possible to evaluate the worth and value of the experimental educational unit. We were encouraged by many to be experimental in our approach to serving the University.

In 1980, when it was time for us to review the effectiveness of program and leadership of Dr. Barefoot as head of University Studies, I also appointed a special committee to make recommendations on the future role of the Division. While the Divi-

sion had done a good job in its assignment, the faculty of the Division, Dr. Barefoot and I all felt that this was the time to take another look for we had reached that level of development. We looked at the goals, procedures and practices being used. In October 29, 1981, I wrote the special committee accepting their recommendations. These were accepted as general guidelines for the future role of the Division. I stated, "The recommendations should not be viewed so stringently as to be totally prescriptive." Some recommendations such as using the Advisory Committee to act as a course review committee could be implemented soon. Others, such as the establishment of a University Scholars Program, could not be implemented then but required further study. Most features of this recommendation may have been incorporated into the programs, but the Scholars Program did not get implemented until much later and then not precisely as proposed.

I also said, "I am requesting that the Division of University Studies in the future make use whenever possible of joint and associate appointments. I would further encourage the Division in any new appointments of full-time faculty to have the credentials of the leading candidates reviewed by the appropriate discipline department and to have any final candidates interviewed by that department so as to provide the opportunity for associate status with the discipline department at the time of the initial appointment." It also called for the faculty of the Division to be scholars as well as teachers. Acceptance of the report of July 28, 1981, was discussed with the faculty and the University Administrative Council. The committee was split over whether the Division should continue to report to the Provost or to the Dean of SHASS. The majority felt that it should remain as it was, reporting to the Provost. The school deans felt that way too. So it remained under the Provost.

The Division was blessed with excellent teachers, but few had strong goals of scholarly research beyond giving papers at work-

shops, conferences or symposia. That was understandable given the origin of the unit as primarily a teaching and service group. With the appointment of Dr. Elisabeth Wheeler that was to change. Dr. Wheeler, NCSU's first paleobotanist, was given the Isabel C. Cookson award (Best Paper) in the Paleobotanical Section of the Botanical Society of America in June of 1976. She was a joint appointee in UNI, Botany and Forestry. Later she was tenured on the Forestry faculty and has been most successful in achieving national and international recognition. This was evidence of a successful UNI experiment. Barefoot continued to contribute to scholarship and other faculty in the UNI did too. Riddle, an outstanding scholar, continued to participate in and encourage scholarship by faculty in the Division.

Dr. Rolf Buchdahl came as a Visiting Scholar in the Division in the late 1970s. Dr. Buchdahl's initial acceptance by the UNI faculty was reserved. He was a retired researcher from industry. Faculty said, "He is not a teacher!" He rapidly overcame that by his insight, skill and productivity. He represented the epitome of the type of appointments we sought in that era, and he served the Division and the University well. He conceived the idea of a Provost Forum as an opportunity for the faculty and administrators and other interested members of the University to discuss issues and pedagogical concerns of the day. He led the planning, scheduled, and managed all of the early Provost's fora. Over the years we held from one to three fora per year. Most but not all of these have been developed by committees. These were usually chaired and coordinated by faculty members of the Division. I selected the titles from among those suggested, but the ideas for these fora came from everywhere. I began to keep a list of suggestions or issues that were vexing during the year and I would throw these into the hopper for consideration. So many ideas were proposed and we also had a forum to discuss every major academic policy that came under consideration. Most of these

were well attended, created a great deal of interest, and gave us an opportunity to hear the concerns at least of the faculty who came. One that I thought would be best attended, but it had the least attendance of all, was a forum on Overhead Funds. VC Worsley led the discussion and described how these funds were obtained in grants and contracts and how they were disbursed and why. I had heard gripes in abundance about the mysteries of the overhead, yet when the time came those who had complained the most about administrative slight of hand techniques and secrecy in the handling of these funds didn't come to find out how they were determined, how they were used or to get their questions answered.

In the mid 1980s I decided that we should emphasize undergraduate teaching for a few years in the Provost's fora. We had several great fora on this theme. Perhaps the best attended, and it was one of the best, was delivered by Patricia Cross on AA Research University and Undergraduate Education." One of the Provost's fora that I thought was among the most important followed and covered the report of the Commission on Ethics in the Professions and the Workplace. This Commission's activities led to efforts in all of the schools and colleges to have seminars on ethics, and each school looked at what they should do to include ethics in the education of all NCSU students. Once again we turned to the Division of University Studies and asked Dr. Erin Malloy-Hanley to take the leadership in the activities of the Commission and in the presentation of this Provost's forum. The most significant series of lectures and talks on ethics was held by the Graduate School. These efforts have led to recommendations that schools and/or curricula include discussions of ethics in some courses or seminars in the various fields of study at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at NCSU. We held many more fora, but I think I have mentioned enough of them. We held some of them in the evenings and others during the day. We never found a best time, but the evening was

probably the time that had the least attendance. Buchdahl's idea was a great one, and it has served the University and the Provosts very well.

It was in 1970 that a new All University Committee on Environmental Programs was established. This was to become a center to assist the NCSU and the UNC-CH campuses in developing resources for environmental instruction, research, and extension. While this was an all University Center it had a very small amount of funds. In 1974 it was decided that these resources would report through the Provost instead of through the Dean of Research. I transferred the management of the funds which came to NCSU to Dr. Carnesale, the Head of the Division. When Carnesale left NCSU that fund was managed by Dr. Barefoot. When Dr. Riddle became Head the funds were managed by Dr. David Adams, a member of the faculty who had a joint appointment with the Department of Forestry. After the Division of University Studies was transferred to CHASS, I transferred the environmental studies efforts to The Vice Chancellor for Research who later placed it under the Natural Resources Research Center and the Dean of Forest Resources. Dr. Adams continued to manage the program and the small amount of funds.

Dr. Barefoot wrote:

As Coordinator of Environmental Studies, I was to play an interesting role in securing what is now Jordan Hall. One day Drs. Jay Langfelder and B. G. Copeland (J. G. Vandenburg was to join the group later for final planning) came to my office to discuss the need for a new building to house several then disparate departments or offices such as MEAS, Marine Science, Wildlife and even certain forestry functions. The idea was to create a place for the synergistic meshing of interdisciplinary thinking and research in the Natural Resources. At a meeting Barefoot agreed to put the idea before Chancellor Joab Thomas. Dr. Thomas encouraged us to proceed and asked us to

prepare a brochure that he could pull out of his back pocket for someone looking for such a project. With a small grant from the coordinator's budget to some students in the School of Design who examined several sites in cooperation with the Office of Campus Planning, a prospective building was presented to a seminar-workshop in Kilgore Hall. Dr. Ellwood then seized the ball and with the help of the then Lieutenant Governor Robert Jordan secured the appropriations for the Natural Resources Building which was later named for the Jordan family.

The underlying battle for the Division's survival still lay in its acceptance by the University for its academic integrity in teaching. Interdisciplinary teaching was under fire. Barefoot said, "The major battles on these lines were orchestrated to occur in the University Committee on Courses and Curricula, upon which we were seated by the Provost. One attack, which failed, so blunted the attacks that the Division could be said to have won the war. At least the attackers knew that their efforts were more likely to be futile as long as the rest of the University community supported the Division as it did in that attack in the committee. A period of semi-truce ensued, which allowed the unit to concentrate on building a solid academic program. I believe we did!"

Over the years we developed a large number of excellent interdisciplinary courses that served the University's students well. Some new ones would arise usually on an experimental basis and after being taught for a year were added to the official courses of the Division. A few others did not succeed. At times a course might be taught for just a few years before being phased out. In 1986 the Division listed some 18 courses excluding the 290 and 490 courses. The course *World Population and Food Prospects* was still there. So were the old numbers of UNI 301, 302, 401 and 402, but with different titles and contents from those which were the base courses of the Division in its beginning. Harry Kelly would have been pleased

to see that *Peace and War in the Nuclear Age* was being taught. This was a subject that he thought would be most important for our students because after his experiences in Japan in World War II, he hoped to never see such instruments of destruction used again. Also, those courses that related *Technology and Society* were things that he dreamed would someday be taught here for he thought that these were neglected areas in university education almost everywhere. There were other courses dealing with environment and with ethics. There were programmatic attempts in Women's Studies and Environmental Studies. Of these, the work by Professor James Wallace (Vice Chairman, N. C. Environmental Commission; member, N. C. Sedimentation Commission; and Member, Environmental Quality Committee of the National Conference of Mayors) and Dr. David Adams resulted in a recognized environmental program in the Division. An effort begun by Dr. Donald Huisling in *Life-Long Learning* was pursued vigorously by Dr. Charles Korte. It is now the *Encore Program* of the University. Likewise African-American Studies received recognition under Dr. T. N. Hammond while Dr. Korte was Head. Yes, Harry Kelly would have been pleased to see the accomplishments of his academic child.

In 1986 I felt that the Division had developed sufficient stature and strength that it could now find a receptive home in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Dean Toole was also excited about the move. This was probably the best decision that I made about the Division because it has been a most effective catalyst for the Division's growth and development. Here the name changed to the Division of Multidisciplinary Studies. They now have academic programs and advise as well as teach undergraduate and graduate students. So they have come to do all of those things that a faculty in a research university are expected to do and have still retained that excellence of teaching undergraduate multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary courses.

Dr. Barefoot resigned as Head and left in early 1982 on an off-campus assignment to become Chief of Party for an Agency for International Development sponsored Reforestation and Watershed Management Project in Sri Lanka. Dr. John Riddle from the Department of History became the new Head of the Division. After the Division moved to CHASS Riddle decided to return to teaching and research, and Jack W. Wilson was appointed to become Head. After Wilson decided to return to the Department of Business Management in the College of Management, Dr. Charles A. Korte became Head. Korte was the first faculty member of the Division to become its Head.

Although the Provost made no contribution in the following activities (we did follow its development with interest) it should be included as an important new activity of the Division after it became a part of CHASS. Dean Toole had a major interest in the development of dual degree programs with the other schools of the University. Today one of the responsibilities of the Division is to coordinate and manage these activities. I quote from the literature provided me by Associate Dean Moni Sawhney.

The College currently has three double degree programs in cooperation with the other colleges in which students combine a major in one of the humanities and social sciences with a major in agriculture, the life sciences, engineering, computer science or textile management. Students completing the programs earn two undergraduate degrees within five years, a B.S. degree in a science or technical field and a BA or B.S. degree in an area of the humanities and social sciences. These programs are both intellectually challenging and academically enriching and are designed to provide the breadth of understanding that comes from a solid liberal arts education. The result is graduates who are knowledgeable not only in technology and science, but also in human affairs. The three programs have matured over the last few years and have developed into strong academic programs involving some of this University's brightest and

most capable students. The conscientiousness and diligence of each of the faculty coordinators has resulted in double degree programs of which this College and University can be proud.

These programs are sought by students. The first program to start was the Thomas Jefferson Program in collaboration with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences which was started in 1985 with the help and cooperation of Dr. Edward Glazener. The Benjamin Franklin Program was started in 1990 with the College of Engineering, and in that same year the Eli Whitney Program was started with the College of Textiles.

Barefoot wrote me a note as he was suggesting additions and corrections to this segment of the Provost's Office History which says, "My impression now as I have reflected on the success of the Division in later years is that you and I laid the foundation for the successes which have come through the work of Bill Toole, John Riddle, Jack Wilson and now, our current appointee Chuck Korte. We done well!"

Admissions

Admissions was administered through Student Affairs until Chancellor Poulton came to NCSU. In 1983 he transferred Admissions to the Provost. Since Dean Shirley's appointment as Dean of the Faculty, the Deans or Provosts had been involved in the determination of the numbers of new freshmen and transfer students to be admitted. This was done at first in consultation with the Dean of Student Affairs with a joint recommendation to the Chancellor. Late in Kelly's tenure as Provost, and during both Hart's and my tenures as Provosts, prior to making a recommendation, studies were made by Institutional Research of the projected number of continuing students, estimates of the number of new graduate students, and later estimates of the number of special or adult students. The Director of Admissions worked with each school dean and the appropriate VCs to determine estimates of new freshmen, transfer students and the adult students to be admitted in

each school or unit. These were then analyzed so that we could better estimate how the enrollment increases in specific numbers in the various categories would affect total FTE enrollment. After we came under the provisions of the Consent Decree, African-American students were added as a new category to consider. We were supposed to reach a goal of over 10.2% African-American students at NCSU. We never did reach the goal, but with hard efforts by our admission's staff we did make substantial progress. This matter is discussed in the section on *Issues Concerning Race* in Chapter Four.

While there were requirements for admission in 1956 they were minimal, and all students who applied and who met the requirements were admitted. At that time NCSC did not have very close estimates of what the new enrollment might be the next fall. It was at this time that Dean Shirley wrote to Dean Stewart saying that NCSC should look at the College Entrance Examination Board's (CEEB) tests and especially the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) for possible use in admissions, and he also proposed that same year that we look into the use of that agency's Advanced Placement Program. Later we did begin to use the CEEB's programs, including the SAT, Advanced Placement and the College Level Placement (CLEP) programs.

The use of the SAT, high school rank, grades in high school courses and other factors led to the development of what was at first called a predicted grade point average (PGA). This could better estimate a prospective student's chance of succeeding at NCSC and aided in estimating the numbers of new students to be admitted and enroll, thereby helping to project enrollments. In the 1980s we changed the title to more suitable one called Admission's Index (AI). It really never was or has been a good predictor, but it was the best that we had. These formulas were revised each year based on the prior freshman class performance, and from time to time separate predictions have been estimated on the basis of the

NCSU school of enrollment, race and sex. While different formulas including these factors have been used over the years, in time we came to use just one formula. In this formula high school performance is the component which contributes most to the prediction. It includes the SAT scores, with mathematics scores counting more in the formula than the verbal scores. Other factors considered in admissions included courses taken in high school, recommendations from teachers, guidance counselors, and administrators in the high school, and grades from the courses taken.

Besides graduation from high school, specific course requirements were the next criteria adopted for admission. At one time we admitted all high school graduates who applied, but we soon set a specific minimum number of high school units required. When Shirley became Dean it was 16 units. Later we became much involved in what courses should make up the units and four years of English and specific math courses became standard requirements. With time, the specific math courses required for admission changed. In the late 1980s the BOG adopted a set of minimum course requirements for all of the 16 campuses. These can be found in the Undergraduate Catalogs. These courses were very similar to those required at that time by NCSU. They did recommend that all students take two years of a foreign language. At NCSU a foreign language was required for admission only for students in CHASS. Language requirements for graduation existed in CHASS, PAMS, and the Biological Sciences. The recent Commission on Undergraduate Education did recommend that we require a foreign language for admission to NCSU. We found upon review of student's credentials who had been approved for admission to NCSU that almost all of these students had taken two or more years of a foreign language in high school.

Later, after the Board of Governors was created, the system estimated the number of high school graduates that would be available in the State and gave NCSU a budgeted

FTE figure which, among other factors, included NCSU's estimated share of the high school students expected to graduate that next year. This became the targeted enrollment. If our total enrollment was 2% less than the budgeted enrollment we lost resources. If we were no more than 2% above the target it was OK. If we enrolled more than 2% above the target the Chancellor was scolded. At times even worse words were used than those normally used in being scolded and fussed at. With both Thomas and Poulton the scolding got rather severe several times. It came to be that the system's staff would scold NCSU's Chancellors regularly even if the enrollment was only 2% over the budgeted FTE figure given to us. At times when we received our budgeted FTE figure we advised the general administration that their estimates were too low and that we would exceed the 2% figure, a factor which they did not consider adequately was our adult student population. This was the most under served population in the Research Triangle area. It was also difficult to estimate the numbers of returning students. It seemed that in most years when the economy was bad, more students returned in the fall semester than in those years when the economy was good.

The Faculty Senate has always taken a keen interest in and passed a number of recommendations about the quality of entering students, the requirements for admission, and the issues of inter-school transfers. Many of these concerns came to be policies. When we looked at the inter-school transfer policies we found that only a few programs really restricted such transfers. These were Engineering, Biological Sciences, Zoology (Pre-med), Design, Economics and Business (now Management) and Education. In most cases these were over-enrolled and needed to restrict enrollments. In the case of Education, the issue was the high grade point average required for admission to teacher education at the beginning of the junior year. In the 1980s the Senate became much concerned about the duties of the Admissions Committee. Over

the years the Committee had essentially become a readmissions committee again as it was in the early years of Dean Shirley. Late in Poulton's tenure changes were made reinstating many of the former charges to the Admissions Committee. After Monteith became Chancellor these Senate recommendations were fully accepted, and the duties of the Committee in recommending policy were considerably expanded over and beyond those of any preceding charge to an Admissions Committee.

Early in Caldwell's tenure we began to need to restrict enrollments in certain programs because we did not have the faculty resources, the financial resources nor the space to handle all students meeting minimum requirements. These were in those programs mentioned earlier. So the question of what to do with students who were admitted to the university but who could not gain admission to the school of their choice required a solution. Caldwell, with the advice of his Deans and Kelly, decided to put all such students into SLA. This was the beginning of the "Phantom Major" problem. The first phantoms were primarily students who wanted to be engineers. Other phantoms have always included those who wanted to be in the School of Design. The engineering phantoms gradually became fewer. With the high requirements for inter-school transfer those who really wanted to be engineers just withdrew or did not enroll at NCSU if they could not get into the School of Engineering. In time most of the phantom majors in SHASS became business major phantoms.

At the November 2, 1965, meeting of the Faculty Senate questions were raised with President Friday and Chancellor Caldwell about the nature and size of the university in the future. I quote from the Senate minutes of that date. "The question of the size for a university evoked considerable discussion. President Friday stated that the efforts are being made to answer this difficult question. He stated that the university has a responsibility to all the people of the State, and that the University cannot

arbitrarily close its doors after accepting a certain number of students. The decision must be made with the total needs and the total resources of the state in mind. Chancellor Caldwell said that 20,000 is the figure being used in the physical planning for the campus, but that is not restrictive. The feeling was expressed that it would be a mistake to convert the campus exclusively or even primarily to a center for graduate study."

The real issue of controlled admissions came to a head in 1969 when the State Budget Officer wrote Mr. John Wright, the Business Manager, on November 26, 1969. In his letter he said that they had examined the fall FTE enrollment at NCSU and found that the budgeted enrollment had been exceeded by 795 students or 7.9%. He indicated that the trend gave them concern, and that "Inasmuch as the present enrollment already exceeds the budgeted enrollment for the 1970-71 by some 393 students, it appears to us that budgetary problems in that year can and should be avoided by drastic reduction in the number of new students accepted, especially new out-of-state students. He also said:

Included in the 1967 Budget Report is the following Special Recommendation: The practice of institutions accepting more students than the number budgeted has consistently created problems to the State, among the most serious is the presentation to the General Assembly of a demand for payment of an obligation created by an expansion of activities which was not legislatively authorized. There is also the problem of reduction in the quality of the instructional program which necessarily follows the shortage of dollars, teachers, buildings, equipment, and other facilities; and there are finally the bad effects of sudden, ill-planned changes in the size, goals, and programs of an institution. Substantial over enrollments at some of the State institutions have been a matter of serious concern to the Advisory Budget Commission, espe-

cially since there are other State institutions (as well as North Carolina private colleges) which are under-enrolled, and since every State institution has consistently over realized its budgeted out-of-State enrollment we recommend that the General Assembly provide for limitations of enrollments at the several institutions by appropriate legislation.

Mr. Wright wrote Caldwell suggesting that this be taken up with President Friday "since it is going to involve the policy of whether or not the Legislature is going to set the enrollment figures for the university." Caldwell wrote Friday on January 8, 1970, and essentially repeated his understanding with President Friday. This was that we would continue our present policy for accepting all qualified students except that we would hold the enrollment in Liberal Arts at its present level except for the new business administration degree program. Of course, it was not known at this time, but Caldwell's proposal did not solve the problem, for business administration became the fastest growing curriculum at NCSU. NCSU then was forced to begin to look at enrollment as an overall University matter instead of letting each school independently determine its enrollment. This action by the State Budget Officer quickly led to more planning on enrollment and to more control of enrollments for new students, transfer students, out-of state enrollment, foreign enrollments, and the graduate enrollment. Money and budgets talk, for the message delivered was that the State would no longer pick up in the current year's budget supporting funds for our newly enrolled students when they exceeded the budgeted FTE. So we then began to carefully project our enrollment growth. Of course it was just after this beginning that the Board of Governors came into being, and one of its early programs was to project enrollments for the State and to begin to assign FTE enrollments for the various campuses.

Prior to 1983 when the Admissions Office became the Provost's administrative

responsibility, both Kelly and I worked with the Dean of Student Affairs (later called the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs) to develop the targeted enrollment for NCSU. The Director of Admissions would meet with the VC for Student Affairs and the Provost and present suggested goals. Procedures that were used after I assumed responsibility for Admissions will be described later. After I became Provost we realized that we got few resources other than those that were associated with increased enrollment. For example, our library budget was woefully weak, but the new enrollment brought increased funds under the formula at a rate that was much better than it had been before. We rarely got any type of cost-of-living increases in our academic budget for any area. Some few resources did come most years for program improvement and new programs. So Dr. Tally and I consciously decided to try to set our target at the 2% over the BOG figure. I continued this practice for most years, until when during Poulton's tenure we lowered our target at the insistence of the BOG staff to the budgeted figure. This targeted figure was also used while Hart was Provost and Monteith was Chancellor. It is of interest that the figure for new freshmen remained relatively constant over the time I was Provost. We all wanted to have more adults in our programs. Some of these adults desired to enroll in degree programs and would be admitted to our degree programs at a later time. My concern was that the triangle's universities and colleges provided so little opportunity for adult students. Before I retired we were teaching around 300 courses and sections each semester in the evening and offered 15 degree programs that enabled students to complete the requirements in the evening. This subject is discussed in Chapter Seven in the section entitled *Extension*. Poulton was a strong advocate for increasing our campus' access to adults and in increasing the numbers of adults enrolled both in on-campus and on off-campus programs. It was a pity to cut off enrollments in these evening pro-

grams and to turn these students away as we frequently did.

Using this approach we had only two under enrollments which led to budget problems. One was associated with the change in the rule of only 15% out-of-state students which existed soon after Shirley became Dean and was reaffirmed by the legislature when there was student unrest at UNC-CH. At that time the Legislature introduced a bill that would limit out-of-state enrollment which President Friday avoided when he reaffirmed the 15% rule for out-of-state undergraduates admitted to the freshman class. A few years later the Legislature became concerned again, and the BOG changed the figure to 18% of the freshman class. At this time the Legislature was concerned about budgets and the cost of higher education. They realized that out-of-state students still cost the state money. As a result they began to increase the out-of-State tuition every year. Technically the BOG did this, but the Legislature effectively did it in the amount of funds appropriated and with the understanding they had with the BOG staff that a portion of the funds would come from increased out-of-state tuition. Chancellor Poulton was concerned that we might get over enrolled with out-of-state freshmen at the same time that we were turning down qualified in-state students in large numbers. At this time he had proposed a rather substantial increase in our total enrollment to the staff of BOG. They in turn reduced Poulton's enrollment projection and reduced the in-state portion but left the out-of-state portion with too large a number. The Director of Admissions had also been directed to admit out-of-State students more conservatively than the 18%. The result was a substantial budget tuition income shortfall for one year. The second time this happened was when there was a conscious effort not to exceed the enrollment target while Hart was Provost, which resulted in being under the enrollment target. We also began to restrict foreign enrollments at the undergraduate level in the mid 1960s and have continued

to carefully select only a few foreign undergraduates each year.

The two Chancellors who tried very hard to get our budgeted FTE enrollment levels raised were Thomas and Poulton. In one letter Chancellor Poulton complained about our denying admission to so many qualified engineering students. He felt that the State needed additional graduates in this area, which was in short supply. He ended his request by saying that, "if the students have to be denied I would rather put the blame on the BOG than to have the blame reside on our campus." The request didn't work, and we got no increase in our budgeted FTE.

The process used by me and the Director of Admissions to determine our enrollment recommendations to the Chancellor began with consultation with the school deans about the number and qualitative criteria, including minimum AI and GPA that they wished to be used in arriving at new freshmen and transfer admissions for their school. Prior to December 1984, we used the term Predicted Grade Point Average (PGA) when talking about the formula used in admission's decisions. It was at this time that Dean Anna Keller of Admissions suggested that we use the term Admission Index, (AI) instead of PGA. The Dean of Admissions and her staff, in consultation and review with the staff of IR, would look at prospects based on prior year's experiences and the number of projected high school graduates. If the numbers and the AIs proposed by the deans were too far out of line (in either direction), the Director or Dean of Admissions would consult again with that school dean. The Dean and the IR staff would meet with me and we would go through the projected or requested enrollments for each school and all the projections for returning students. At that time we would reach certain conclusions about realistic numbers in each category. In these discussions I also looked at projected FTEs and the estimated or known faculty position projections. If a school was very far out of line I sent the Dean (Director) back to see

the school dean. We then made recommendations to the Chancellor, including targets by school and by adult students. While graduate students were included in our projections we tried to admit all of the estimated numbers of graduate students who might come to NCSU. We then sent our recommendations to the Chancellor for concurrence. With Chancellor Poulton and later Chancellor Monteith, the Provost, the Director of Admissions, the Dean of the Graduate School and the Director of IR would meet with the Chancellor to set goals by student category. We did this soon after we learned the FTE enrollment in the fall semester and after we got a new budgeted enrollment figure from the BOG. This enabled the Director of Admissions, the Graduate School Dean and the Evening Program's Director to have goals for the next year. It was not uncommon however, for us to have to meet in emergency session after we had final enrollment figures for the fall to reset targets for the spring semester's enrollment. On occasion we would reduce the number of transfers, eliminate entry of new freshmen, and sharply reduce the number of adult students to be admitted or enrolled for the spring semester. We did this because our enrollment FTE was based on an average enrollment for the two semesters. I remember one spring when we admitted no new students, except graduate students, and reduced drastically the planned number of adult registrations in the evening and the number of credit hours allowed for these students. The issue was not whether we have space in the classes being taught at night, but whether we were about to go over the danger point in the budgeted FTE. I always believed that the reasons why the Board of Governors were so hard on us about being over-enrolled was associated with the fact that the under-enrolled universities in the system thought that they would get more students if we didn't admit them. The fact that we now had a larger number of students than UNC-CH, and that the vast majority of the members of the BOG were UNC-CH graduates couldn't have had anything to do

with this, could it? I think also that the BOG staff did not want to have to explain over enrollment to the Legislature. On their behalf, I'm certain that they would not have had a receptive audience in the legislature, for increased enrollments meant increased appropriations in the next biennium. I always thought that in our state, which had well below the national average of high school graduates attending college, we should have been working harder to increase the number of students attending college, including the adults who were so under-served in the Research Triangle area. The increases in enrollments for us were in the adult and graduate areas and were not in the increased numbers of new high school graduates. Some of the engineering students that we didn't admit may have gone to UNC-Charlotte or to NCA&T, but they also went to other engineering programs in major college in other states. We never knew how many never went to college. The two other engineering programs at N. C. public institutions did not increase their engineering enrollments by nearly as many students as the number of qualified applicants to whom we denied admission.

When Shirley became Dean of the Faculty we had a probationary system which prohibited students on probation from representing the University in off-campus or on-campus activities. This restriction soon disappeared and was called provisional status for a short time. In 1990 the probationary system was initiated again. Under these provisions a student on probation could not hold leadership positions or participate in extracurricular activities on or off-campus.

The special or adult student route, along with correspondence courses and Summer School, has long been one that a student could use to earn admission to NCSU. After students had completed satisfactorily a specified number of hours, including composition and math (and for some programs, specific math courses), they could be admitted to NCSU. Summer School and correspondence courses have

also been the way suspended students could obtain the GPA needed to be readmitted. In 1989 the Admissions Committee recommended that after a period of absence from the university, a suspended student be permitted to enroll as special or adult student to try to re-earn admission. The issue was referred to the Faculty Senate and in 1991, a policy change was adopted which permitted suspended students after only one year's absence from the university to be allowed to use this mechanism to earn the opportunity to gain entry to the university again. Other requirements for eligibility for Lifelong Education courses included:

- a) have acquired a high school diploma or GED certificate;
- b) not have been suspended from any college or university, including NCSU, for two full semesters not including summer sessions;
- c) not be a degree candidate at North Carolina State University; or
- d) be high school students who have been recommended by their school and approved by the Admission's Office to take lower level courses.

The title of Dean of Admissions was approved for Mrs. Keller by the Trustees on recommendation of Chancellor Poulton with my concurrence. The members of the Faculty Senate expressed some concern about this title for the Director of Admissions and felt that the title of dean should be given only for those holding a more academic position. The Chancellor and I agreed that the title would revert to Director upon Mrs. Keller's retirement, and it did when George Dixon became Director.

When Admissions reported to me there were a small number of exceptions admitted as athletes. Chancellor Poulton was concerned that the number was too large so he reduced the number to 23. Each of these were admissible under the NCAA formula but were below the requirements for admission to NCSU. Prior to this time, if the students met the NCAA requirements we admitted them. This was a practice at most universities and had existed under Caldwell

and Thomas until Thomas imposed a more limited number of exceptions to NCSU admission's requirements. After the 1984 freshmen were admitted, Poulton was very concerned about the quality of those exceptions who had the poorest admission credentials under the NCSU formula. He then wrote the Athletics Director and said that athletes who were exceptions and admitted with AIs under the NCSU formula below those of other non-athlete exceptions admitted to NCSU, could not play in their first year. He assigned me the responsibility to make this determination. Poulton and I also understood that if a student who was an exception performed well during the first semester, that I could and probably would rule that the athlete could play in their sport during the second semester. In the fall of 1985 there were several who were ruled ineligible by me to participate that fall. The coaches concerned and Director of Athletics appealed to Chancellor Poulton, but he upheld my decision. It was at this time that Poulton also eliminated the practice of exceptions who were admitted on the basis of the minimum NCAA rules. He delegated to me and the Director of Admissions the responsibility of admitting athlete exceptions. There were no specific numbers, but I knew that the number must be very small. The system we used was as follows: before a student could be admitted, the Director of Admissions sought all of the advice from the high school that she/he possibly could get. The SAT qualitative factors, the high school record, courses taken, and the recommendations from the high school were reviewed by the Director of Admissions and personnel in the Academic Skills Program. The more borderline cases required interviews by both Admissions and Academic Skills personnel. The Director of Athletics and these two Directors then recommended to me whether we should accept or reject admission in each specific case. This process did improve the academic quality of admitted athletes. All of these athlete student exceptions were required to participate in the University Transition Program. This pro-

gram is described in Chapter Seven under *Academic Skills*. Under the new Admission Committee's responsibilities, these decisions are now made by that Committee.

As Provost I had to hear appeals from denials of readmission by the Admissions Committee. I heard few cases, for the word was out that the Provost did not overrule the Admissions Committee. Provost Kelly heard few cases too. In one of his cases a young man told Dr. Kelly that he had made three As and a B in the two summer sessions and that the Admissions Committee had denied him readmission. Kelly asked me to look into the situation, for this type of performance should get the young man back into school. I checked his record and found that in Summer School he had repeated an introductory (compensatory) math course twice (once in each summer session) in which he had previously made a B. The other course was also a repeat of an A grade, and the only new course taken was a Physical Education (PE) course in which he made a B. His record showed that he normally made good grades in PE courses. Dr. Kelly was so upset over the student's telling him a true but misleading tale that he would not talk to the student, and I had to tell the student that his appeal was denied. I heard two cases in which I overturned an Admissions Committee's denial. One was an athlete whom I ruled was not to continue to participate in intercollegiate athletics after consultation with the Chairman of the Admissions Committee and the Director of Athletics. He was to keep his scholarship. I am really proud of this young man, for he graduated. The second case was a young woman with a SAT score of over 1200. She told me that she was living off campus with a young man and that she had gotten into drugs. She said that she had learned her lesson and was ready to study and to work. We set up performance criteria, for she could not get back into good academic standing even if she had made all A's the next semester. I am sorry to say that she met none of the performance criteria.

Deans Shirley and Kelly worked with Director Kenneth Raab, Provosts Kelly and

Winstead worked closely with Dean Anna Keller, and Provosts Winstead and Hart worked with Director George Dixon. Each was a superlative leader in admissions work and had an outstanding staff. We never had a dearth of applicants for admission to NCSU and over the years the quality of the criteria presented by these applicants has increased. From time to time Chancellors Thomas and Poulton felt that these student applicants did not deserve to be denied admission, but to keep our enrollments in check, admission had to be denied.

Cooperative Education

Cooperative Education has existed at NCSU for many years. In a letter dated January 26, 1953 from Chancellor Harrelson to Dean Lampke, a suggestion was made that the Cooperative Education Program in Engineering be reopened. It appears that we had a small Co-op program in Engineering prior to World War II.

Cooperative Education at NCSU increased in the numbers of student participants and expanded from the School of Engineering to include programs and students in almost all of the schools. After consideration of alternative ways to handle these programs, it was decided that we could gain greater efficiency and effectiveness if the separate school's efforts and personnel were combined into a single university-wide operation. On July 1, 1984, the program was assigned to the Provost's Office. Associate Provost Murray Downs assumed administrative responsibility, and Dr. William D. Weston was appointed as Director of the program.

The Cooperative Education Program is designed to be an integral part of a student's program and is available to majors in all schools and colleges. The co-op program enriches and expands classroom learning by providing sponsored paid work assignments in industry, business and government. Work experience is selected based on its relevance to a student's major and/or career goals and provides for alternating semesters of study and full time-work. A parallel plan (part-

time work and part-time study) is also available in most colleges although the students on the parallel plan comprise less than five percent of the co-op enrollment. A co-op registration fee is paid by the participating students and provides the primary support for the program. All campus activities, facilities, and programs are open to co-op students as they are to other students. The program staff recruits students, develops job opportunities, facilitates the hiring process, and monitors the students at work sites. To be eligible to participate, undergraduate students must have a minimum grade point average of 2.25, and graduate students a minimum of 3.00. The results of a number of studies have shown that co-op students, on the average, perform better academically and persist to graduation at a higher rate than other students with similar characteristics. Student participation continues to increase with a growing percentage of master's and doctoral students involved. By meeting established criteria the Cooperative Education Program maintains accreditation by the American Society for Engineering Education. In 1993-94 the number of student placements was 1391, with 24% of these women and 20% minorities. Eighteen percent were 25 years of age or older. The make up of participants from the various academic units were: Engineering, 62.8%; Management, 5.58%; CALS, 4.2%; PAMS, 2.9%; Forest Resources, 1.9%; CHASS, 1.6%; Textiles, 1.4%; Design, 1.2%; Education, 0.1%; and Graduate students, 17.2%. Most of the 291 employers were from the private sector with only 16.3% of the agencies being governmental and 6.5% of the students placed with them. Only 14.4% of the students were at out-of-state locations. The gross earnings of the co-op students for the year was \$10,742,772. This program is now a unit in the Division of Undergraduate Studies.

International Programs

It was not until Chancellor Thomas arrived that International Programs began to report to the Provost. At that time Jackson

Rigney was employed to handle these programs and was titled Dean of International Programs. He had been in charge of International Programs on a university-wide basis since 1968. Jack Rigney told me:

In the early 1960s the United States Congress became interested in broadening the understanding of the U.S. citizens in international relations and proposed a rather massive educational program. It passed the International Education Act in 1965-66, under which grants were to be made to key universities in the country. In anticipation of such funds NCSU, along with many others, began to tool up to compete for these funds. Chancellor Caldwell was prominently involved in the Land Grant Association's efforts in supporting the movement and wanted to be sure NCSU was adequately involved. It was under these circumstances that the Office of International Programs was created.

Unfortunately, Congress never funded the Act, but it succeeded in stimulating the formation of units of International Programs in many colleges and universities in the country.

There was not a great deal of involvement of the Provost in activities of this office while it reported to the Chancellor because the international courses and faculty research activities with which the Provost or Dean of the Faculty were most concerned were not supervised here, but were the responsibilities of the departments and of the schools. Each NCSU leader of International Programs has tried to strengthen, foster and encourage the development and expansion of such activities. They have also attempted to know potential resources which might support such activities. Because of his prior experiences, Provost Kelly had perhaps the greatest experience among the Deans of the Faculty and Provosts in enhancing and increasing the scope of our international involvement. On July 2, 1964, Kelly chaired an informational meeting on International Relations and Activities at

NCSU. This summarized most international activities on campus at that time. On September 23, 1964, in an inquiry to a friend at Colorado State University who had just been appointed Director of the Office of International Programs, Kelly asked for information about that campus' program and stated that, "We have been considering the feasibility of establishing such an office on our campus to coordinate the various international programs and to help us determine our responsibilities for education in these areas." In 1966 Dean Peterson of the Graduate School wrote to Kelly and said, "This past fall, prompted by the staggering increases in foreign applications for admission to our Graduate School, we explored with considerable thoroughness various avenues for obtaining more complete and accurate information about foreign student applicants." As a result the Administrative Board of the Graduate School devised strategies and put them into place to enable a more effective evaluation of the credentials of foreign student applicants.

At this time several schools and especially SALS were being swamped with applications from foreign graduate students, but they were being pressed for facilities to accommodate all of the qualified domestic applicants. The School of Engineering, on the other hand, was having great difficulty in recruiting domestic graduate students and was forced to accept a higher proportion of foreign applicants to keep their graduate and research programs going.

On March 1, 1968, Rigney became Dean of International Programs at NCSU. Rigney made a study on limiting enrollments of international students at NCSU. This policy specified that the total enrollment of international students should not exceed 4% of the student body and that diversity in national origin should be maintained. This policy was issued on April 26, 1971, and with some modifications has guided us on the numbers of foreign graduate students to be admitted and on the distributional representation of these students. We wanted to be of service in the

education of international students especially to those from developing nations, but at the same time we wanted to keep the numbers at reasonable levels. Enrollments of international undergraduates have always been small in part because of regulations about the admission of out-of-state freshmen, but the demand for admission to NCSU from international undergraduates was not large. Degree opportunities were much more available for undergraduate students in their home countries.

At the time that Rigney began to report to the Provost some of his duties were described as follows:

1. To advise the Administration on responsibilities and opportunities for research, service and other educational activities in international affairs.
2. To keep the University abreast of government policies and programs relevant to our involvement in international affairs.
3. To keep the University administration appropriately informed of all University activities in international affairs and to coordinate these activities with the appropriate schools and divisions.
4. To represent this campus in any formal or informal multicampus relationships of a cooperative character in international programs.
5. To coordinate implementation of the authority of the University to grant the degree of Master Of Technology in International Development.
6. To assist the various departments seeking support from the public and private granting agencies.

Rigney and his successor J. Lawrence Apple were both very involved in the Land Grant University community in the development of operational guidelines and in their implementation under the Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act and in successive legislation in this area. Both were also involved in activities of the North Carolina

World Trade Association and improving institutional support to North Carolina industry and agriculture in their international involvement. Rigney started the development of alumni chapters in foreign countries which would not only help to maintain contacts with NCSU, but would also serve as focal points for professional contact between N. C. industry and their foreign interests. Under Rigney and since that time, the office has served as a focal point for international visitors and has provided assistance to them as they came to the University for a great variety of functions and lengths of stay here.

At the time of Rigney's retirement he went to a half-time appointment. International sources for funds and grants at this time were scarce except for some AID related programs in Agriculture. In that school Dr. Apple had been given the title of Coordinator of International Programs. Dean Rigney continued in this part time basis for two years. During this time the UNC System was beginning to develop and require a more structured Long Range Plan for each of the 16 campuses. Rigney headed this function at NCSU during Thomas' tenure.

Upon Rigney's retirement, J. Lawrence Apple was appointed as Coordinator for International Programs for the University. Apple commented on his assignment.

A major thrust was to develop programs that would enhance the international literacy of our graduates and that would promote enhanced collaborative scholarship by the faculty. Both of these are obviously interconnected; i.e., if the faculty are not involved internationally they will not likely reflect international dimensions of the courses they teach. These initiatives were based upon the general consensus that the competitive success of the USA in world politics and business requires that we as a nation become more literate of other cultures, languages and socio-economic systems. If this is to happen over the long term, our educational system must play a major role including the universities.

He also continued to direct the International Activities Office of the SALS. He worked on a half time basis for each unit. This employment arrangement continued until his retirement in 1991. During Apple's tenure the university expanded its international relationships, and adopted a number of guidelines developed by Dr. Apple and the International Programs Committee, our principle faculty advisory group on international activities on our campus. These included guidelines for the establishment of University Relationships with universities in other nations. These became Sister Institutions. Also it provided for the development of similar sister relationships by departments and schools without involving the entire University. University-wide NCSU linkages and the nations involved are as follows:

1. Universidad Nacional Agraria at La Molina, Peru
2. Nagoya University at Nagoya, Japan
3. University of the Philippines at Los Banos and Diliman, Philippines
4. University of Costa Rica at San Jose, Costa Rica
5. Northeast University, Liaoning University, Liaoning Academy of Social Science, Liaoning Academy of Agricultural Science, Shenyang Agricultural University, Shenyang Polytechnic University at Shenyang, Peoples Republic of China
6. Ain-Shams University at Great Cairo area, Egypt
7. University of Technology at Campiegne, France
8. Federal University of Rio de Janeiro at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
9. University of Science and Technology at Kumasi; University of Ghana at Legon, University of Cape Coast at Cape Coast, Ghana
10. Technical Universitat "Otto von Guericke" at Madgeburg, Germany
11. National Chiao Tung University at Hsinchu, National Taiwan University at Taipei, Taiwan, ROC

12. Province of Northern Brabant at Brabant, The Netherlands

Our oldest and almost a continuous relationship with a foreign university has been with the Universidad Agraria, at La Molina, Peru. This has been a relationship with the School/College of Agriculture at NCSC/NCSU. Apple stated, "Institutional linkages were formed to provide a more orderly and accommodating mechanism for collaborative scholarly activities abroad by faculty and study abroad by students." During the 1980s fewer than 1% of NCSU's undergraduates earned academic credit under a study-abroad program.

Area studies committees were established for those areas of the world with which we were becoming involved. Those presently in place and developed under Apple's administration are China, Africa, South Asia, and the Commonwealth and Associated States (Russia). Two others, Japan and Latin America, were in existence in some form under Rigney but were formalized under Apple. This brought a greater number of faculty whose fields were international in scope into a campus-wide involvement in international activities. Ideas were developed and the University made much progress in its planning for international involvement under Dr. Apple's direction. Dr. Apple did two surveys of the international activities of faculty at NCSU. The last survey was an extensive one and was conducted at all 16 campuses of the BOG system. Apple was the major architect in the development of the instrument.

In July of 1978, an exchange program was established between Universities in Israel and with UNC-CH and NCSU. The idea was Governor James Hunt's, and the funds for the program were raised by a group of interested Jewish citizens of North Carolina. Several of these were appointed by Governor Hunt to serve on an advisory committee for the program. The program was to exchange scholars between the two N.C. universities and universities in Israel. To get the program established, the funds

were at first used to support several scholars annually. Later we began to try to get enough funds in endowments so that the program would continue. The endowment funds were sufficient for one scholar per year. Scholarly exchanges were for one semester. If an individual chose to extend his/her visit for a second semester it was done without additional payment from the program, but the individual home universities usually continued to support their scholars. The idea was that in a four-year cycle NCSU and UNC-CH would have received and sent one scholar each. I was appointed Chairman of the University of North Carolina Committee for the Visiting Scholar Exchange Program with Israel by the Governor on President Friday's recommendation and remained in charge of handling the program for the UNC. When Governor Hunt left office after his second term, the Advisory Committee was not continued; however, I continued to handle the administrative matters for these exchanges and Mr. Worsley continued to handle the finances for the program. Later these activities were transferred to Dr. Apple and the International Programs Office. Israeli scholars were selected by appropriate administrators in Israel. For many years Mr. Schlomo Birnbaum of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem was chairman of the selection and arrangements process in Israel. The faculty to be exchanged were to be technologists or scientists. The home university continued to pay the salary of their faculty exchangees while they were in the exchange program. We then used the programs funds to pay cost of living funds and travel funds for the faculty member. This was for \$8,000 for the N. C. scholar and \$10,000 for the Israeli scholar.

In August 1984, the Council on International Programs presented a report entitled: "The International Dimensions of North Carolina State University." This study had many recommendations, and it was to become the starting point of several other studies instituted by the Council. It did become the blueprint for further studies

and for the development of international activities at NCSU. Recommendations as summarized in the Executive Summary of the report were as follows:

1. Almost regardless of structural or financial considerations, the key to success of a university-wide program lies in the administrative structure accorded the activity within the university governance structure. NCSU lacks a sense of mission that should be fulfilled by a strong statement, affirming recognition of the importance of international programs, issued by the Chancellor. In the same vein, specific policy statements, delineating goals and guidelines, should be drafted at the school level. The absence of such statements is perceived as a lack of institutional commitment.
2. The Chancellor should appoint an Advisory Board composed of distinguished citizens who represent the several clienteles in the State that have international involvement or interests. This Board could provide objective counsel on matters international and also serve as 'honest brokers' for NCSU's international involvement to the citizens of North Carolina. Our involvement requires a strengthened advocacy both on campus and throughout the State.
3. Our administration of international programs should be more effective by initiating some structural changes. Such modifications should be considered for the Office of International Programs and for the Offices of the International Student Advisor.
4. Disincentives to faculty participation must be minimized and incentives should be emphasized. This could be one effect of the mission and policy statements mentioned above. Our rich faculty experience should be more gainfully exploited, as should the considerable resources represented by the many talented international visitors to our campus and the Research Triangle area. Only as this

pool of experience is put to use can meaningful curricular improvements be made.

5. Institutional linkages should be strengthened. This might involve other academic institutions, public or private, foreign or domestic, as well as appropriate commercial interests, that could provide meaningful international-intern opportunities for our students.
6. The dialog must be continued and nurtured. Better communicational levels of the university's operation must be fostered. Open, objective discussion of all recommendations is requisite to their acceptance. Two obvious arenas are the school curriculum committees and the Provost's Forum.

This report summarizes the responses of an extensive faculty questionnaire which addressed views of the faculty. Apoll said:

During the 1980s there was considerable emphasis through the Division of International Affairs of NASULGC on the 'internationalization' of higher education. These national initiatives gave us encouragement for the conduct of two self studies of the status and interest in further internationalization, the first was within NCSU and the second included the UNC System. Under the one conducted in 1990 each campus was to develop a long range plan and implementation strategy. In the case of NCSU, the report and implementation strategy were approved by the Dean's Council in May, 1991. I regret that the implementation of that plan has not made much progress within the past four years, but then the budgets have been cut substantially during that period. At the UNC System level the whole matter was apparently dropped.

The NCSU survey also included a summary of participation of faculty in international activities. We did have a very well attended Provost's Forum which discussed

the role at NCSU before the plan was presented to the Dean's Council.

We established an NCSU Policy Council on International Programs which consisted of four Deans (on a rotational basis), the Provost, and the Coordinator of International Programs. This worked well. This council was appointed by Chancellor Poulton on April 15, 1985, and its charge, which was quite lengthy, can be found attached to that memorandum. A reason for its effectiveness was that all recommendations that came to the administration on international dimensions of the University came through and were recommended by this body. To have four deans, the Provost and the Coordinator of International Programs all encouraging the adoption of recommendations was a powerful force of support. Both the NCSU campus and the UNC system adopted strong statements in support of international programs and activities.

One of the functions of the International Programs Office was the handling of visas for international EPA personnel. This involved appropriate visas for the employment of faculty, staff, and for temporary or visiting personnel. This office maintained up-to-date information on regulations of the federal government and assisted departments in making certain that visitors who were to receive compensation for services at NCSU obtained the proper visa before they left their home countries to come to the USA. They also assisted the departments who were attempting to hire international persons to permanent positions to assure that person had obtained the proper visa. "A Policy Statement on Faculty Appointments for Aliens" was issued on February 1, 1984. There was in that same year a "Policy on Petitioning for Alien Employment Certification and Permanent Residency Status by North Carolina State University." I recall one instance where a unit did not seek help and a new faculty member came to us with a visa which did not permit the holder to earn money in the USA. He had to return to his home country to obtain the proper visa

before he could be placed on the NCSU payroll. We had other instances where there was no consultation before a visit and an honorarium could not be paid to a visitor with an improper visa. Most of these were visitors who came to professional meetings in the USA and then were invited to NCSU to give a seminar. One other area of constant concern was in assistance to Research Associates and other post doctorates and their reappointments. Many of these had come initially on student visas to this country to work on a doctoral degree, and after gaining the legitimate postdoctoral experiences provided under the student visa's regulations they now wanted to stay in this country permanently. Federal regulations were strict, and the International Programs Office made certain that we did not employ individuals improperly. As the years passed the amount of work and the quantity of regulations grew. The International Program's staff were of great value and performed a great service to NCSU. They were not always thanked for the service and were at times criticized for not bending or violating these federal regulations. An example of the regulations and help provided can be found in the "Visa Categories and Payroll Procedures for Aliens" which was distributed January 1, 1985. Prior to the assumption of this activity by the Office of International Programs, this function was performed by Mary Strickland or other individuals in the Personnel Office of the Provost.

During the 1980s Apple and the Advisory Committee sought to institutionalize international activities by the development and approval of policy guideline statements. Significant among them were: "Mission and Policy Statement for International Programs" which was approved by the NCSU Board of Trustees on September 13, 1986; "Guidelines for Establishment of Linkages with Universities Abroad" which was approved by the Chancellor on December 4, 1987; "Policy Statement on Study Abroad" which was approved by the Chancellor on June 4, 1986; and a "Policy

Statement" which was issued as an Administrative Memorandum by President Friday on November 17, 1983. Three other significant reports of Activities of the International Programs Office by J. Lawrence Apple were: 1) Description of Relevant International Experience of NCSU on November 21, 1985; Overview of International Programs at NCSU on December 5, 1988; and Status of International Linkages on December 30, 1988.

Upon Apple's retirement Dr. Edward Erickson, a Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for Economics and Business Studies, became the Interim Coordinator, of International Programs on a full time University appointment rather than on a joint appointment basis with part time responsibilities to another unit. Linkage programs in Africa have been added and those in China have been strengthened under Erickson.

Radiation Protection

We have had an Office of Radiation Protection for many years. This office was necessary and was required by federal agencies when we began to do research involving isotopes and radioactive elements and compounds and use them in teaching as well as in research. The Provosts had little to do with the office except to recommend members of the faculty for the Radiation Protection Committee before Thomas became Chancellor. All members, except one who was a member of the CHASS faculty, were to be experienced in radioactive research. Dr. Kelly wanted to add a humanities faculty member to the committee. At the time that Thomas became Chancellor, the Radiation Protection Office began to report to the Provost.

This staff monitored all sites where radioactive materials were used in research or teaching at periodic intervals and monitored radioactive waste. The staff was responsible for assuring the proper storage and disposal of radioactive waste to approved sites using approved methods for shipping. The unit required some very

sensitive and expensive equipment for measuring and monitoring. The Provost heard problems, received reports of any spills and how these were handled. Fortunately these were few and were not serious. The Provost received frequent reports on the activities of the unit. I had to help the unit get additional resources whenever an item of equipment needed to be purchased or replaced because the equipment was expensive and needs for replacement of their equipment occurred infrequently. Thus there was not a large equipment budget. Since research in this area was continuously expanding, we also never had adequate resources for cost of waste disposal and shipment and had to request additional funds each year. Personnel matters also came to the Provost, including approvals for salary increases, hiring and promotion. Fortunately we had few problems in personnel matters. The few that we had were as complex and difficult to resolve as those that I encountered anywhere at NCSU.

The knowledge and skills of the personnel in this unit were valued by the related agencies in State government and in industry. When problems arose elsewhere, their services were sought to study and to recommend solutions to these problems. As a result there were modest consulting activities which I had to approve for the staff.

Thomas L. Carruthers was the Director when the unit was transferred to the Provost. After his retirement, D. William Morgan, the Assistant Director, was selected as the next Director. The Radiation Protection Committee served as the search committee.

Since the unit did most of its work in relation to research and since Chancellor Monteith had indicated that under his administration the Provost would assume a number of new responsibilities, I transferred responsibility for the program and the unit to the Vice Chancellor for Research early in 1990, the year that I retired.

One thing that the staff worked on in conjunction with others involved in hazard-

ous waste was to try to get adequate facilities. When plans were first made this facility did not make get a high enough priority to get funded for a couple of biennia. When problems arose with toxic waste at NCSU, the 1994 Legislature appropriated funds for such a facility.

Fort Bragg

In 1964, after approval by the Board of Higher Education, a four year degree granting branch was established at Fort Bragg. For years during and after World War II we taught courses at Fort Bragg. When the courses were taught and degrees not offered, the program reported to the Director of Continuing Education and through him, beginning in 1955, to the Dean of the Faculty. The first Director of the four-year program at Fort Bragg was Dr. Horace Rawls. He soon resigned the position and returned to Raleigh where he held a professorship in the Sociology Department. Dr. Millard P. Burt, Academic Dean at Methodist College, was appointed Director and assumed responsibility in 1965. The position continued to report to Dr. Jack Suberman, Director of Continuing Education, until he left NCSU in 1967. I was appointed as Assistant Provost at that time, and the program began to report to me.

A study of the college program at Fort Bragg was presented to the Board of Higher Education in 1963. It described the semester schedule which varied from that of the Raleigh campus in that it had one summer semester and four semesters during the academic year. These time periods more nearly met the needs of the military personnel who constituted the majority of the student body. The program was to include degree programs in Economics, English, History, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. We were to teach all of the courses required for a BA degree. Obviously we could not provide the great diversity of offerings that we did in Raleigh. It was to be staffed by resident full time faculty with

some faculty from the Raleigh campus who commuted to teach courses and some part time faculty. Some of the part-time faculty were members of the army and air forces who had doctorates and were stationed at Fort Bragg and at the Pope Air Force Base. Others were faculty at local colleges. We had some problems when students were sent by the military to cover emergencies all over the world, but the program proved to be capable of flexibility and adaptable to these and other issues where almost all students were part-time. This was one of the major reasons for having five semesters during the year. Members of the Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base civilian staff and family members of the military were also eligible to attend. After the undergraduate program was transferred to Fayetteville State University and when NCSU, ECU and UNC-Charlotte established several masters programs, the civilians in the Fayetteville area also could enroll. NCSU's graduate programs reported to their departments and to Associate Dean James Peeler of the Graduate School at NCSU. These graduate programs did not last for many years. They were phased out in 1982 and will not be discussed further.

The undergraduate degree programs were established so that the faculty and the academic content and the courses to be taught were identical to and under the control of the departments on the NCSU campus. The scheduling, the registration of students, the recruitment of students, and the collection of tuition and fees were done by the staff at Fort Bragg. Student records were kept by the Registrar at NCSU. Actually while the departments approved all of the faculty who taught at Fort Bragg, it was Dr. Burt and the other faculty at Fort Bragg who recruited and found most of the faculty who were hired and worked there. The military was the most effective recruiting agent for students. The military also provided the library and all of the physical facilities required for the program. Mr. William A.

Edmundson, Director of the Army Education Center at Fort Bragg, gave the strongest possible support to the program and he deserves much credit for its success.

We provided the same contracts, benefits and privileges to faculty at Fort Bragg that we provided to the faculty on the NCSU campus. Many of the students at the Fort Bragg Branch had attended other institutions and had made some progress towards a degree elsewhere before they enrolled in the NCSU program. Studies about our students at Fort Bragg indicated that they were very well qualified and truly exceptional academically. They were dedicated and worked very hard on their courses and were on the average older and more mature than the students on the Raleigh campus. This was a very successful program.

We were operating a program in the backyard of a sister institution, Fayetteville State University. Chancellor Caldwell told the Faculty Senate, and recorded on page 122 of the Senate's 1969-70 minutes, "The enrollment of the Fort Bragg Branch is presently about 1000 students with a staff of 16 to 18 faculty." We actually had more FTE faculty than that. He also said that a legitimate question that could be raised was why local colleges had not taken on this program when it started in 1964, and he indicated that, "In general the private institutions were not interested and the State supported institution, Fayetteville State Teachers College, did not have sufficient budget and other resources to take on the project. However, the situation today is that Fayetteville State Teachers College has been designated a University with a sizable improvement in budget and, incidental to the question they have a new president." On December 12, 1969, Chancellor Caldwell wrote to the President of Fayetteville State University (FSU) offering to cooperate with his institution in strengthening their program and in obtaining their cooperation in the Fort Bragg Branch with the eventual goal of turning the program over to FSU.

He indicated that this action was not a result of the HEW report but was purely and simply a common sense move. He indicated that the authorities at FSU and the authorities at Fort Bragg had indicated a favorable response to this recommendation. The proposal was formalized and the Board of Higher Education gave its approval on April 17, 1970 for the transfer to be started and for Fayetteville State University to assume responsibility for the Fort Bragg Branch on July 1, 1973.

I was given the responsibility to work with FSU to facilitate a smooth transition of the program and to ascertain that it would be transferable by July 1, 1973. I met with the administrators at FSU, Dr. Burt and Mr. Edmundson many times. While I got much of the credit for the orderly and smooth transfer, most of the credit must go to Dr. Burt and to the faculty who handled the

matters of transfer and public relations in a splendid manner. Most of the faculty at Fort Bragg transferred to FSU at the same ranks, salary and with the same privileges that they held at NCSU. A few who had planned to leave us left at that time too. Four were transferred to the Raleigh campus. These were Dr. John W. Magill in Psychology, Dr. Cleburn G. Dawson in Sociology and Dr. Millard P. Burt and Dr. Conrad Glass in Adult and Community College Education.

At the meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in December of 1973, the accreditation of NCSU including the Fort Bragg Branch was reported. The Southern Association accreditation team had visited the Fort Bragg Branch just prior to its transfer to FSU. Of course the transfer which was to occur was known and understood by the accreditation team.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS AND ACTIVITIES

Faculty Senate

The first mention of relationships between the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate was in 1960 in a memorandum from Caldwell referring to duties of the Dean of the Faculty. In this memorandum the Dean was "to assist the faculty bodies in any helpful way possible in the performance of their functions, and he is expected to maintain a complete file of all formal actions and recommendations for administrative reference." To accommodate this function and to ascertain that the Senate recommendations or resolutions were acted upon, this practice was followed. The recommendations were sent to the Dean of the Faculty or Provost by the Senate Chairman for action. The Provost would send a copy to the Chancellor if the Chairman had not done so. If the matter needed to be studied or resolved by another office in the NCSU administration, the Provost would send the resolution to the appropriate VC within whose area of responsibility the matter fell. We always acknowledged receipt of the resolution to the Senate Chairman and indicated where it was sent. Most of these resolutions were sent to the Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs or Finance and Business. To avoid inaction on a resolution, I kept a log on my desk. If the resolution dealt with an academic matter, it would be put on the Administrative Council or the Deans Council agenda. After study and discussion and a decision had been made to accept a resolution dealing with policy, it would be formally accepted by the Chancellor and a policy memorandum would be issued. If it were a procedural matter it was usually accepted by the appropriate VC or by the Provost. If the proposals were not acceptable as presented, but would be accepted with modifications, there would be negotiations usually between the Provost, the appropriate

VC and the Senate. After the Senate recommended that Conference Committees be established in areas of disagreement with the University administration, Hart and I appointed the administrative members of a Conference Committee. The Senate Chairman appointed the Senate members. In other cases either the Chancellor or the Provost would write and say that the proposal was not acceptable. There were very few rejections of the Faculty Senate's proposals, but there were a large number of Conference Committees. Most of these dealt with procedural matters.

When I had just joined Dr. Kelly as Assistant Provost, the Senate recommended that the Provost would be a member of the Faculty Senate, and it was approved by the Chancellor, the Governance Committee, and the General Faculty. Dr. Kelly did not want to attend regular meetings of the Senate. He felt that it would be a conflict of interest for him to attend these meetings and to participate in discussions because recommendations of the Senate would come to him for action. For this reason he sent me to represent him at Senate meetings. The years I represented Provost Kelly at the Senate meetings seemed to be appreciated. I represented the Provost with regular attendance and participation in committee activities as well as regular meetings. Dr. Kelly attended Senate Meetings only when he received a special invitation. In 1970 Provost Kelly wrote to the Senate formalizing my Senate service and indicated that I would represent him. The Senate really would have preferred the representation to be by the Provost and not by his delegate. When I became Provost I knew that the Senate wanted me to attend its meetings regularly. I put the Senate meetings on my calendar for these years so that I would have very few

conflicts and could attend meetings regularly. I did ask Dr. Downs and Dr. Clark to attend most meetings, too. From time to time I could not attend because of a conflict, then one or the other, usually Dr. Downs, would represent me. These two individuals became primary and regular resource persons for the Senate committees. The practice of the Senate sending actions to the Provost has continued since that time, except for resolutions which required no action from the administration. In a few cases, especially during Chancellor Poulton's term, some Senate Chairs sent a few actions directly to the Chancellor, most often with a copy to me.

Prior to 1956, the list of graduating students were approved by the vote of the General Faculty. With the encouragement of the Faculty Senate and University administrators, the faculty voted 89 for and 103 against continuing the practice of voting on the graduating students. I don't know whether this truly reflected the combined influence of the Faculty Senate and the University administrators or not. I suppose that it is hard to break with tradition, but it was only a 14 vote victory.

In 1957, the Senate sent a copy of its proposals to the President of the University. He rejected one recommendation of the Senate on salary policy that year. The Senate voted 18 to 6 to write the President expressing regret that he had rejected their proposal. Shirley objected strongly to the Senate sending its recommendations directly to the President, and stated that items should be submitted to the NCSC administration and that they then would forward them only when necessary, when the President's approval was needed. Bostian also questioned the wisdom of the Senate sending items directly to the President. Those of us who followed in the NCSU administration were glad that this issue got solved appropriately before we were hired.

On January 1, 1960, Caldwell assigned the budget for the Faculty Senate Office to the Provost. This meant that budget increases, personnel selections and salary

increases for the Senate SPA secretary were processed through the Provost's Office. This practice continues to be followed.

In 1961, when the Government Committee proposed the Chairman of the Senate as the Chairman of the Faculty, both Caldwell and Shirley reacted negatively, for they had assumed that the Chairman of the Faculty was the Dean of the Faculty. At issue was not the holding of General Faculty meetings, which the Chancellor chaired. Shirley said, "The thing that concerns me most about this proposal is that it reduplicates once more the division between faculty and administration. The document has a fatal resemblance to the faculty constitution of the School of General Studies which puts the Dean in such an off-hand position that he can legally do almost nothing and leaves everything to the vote of the faculty." He went on to say that the General Faculty was too large to function as a deliberative and legislative body. Decisions for changes in Governance continued to require a vote of the faculty. In time it required a very large effort of the members of the Government Committee, the Faculty Senators and the University administrators to get faculty to attend a General Faculty meeting. Even if all those in attendance voted yes, there might not be enough faculty present to pass the proposed change. In time the General Faculty approved the proposal to have these issues decided by mail ballot. I recall that this change to a mail ballot barely passed by the voice vote cast, not because of the number of no votes, but because the total number of attendees at the General Faculty meeting was barely enough to pass an issue. I have often wondered if the result would have been the same if an actual count of votes had been taken at that meeting.

The agenda for General Faculty meetings were set and announced by the Senate, after giving the campus an opportunity to submit agenda items and after a meeting of the Senate leaders, the Chancellor and the Provost. In time General Faculty meeting agendas have come to include the Senate telling about its accomplishments and the

current status of its proposals, the activities of the delegates to the Faculty Assembly of UNC, the Provost's remarks, and the Chancellor's remarks. Other items are included as requested. The Chancellor, not the Provost or the Chairman of the Senate, has been the Master of Ceremonies at the General Faculty meetings. This meeting has provided an opportunity for the faculty to be better informed about major issues; however, poor attendance has continued. I recall hearing complaints many times about the faculty not being informed about an issue when we had discussed the matter thoroughly at the last faculty meeting. Since the attendance at General Faculty meetings were so poor, Chancellor Thomas proposed that the General Faculty meet once a year instead of twice a year. The idea failed when brought to a faculty vote. In this case there was not a quorum present, but I recall that there were a large majority of no votes from those attending.

After Poulton became Chancellor and with his support, we officially began to provide one-half release time for the Chairman of the Faculty Senate as well as for the Chairman of the Honors Council. This was not at one-half of the Chairman's salary, but it was at a level of around \$30,000 to enable departments to hire sufficient faculty on a temporary basis to carry on at least one-half of the Chairman's teaching and advising responsibilities. This practice continued under Hart and Monteith.

There have been so many contributions of the Senate to the University that I shall only mention a very few here. Others are mentioned and discussed in many other sections of this history. One of the early efforts of the Faculty Senate while Shirley was Dean of the Faculty, was to get tenure for the faculty at NCSC. Another effort that was vital to NCSU was the new tenure documents that were developed shortly after the consolidation of the institutions that reported to the Board of Higher Education, and of the UNC System under the Board of Governors. The EPA mediation procedures also have to be placed very high on the list.

The administrative review procedures for department heads and deans and the guidelines for the selection of administrative officials have been very useful and helpful. Over the years the Faculty Senate has considered, studied, debated, and voted on almost all of the academic and personnel policies now in existence on our campus. While no one of these contributions has been earth shattering, they together have helped to define what NCSU was to become. They have largely determined our quality and what we are today. I believe that the quality is great, and I thank the Senators for these academic contributions which are their most valuable contributions. None of these lost sight of important quality factors or of the importance of undergraduate education, including the teaching of freshmen by senior faculty. When so many institutions were dropping requirements in math and science and in some areas of the humanities and social sciences in the late sixties and early seventies, we did not. I sometimes wished that we had fewer changes in the grading systems, but we tried and revised, and revised again, a number of systems.

Certain matters are the province of the Board of Governors and while this campus cannot determine these, they have usually been debated. These recommendations have usually been forwarded by the Chancellor to the President. The Senate and the Provosts have had cordial and mutually beneficial relationships. I believe that there has been a synergistic effect of having these two work hand in hand together to bring about desired change. The campus has adopted almost all of the Senate proposals. As indicated earlier, there have been modifications in the proposals, usually for improvement in procedures rather than for changing the concepts of the proposals. In many cases, because of this close working relationship, major differences have been resolved before the action was brought to a vote in the Senate. The campus should be thankful because this relationship has brought out a cooperative and "let's work together for the good of the campus" attitude, instead of

having an adversarial atmosphere. It was a joy for me to have participated. I served officially for just over sixteen years as a member of this body, although I only voted on a few resolutions. I also attended as Dr. Kelly's representative for another seven years. I doubt if anyone will ever again serve on the Senate for so long a time. I salute the Senate for its wisdom so many years ago in making the Provost a member.

I have in no way given the Senate adequate coverage for its value to NCSU and for its many contributions. Fortunately I did not have to for I have learned that with Provost Stiles' encouragement, Dr. Murray Downs has agreed to write a *History of the Faculty Senate*.

Student Affairs

All of the Deans of the Faculty and Provosts have worked closely with the persons who have headed Student Affairs. This has meant that the Assistant and Associate Provosts and Assistant and Associate Deans of Student Affairs have also worked together collaboratively and closely. Many of these areas have been mentioned in other sections of this history and will not be repeated here.

When Thomas was Chancellor, he began a plan which would have involved the Chancellor much more extensively in external matters and in a major capital campaign which was scheduled to start about the time that he left NCSU. It was his plan to make the Provost responsible for more internal operations of the campus, except for athletics. He left to return to the University of Alabama before this plan was entirely implemented. After Monteith became Chancellor, he decided that the Provost should be responsible for most internal matters and Student Affairs began to report to Dr. Hart while he was Provost.

Over the years, in reading the correspondence between the Provosts and the Deans or the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs, it is evident that the two units and their leaders worked cordially and effectively together for the betterment of the University and its students. Of course they did not

always agree, but it seemed that consensus could be and was reached on most issues of common concern.

Although Kelly, Hart and I had to review the proposed salary increases for the EPA personnel in Student Affairs in all of their various areas of responsibility, we had little disagreement with what was proposed by Dean James Stewart, VC Talley and VC Stafford. The Chancellors usually wanted to see the proposed salaries of the Assistant and Associate Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs and occasionally for others. Our greatest wish was that we could have had more funds for these salary increases.

Student Affairs managed the staff and operational budgets for the music program. The academic component and classes reported through CHASS or its predecessors. ROTC also reported for management purposes through Student Affairs, but the courses and teaching reported through the School of Engineering. Shortly after the Admissions Office was transferred to the Provost by Chancellor Poulton, VC Talley and I had more disagreements than we had before then, or later. We both learned about the proposed transfer at about the same time. I believe that Dr. Talley thought I was involved in some of the changes being made or considered at that time by the Chancellor. I was even less informed than he was about what was being considered that involved Student Affairs units, but I too heard rumors of possible additional changes. There were a number of times that I thought that Chancellor Poulton enjoyed what he thought of as creative tensions and healthy conflicts among his VCs.

The Provosts were supportive of requests for new appropriations to enhance the improvement of the programs managed by Student Affairs. We frequently called these activities the "hidden curriculum." The units in this Division supported almost all of the cultural activities available to students on the NCSU campus. Thank goodness for receipts, student fees and admission charges to events for faculty and others, which supported most of these

activities, for state appropriations were very parsimonious for support of cultural events. Our cupboard would have been bare without the receipts which paid for these cultural activities, and our students' educations would have been very deficient if we had provided only those activities which would have been supported by state appropriations. The imagination and enthusiasm, especially of Talley and Stafford and of their staffs created and brought to NCSU programs in music, the Student Center programs, including Friends of the College which was the major cultural event of Eastern North Carolina for so many years, the Center's exhibits, the Craft Center, Stewart Theater and Thompson Theater.

Registration and Calendar

In January of 1956, Dean Shirley was appointed to represent the administration on a special Calendar Committee with representatives of the Faculty Senate. This special committee was appointed because the calendar had been modified by a recent proposal of the Faculty Senate which was approved by the Administrative Council without either group asking the Calendar Committee and Registration and Records if the changes would work for the next semester. This resulted in considerable confusion and misunderstanding about which calendar was in effect, the new one or the one previously published. There were several recommendations made by this special calendar committee which were later adopted which established calendar policy for years. These affected both the summer session and academic year calendars. In this action two six week summer sessions were to be held instead of one longer session. It was stated that, "Until the summer session is regularly appropriated for, the second six-weeks session should be held to a minimum size to meet a recognized demand." Soon there were regular appropriations, but they were never funded adequately with necessary support funds for instructional supplies and equipment in the summer sessions. Some special summer programs could be held,

even though they did not coincide with the regular schedule of the summer session periods. An example at that time was the Institute of Statistics' summer program. Later a number of Agricultural Extension and NSF grant sponsored summer courses in a number of scientific areas were taught for varying lengths for high school students and for high school and college teachers. The first session of Summer School was to start as soon as practical in June after the end of the regular academic year session. At this time, all summer session classes were to meet five days a week. The credit hours for courses were changed for the summer sessions rather than varying the number of days and hours different classes would meet. This did not work, and created so much confusion that soon courses continued to have the same credit hours as they had during the academic year. The contact hours also remained nearly the same as those of the academic year. In this way a three credit course did not meet as many days or hours as did a four credit course.

The normal fall semester and spring semester would include as close to 90 days as possible, including days of registration and examination. This was to change later when a UNC System committee chaired by VP Arnold King was appointed to set a standard calendar for all campuses. It also was shortened further years later when we dropped orientation days for new students and registration for courses just before the beginning of the semester.

In 1955, it was decided that the two graduation exercises per year would be dropped and that there would be only one exercise at the end of the Spring Semester. At the beginning of Hart's term as Provost and at the request of the students, we tried graduation again at the end of the Fall Semester on an experimental basis. It was so well attended and there was so much interest that having two graduation exercises per year again became the practice.

In 1956, there was concern for balanced fall and spring semesters and in the number of MWF and TThS classes. Of course this

never succeeded and was to fail badly in the years ahead, for students went to great extremes to avoid Saturday classes. They would register for an extra class and drop any assigned on Saturday morning and developed every reason imaginable to avoid Saturday classes. Faculty were not too happy with Saturday classes either, so soon we had as many classes as there were classrooms during the morning and early afternoon hours on Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The TThS schedule was soon changed to a TTh one. To have an equivalent amount of classroom time, the TTh scheduled classes were taught for longer periods on those two days. This is still the practice with some common exams for multisectioned courses and a few laboratories scheduled on Saturday morning, usually over loud student protests. At this time we had a 10 minute break between classes.

Holidays included Thanksgiving, from noon on Wednesday until Monday morning. This later was to be changed to include all of Wednesday. Christmas was to allow for a full week before Christmas to enable students to get Christmas jobs, usually at home. Also the calendar was to be adjusted each year so that students should not have to drive back to campus in New Year's traffic. Easter was to be for a full week, and lasted from Wednesday night of one week until Thursday morning of the next week. Much later the students were to obtain a mid-semester break of two and one-half days in the fall and a week in the spring, but not at Easter. Extra holidays for calendar-year employees were scheduled at Christmas so as to make up for the scattered number of holidays allowed by the State for employees. These holidays throughout the semester were not very suitable for a university calendar. Employees got the fourth of July, Labor Day and New Year's Day as holidays too. At this time the Easter holiday, which had for years been reduced to only one day, was eliminated.

In 1962-63, several recommendations came from the Faculty Senate that were approved. It was recommended that we move to a calendar that ended the semester

before Christmas, but this would not be approved until several years later. This change would later be sought by all. After it was adopted it was of great educational benefit, but it has led to some very hot dormitory rooms and classrooms at the beginning of the fall semester. Also recommended that year was that we move to a summer session of two sessions with five and one-half weeks in each. This last recommendation was approved and still exists today.

In 1963, there was another study of the calendar, with a recommendation that we go back to the quarter system. This was opposed by a majority of the Faculty Senate members and by many others. In 1964, the Senate opposed starting the fall semester in sufficient time to end before Christmas. Among other matters discussed was a cube system for year round operations. After much debate, that proposal did not gain support, and it was a good thing that it did not succeed, because everywhere the cube was tried it was not practical and did not work. In fact, in most places it was a financial disaster, for it was not possible to get students enrolled in sufficient numbers in the summer to have four sessions balanced in student enrollment. The cube concept was intended to utilize the facilities and faculty maximally throughout the year.

In 1964-65, as a change in the length of the semester break was being discussed, it was stated that the Chancellor had concerns about approving "so lengthy a mid-year hiatus." As different calendars were being discussed at NCSU, Chancellor Caldwell was reminded by President Friday that the calendar was an all-university matter. President Friday requested in January 1966, that NCSU defer its plans until an All-University Calendar Committee, to be Chaired by Arnold King, could make recommendations. I represented NCSU on that committee while I was an Assistant Provost. After considerable study, a recommendation came forth in 1969 that all of the campuses would move to a calendar that ended the fall semester before Christmas.

In 1966-67, the calendar was still being discussed in the Senate. The Graduate School was concerned about the length of time after the spring semester's ending and the beginning of summer school. By January 1966, the discussion had arrived at a calendar that would conclude the fall semester before Christmas. The debate continued, although NCSU was ready to implement the changes for the fall of 1966. That new calendar would change the starting dates of summer school so that it would begin approximately one week after graduation in May. The School of Education had concerns, for this would prevent the public school teachers and high school graduates from coming to the first summer session. The Senate finally made a recommendation that we adopt this calendar with the following provision.

- a. The fall semester should end no earlier than December 18, and should begin as near September 1, as possible.

Neither of these two guidelines have been followed precisely for the semester usually begins before September 1, and frequently ends before December 18.

- b. Restrict the final examination period to six examination days with the understanding that no student be required to take more than two examinations in one day or more than three in any two consecutive days.

The two exams a day recommendation has been in place ever since.

- c. The Christmas holiday periods should not exceed two weeks.

This has not been followed and the students who wish to work over the holidays and all concerned have benefitted from the longer break.

- d. A spring holiday of one week should be scheduled at or about mid-semester without undue consideration for the time when Easter occurs.

This has been applauded by the students, and the faculty have also needed this break. These were adopted after the UNC System finally recommended a general calendar to the Trustees. This recommendation was that a calendar have 85 days including Mondays through Fridays, and not counting holidays. The 85 days were to include orientation days which were held at this time in the fall, just before registration, registration and change days. It also required each campus to have a Calendar Committee. In 1969, President Friday gave each campus the authority to proceed with its own calendar. All campuses of the UNC System did not precisely follow the semester lengths prescribed by this last committee, but all came very close. In the fall of 1970, a calendar that ended the fall semester before Christmas was finally implemented.

There is a rather complete review of the Senate's proposals over the years in the minutes of the Senate for 1968-69. There is also a rather complete set of correspondence and background in the Chancellor's files for 1969-70, in the Calendar folder.

In minutes of the Chancellor's staff meeting on November 30, 1970, I noted that a change from the 10 minute break between classes to a 15 minute break between classes was under consideration by the Provost. I found no record of action taken or of any specific study in the files. In 1975, I proposed to the Senate that the 15 minute class break be considered again. On February 3, 1976, the Senate recommended that we adopt the 15 minute break between classes and this was done. Few classes now started on the hour. Classes not starting on the hour had been the practice for the Tuesday-Thursday classes for many years. The 15 minute break came into being primarily because of the increased time needed to make it between classes from the extremes of the campus. This was brought on by the spread on the campus buildings over larger areas and especially near or on Western Boulevard. When the College of Textile's new building, and certain other graduate and research buildings opened in the nine-

ties at the Centennial Campus, it became necessary to provide scheduling for classes at that location using class starting times at the mid-class point of those on the North Campus. The bus service available and the class schedule changes for all classes taught at the Centennial campus has enabled the Textiles and the other students in those facilities to have less difficulty in meeting their schedules at both of these campus extremes. I understand that Textiles students have some block scheduling to avoid some trips on the bus.

In 1972, a longer Christmas break came into existence when the opening of the spring semester was changed from January 3 to January 10, and it did not result in a long mid-semester break hiatus as Caldwell had feared. We certainly had no students returning to campus on New Year's day after this change. The graduation date at NCSU for the spring would always be the second Saturday in May. That year the Saturday classes in Summer School were deleted too. In 1973, a recommendation was proposed to start the first summer session about one week after the spring graduation exercises. As discussed earlier, there were a number of concerns because this would eliminate high school graduates and teachers from attending day classes in the first summer session. At this time we did not teach many if any classes in the evening in Summer School. These students could attend classes the second summer session, and they did. We taught the classes that new entering students and school teachers would need in this session and the enrollment in the second sessions increased. In 1976, Chancellor Thomas approved a fall semester break of two days falling on a Monday and Tuesday. This balanced out the fall and spring schedules since Thanksgiving holidays at this time were on Thursday and Friday. Much later the Thanksgiving break would also include all of Wednesday.

Students have always wanted the names of the instructors listed in the schedule of courses used for registration. They consid-

ered this to be especially important in the courses with multiple sections. I understood their wish. While almost all of the faculty were rated as good teachers by the students, we probably did have a couple of duds here and there. As an adviser I had learned who the very poor teachers were, and I tried to keep my advisees out of their sections. The students also had many other reasons for not wanting this or that teacher, or for preferring another. In 1967-68, the Senate passed a resolution which would encourage the listing of instructors and thereby closely, but not precisely, agreed with what the Student Government had proposed earlier. Dr. Kelly accepted the Senate recommendation and encouraged the departments to list instructors. Not all departments did. Some gave a variety of reasons, including that they had not assigned teachers to specific sections in time for the early registration. When telephonic registration came into being, even fewer teacher assignments to specific sections had been made. Other departments would decide what courses the faculty were likely to teach, but they did not make the final assignment to all sections until the drop-add period was completed. During this period, sections for some courses would be dropped, merged or added. I recall some students who complained. It seems that they had registered for a section listed to be taught by a super teacher. When they got to class their teacher was sometimes new to the campus and unknown to them. Departments mentioned that some faculty would teach more sections of one course and fewer of another than was initially planned. With the larger numbers of temporary positions we would not have yet hired the faculty who would teach some courses at the time of preregistration. The students knew all this, but they wanted to see as many faculty assigned as was possible. I do believe that some of the departments did not want the students to know when certain faculty would teach, and for all of these reasons mentioned earlier they continued to list most multi-section classes as taught by

staff. If certain teachers had been listed, these very few faculty would have few or no students registered for their sections. Most of the departments did cooperate to the extent possible.

Although the responsibility for calendar and registration was under the Dean (VC) for Student Affairs, the Provosts have been involved in these two functions over the years. The Provosts maintained representation on the two committees, and later the combined committee through Mr. Simpson, Associate Provost Winstead and Associate Provost Downs. In 1984 when the two committees were combined, it was made clear that the recommendations of the committee would have to be approved by both the VC of Student Affairs and the Provost. Each year when there was a new feature, or even a minor change in the calendar, the Registrar reported the proposal to the VC of Student Affairs, and then that VC conferred with the Provost and they either accepted or rejected the proposal. They jointly recommended the calendar change to the Chancellor. The Provost and the VC had for these many years an informal working arrangement, because they needed to work together. So we did. Now the working together was formalized, but really brought about no changes. This process continued under Stafford and Hart.

When changes were proposed in procedures for registration a similar process was followed. At the time of Shirley, registration occurred over a two day period just before classes started in a semester. Later, after meeting with students, advisors sent registrations for continuing students to the Registrar. Registration days were for those continuing students who did not make out schedules, new students, and those students who wished to make changes in their schedules, such as getting out of Saturday or late Friday afternoon classes. Students also handled schedule conflicts on these days. A most significant change came when registration began to occur around mid-semester for the subsequent semester for all continuing students. The associated one or two

Change Days just before the semester began, was also continued. New students registered at this time, and schedule conflicts were resolved. Later an entirely new and revolutionary approach to registration was begun through the procedure of registration by telephone. Personnel in Student Affairs developed the process. It was first used in the fall of 1988 for the spring semester of 1989. This was the most significant change ever to occur in registration at NCSU. The first time it was used the system crashed. The telephone lines couldn't function because all of the students decided that to get the times they wanted for their classes, they would have to get on the computer first. While there was an adequate number of ports to get everyone registered over a few days time, the phone system could not cope with that number of calls at once. The personnel in Registration and Records adjusted and developed a registration schedule that worked. Don Patty, Jim Bundy and Ron Butler deserve a lot of gold stars for this innovative approach which was transported from NCSU and is now used at a large number of universities.

The most important benefit from preregistration and early registration was better planning, which resulted in wiser use of resources, finances, personnel and classrooms. Questions of what was to be taught and how few or how many sections of multiple section classes could now be more closely determined before the last moment. It also helped the bookstores and faculty in ordering textbooks. In the earlier years it had been a nightmare, for those teachers whose planned assignments had to be shifted to another class that they had not planned to teach. In the early days of registration in Reynolds Coliseum just before the beginning of classes and with no computers, registration and change days were always a crowded and hot mess. One estimated the numbers of classes and which classes would make, but there frequently were large shifts in the desired classes by students and a large number of classes or sections had to be

opened, merged or closed when not enough or too many students registered. Some of this dilemma is described in Chapter Seven in the section on *Chancellor's, Provost's, and Dean's Relations*, in a letter written by Dean Cahill to the Chancellor and to the Dean of the Faculty.

Preregistration in the preceding semester for continuing students took care of most of the problems in planning for the upper-level classes. This still left those problems associated with the transfer student who did take upper-level classes, and for the freshmen students. Some planning was done for these students, but there were still a large number of problems. The movement to a summer orientation with scheduling done for new freshmen and transfers, and its success in getting most new freshmen students scheduled, was of tremendous help. This enabled us to drop registration from just before the beginning of a semester for all but just a very few students. This did increase the importance of Change Day for a few years for many students who, for whatever reasons, wanted to switch from the section to which they were assigned. With the advent of the telephonic registration, changes could be made well in advance of the beginning of the semester. The long lines in hot Reynolds Coliseum just before the beginning of the fall semester were gone forever. If these changes had not been made our efforts to teach the undergraduate student and to maximize our resources by adding needed sections and merging or dropping under-enrolled sections would have been a great calamity in the world of today, because late and annual Legislative sessions are the rule, and it is often not known what the budget will be until just before the semester begins. This staff deserves a great thanks for their contributions to NCSU's educational efforts. The persons on the Provost's staff who were the major players here were Mr. Simpson and Dr. Downs.

With telephonic registration and a number of other changes in place Vice Chancellor Stafford and I recommended

the calendars for 1989 through 1993 on March 18, 1988. In making the recommendation to us, the Calendar Committee considered the following items:

1. Number of Class Days and Minutes of Instruction - There has been concern expressed that over a period of time the academic calendar had been shortened. As a result, the committee added class days onto the existing calendar so that the proposed calendar will have 71 class days per semester.

One primary factor which allowed this is that the new telephonic registration system will delete the need for a Registration Day.

There will be a consistent number of MWF and TTh class days each semester. There will be 42 MWF classes each semester for 2100 minutes of instruction. There will be 29 TTh class days each semester for 2175 minutes of instruction. The summer sessions will have 24 class days per session with 2160 minutes of instruction.

2. Starting Dates - Both fall and spring semesters will begin on Wednesdays and end on Friday. The committee feels that this is important for consistency.
3. Holidays - There will be a total of seven holidays each semester.

The holidays for the fall semester would include Labor Day, one day, Convocation, one-half day, Fall Break, two and one-half days, and Thanksgiving, three days. For the spring semester the holidays were Martin Luther King Day, one day, Spring Break, five days and Good Friday, one day.

One other matter of calendar was that of the work schedule or calendar for academic year faculty and teaching assistants. For example, the schedule for teaching assistants and nine-month faculty in 1981-82 had been set from August 24 to May 16. To avoid confusion I set these dates to be for nine months each year beginning on August 16 and ending on May 15.

Extension

One of the duties assigned to Shirley was oversight of NCSC University Extension. This was the continuing education component and did not include the programmatic extension components in the various schools, but all of the personnel matters for all on-campus extension personnel in the various schools which required approval by the Dean of the Faculty. Shirley began to appoint the University Extension Committee. Soon after Kelly came, he recommended the membership of that committee to the Chancellor who appointed the committee. The Chancellor continued to make the appointments to the committee after the Division of University Extension was created. When the Committee on Committees was established, this committee then nominated members of the University Extension Committee.

During Shirley's tenure we had off-campus extension programs at Gaston College (Technical Institute) in engineering, which reported to NCSU. This became the first campus of the Community College System and stopped reporting to NCSC. We also soon had the first two years of an engineering extension college program at Charlotte College which later was to become UNC-Charlotte.

When the Administrative Dean for Extension was appointed, Continuing Education functions were transferred from the Provost to the Division of University Extension under the supervision of Dr. William Turner who reported to the Chancellor. This unit supervised or had oversight for all short courses and continuing education efforts, including those short courses taught by and managed by extension units in the academic departments and schools. It did not have supervision of extension personnel and programs housed by academic departments in the schools.

Operations for management and the budgets of the summer sessions and scheduling and registration for the evening classes reported to Dr. Turner whose title was soon changed to Vice Chancellor. Both the off-

campus credit offerings and the summer sessions continued to report to the Provost for academic content and for personnel who taught these courses. This procedure continued until 1993. This section is now called the Adult Credit Programs and Summer Sessions. The Provost had to approve or concur with most of the policies of this Division. For example, no courses for University credit could be taught unless they were approved through the regular mechanisms for course approval. All faculty who taught credit courses had to be approved and were usually selected by the academic units. If a non-campus employee was hired to teach any credit offerings, the faculty member had to be appointed through the regular appointment process.

Each year the enrollment of summer sessions grew and grew. More and more courses had to be taught. Many of the students used Summer School to make up for lack of progress or to regain eligibility to return to school in the fall semester. More and more they came to gain extra credits towards graduation and to speed up earning their degrees. We found that a large number of public school teachers took courses in the second session of Summer School, and many students from other colleges and universities who lived or worked in the Raleigh and Durham areas during the summer came to NCSU to take summer session courses.

In 1968, Dr. Turner, Administrative Dean for University Extension, made a request for funds which would establish an Evening College as a separate College and which would report to the Administrative Dean of Extension. The files of that year make it clear that a decision was made which would continue to have most student services, registration and records, et cetera, provided by Student Affairs with some support to Continuing Education so that the students could register for evening classes conveniently at the McKimmon Center with its adequate parking. The academic offerings and instructional positions would continue to be allocated to the existing academic departments and schools, for the

instruction of classes in the evenings. It was true that from time to time, especially in the early years, a department or a school might try to forget that a part of their positions and academic budgets was allocated to provide for the teaching of evening classes. As this component of our instructional program grew, getting courses taught in the evening was not a serious problem. In only a very few cases did Provosts have to point out that a unit would have had no increases in positions if they had not been teaching students in the evening. I understand even today an occasional unit needs the reminder that without the evening courses they would have to return positions to the Provost. The demand for evening courses has grown enormously. Before I retired in 1990 we had begun to offer 15 degree programs in the evening, and today about 20 degree programs can be completed in their entirety by taking courses in the late afternoon and evenings. Most of these are masters degree programs. In 1990 we taught more than 300 courses, and at present we are teaching more than 400 courses and sections per semester in the evening. This has been very important to the adults who work full time and who wished to continue their education, by taking courses for pleasure, for professional development or to earn a degree.

The Vice Chancellor for Extension and his staff managed the approval mechanism for getting courses taught for credit at off campus sites. The BOG required approval by the BOG staff of any courses taught out-of-state. The BOG developed a cumbersome in-state approval mechanism requiring that the teaching campus get approval for any off-campus credit course to be taught in a county or in an adjacent county to an existing UNC campus. For example, if we wished to teach a College of Textile's course in Alamance County in a textile manufacturing plant to the employees of that company at that company's expense and request, we had to get the approvals of UNC-CH, NC Central University, NCA&T and UNC-G. None of the campuses had a program in textiles except for those courses called textiles which were

taught in home economics departments. Of course our courses did not duplicate or resemble any offered on those campuses. Occasionally, but rarely, we did get an objection from another campus to our teaching such courses in Alamance, but we were able to appeal the objection and to proceed anyway. The VC of Extension handled these approvals and reports with the system administration. Besides handling the advertising and the registration of evening classes, VC Turner headed our campus efforts to get more classes produced for TV and delivered by Cable TV. Extension even financed the production of some of the early TV courses. The content of the courses were the responsibility of the academic units and were approved if they were new courses via regular academic procedures.

This unit also managed the arrangements and logistics for short-courses taught on and off campus. This was a major undertaking, and continues to be a major effort, an important example of educational service to the people of the entire state and to the economy of the state. We have taught short courses to over 100,000 persons annually on campus for many years, and to another large number of groups at off campus sites. This is another example of the type of program that operates almost entirely on the income from fees charged to student participants. In many cases these fees are paid by the company or organization which employs the participants. The Provost had little to do with this operation, except to be proud of its accomplishments. He was involved in the approval of any exceptions to the guidelines on earnings for extension activity by faculty of the NCSU campus.

The Provost was also expected to review all of the salary increases and appointments for its personnel from this unit. In 1973, Kelly questioned and disapproved some of the salary increases proposed. However, Caldwell felt that the increases should be approved. He said:

I like to presume the concept that all salaries on campus be subject to a

central review for coordination and policy overview. But I also respect the line of responsibility which is held by such offices as the Vice Chancellor for Extension and Public Service, the Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, the Dean of Student Affairs et cetera. The particular sequence in this case now is a bit awkward and I need you to suggest a handling of it that cures the awkwardness. After all you're our genius on smoothing things out.

For many years we had large extension operations in SALS, and smaller units in the Schools of Forestry Resources, Textiles and Engineering. Later extension units were added in Education and SHASS. Later still the College of Veterinary Medicine had its own extension personnel and some of these were joint or associate faculty with CALS.

In the 1960s, Drs. Kelly and Caldwell approved Dean H. Brooks James' recommendation that persons employed on a full time basis in extension carry academic rank if they were employees and members of academic departments on campus. Of course they had to meet the qualification for the various ranks. Others would continue to be Extension Specialists. Those who taught or who did research could carry a professorial title without the Extension prefix. More and more of the Extension Faculty began to do applied research and were becoming involved more often in the education of graduate students. With the recommendation of Dean J. E. Legates and George Hyatt, Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, we dropped the use of the Extension prefix to an academic rank in SALS in almost all cases. Many of these faculty had appointments with part time assignments in extension and in either instructional or organized research functions. The prefix "Extension" was used only in those cases where the person performed only extension functions. I later agreed with the same two individuals that those persons employed in Agricultural Extension in discipline specialties such as Home Economics could also carry the academic ranks with the Extension

prefix. We had been consciously trying to make the three functions of a Land Grant University truly equal because extension had been looked upon by the research and teaching faculty and others as a function of lesser value.

As we added extension functions in the other schools, the faculty performing extension functions could not be distinguished from other faculty, and usually had performed and acquired their rank in teaching and research. They were almost always serving extension in a part-time capacity and were likely, if full time, to stay in extension for only a short while. This came to be the practice in all of the schools except that most of the extension personnel in the Colleges of Forest Resources and Engineering and many in CALS continued to work full time in extension. While we did not have extension positions in Design and in PAMS, some regular faculty performed part-time or even full-time in extension functions. This was true in Management too, but we did add a position for the Center of Economics and Business Studies to provide a central focus to encourage both research grants and contracts and extension activities with industry, business, and government agencies by these faculty.

The question continued to arise of how or whether extension activity be counted in tenure decisions when there was no organized extension activity in a department? I recall one case when a faculty member, an assistant professor in PAMS without tenure, came to talk to me about this concern. He had definite ideas about extension needs in his field. I told him that we, in Holladay Hall, would have no difficulty recognizing these as suitable for promotion and tenure decisions, but he must make certain that the senior faculty, his department head and school dean agreed. In this case they did. I recall a similar discussion with a faculty member from SHASS. In this case I gave the same advice; however, I told the faculty member I doubted he would get a favorable response. I had met recently with the department heads in SHASS and did not get a

feeling that extension activity would be considered as equal to traditional scholarship in his department. The faculty did not agree at that time that extension should be the equivalent of research. He was later promoted after making the traditional contributions. Since I retired, extension activities have come to be recognized in CHASS, and at least two faculty in two different departments have been promoted with their extension activities recognized as suitable contributions by the senior faculty in their departments. Both of these faculty also had made some traditional scholarly contributions.

One function that provided a lot of valuable extension activity was the faculty consulting activity with industry, government and business. The Provost did not become very involved here except to be concerned that the activities did not interfere with campus obligations and that they were not excessive. The school deans and the department heads were responsible for overseeing compliance with policies concerning these activities. If a request or plan for consulting got turned down by these administrators, the appeal would come to the Provost for resolution. I had very few appeals. The annual records for reporting to the UNC General Administration for consulting activities were coordinated by the VC for Research.

For many years correspondence courses were developed by faculty in departments were processed, organized, advertised, and registered for by the Adult Degree Credit Program of Extension. In 1974, these courses were now called Independent Study and were transferred for all campuses of the UNC-BOG system to be managed by the UNC-CH campus. This made all of the correspondence courses more visible and available to all citizens of the State who wanted to take courses by correspondence. This enabled one advertising document and one registration procedure to be used by all. The courses were still handled on each campus by the same faculty as before. The term Independent Study was accurate for

these types of courses. However, there are a large number of independent study approaches available on-campus which were handled for students in their regular course registrations on-campus. These individualized learning courses were also called independent study.

In 1990, the programs of Continuing Education were assigned to report to the VC for Research, and those now entitled Adult Credit Programs which include Summer School, the Evening Classes, and the off-campus credit courses began to report through the Vice Chancellor for Research to the Provost. The position of VC for Research had been renamed VC for Research, Outreach and Extension. The position for Vice Chancellor for Extension was dropped. The name of this unit was changed to Outreach, Extension and Continuing Studies.

Summer Sessions

Until the program in University Extension was established in 1967, the Summer School program reported directly to the Dean of the Faculty. Although the program for most of the years covered in this history did not report to the Provost for management purposes, academic offerings and academic functions did report to the Provost, and summer sessions followed all academic requirements of the University. Only undergraduate and graduate courses approved through the Courses and Curricula and Graduate School procedures were taught. We did have summer courses designed specifically for programs for high school teachers, college teachers and some supported by NSF and other granting agencies, and courses for Agricultural Extension personnel. Other special courses were taught and some of these were taught at irregular times that did not mesh with the beginning and ending times of the official summer sessions. All of these courses were sponsored by academic departments and were processed through the appropriate committees of the schools and of the University. In 1991, the Summer Sessions Program merged with Adult Degree Programs under

the Director of Summer Sessions and once again management was transferred to report to the Provost through the VC for Research. This is now called Adult Credit Programs and Summer Sessions.

All faculty who taught were approved by the academic units through channels, including the Provost. Rules for minimum course sizes were approved by the Provost. This was done in part to help the Director escape the wrath of a few faculty who could become upset if exceptions were not made for them when they taught their summer courses. We also had requirements that were established by the UNC Board of Trustees for compensation prior to the establishment of the BOG. These required that all faculty who received more than 20% of their academic year base pay were to be approved by the Provost. This was done intentionally to encourage faculty to take some vacation time, for if they taught full time in both summer sessions, they had no vacation. More details of these policies can be found in Chapter Three in the section on *Salary Administration*.

The summer sessions operated under their own separate budget, but it followed all of the academic, management and budgetary procedures and processes of the University. It was quite interesting and complex to plan for the first summer session, which operated under one fiscal year budget and the second session which operated under another fiscal year budget. There were many times when we did not know what the budget for the second session would be until the session was almost over, or even after it was over. This came to be the usual dilemma after the General Assembly began to meet annually and to adjourn in late July or even later. Fortunately the unexpended funds from the second session were available for the first session in the next year's summer session. We usually operated the second session budget very conservatively. It was only in those years of budget cuts that we were very severely restrained in the first summer session. Of course it was nice to know the exact amount of the budget for

any summer session before it began, but that will be impossible unless we can persuade the Legislature to adjourn before July 1. We could not over-spend the summer session budget or take losses into the next fiscal budget or into the academic year budget, so it took very careful planning by the Summer Sessions Director in collaboration with all of the academic departments.

In 1956, the Administrative Council approved two six-week summer sessions. In that year they also proposed that a Director of Summer Sessions be appointed. The first was Phillip Rice, an Associate Professor of History. Since there was a surplus in the Summer School budget in 1956, Bostian wrote Shirley that he was approving the payment of \$50.00 more to each faculty member who taught in the summer session. The base salary schedule mentioned in 1955 was \$900, \$1050, \$1200, and \$1300 for instructor through professor for a full load of 15 contact hours per week for teaching in Summer School. Fifteen hours of lab was considered as a two-thirds load. These salaries were not at the levels of Summer School today and the load was different from those which are used today and described in Chapter Three in the section on *Salary Administration*. Research courses and graduate thesis supervision have not been counted in the pay for Summer School. We had a minimum class size of five students for graduate classes and of ten students for undergraduate classes. For the summer sessions in 1973, we had to change the enrollments in Summer School from five and ten, to ten and twelve for graduate and undergraduate classes respectively. This change was necessary because of the large number of small classes, especially graduate classes, being scheduled, and the Summer School budget could not afford the large number of small classes.

In 1960 Jack Suberman, a member of the English faculty, was named as the Director of the Summer School. He served until 1967 and gave considerable leadership in the early development of procedures and processes for the Summer School. Charles

Kolb, who was on the faculty in the Department of History, was appointed as Assistant Director in 1965. After Suberman left NCSU, William Turner was the official Director, but Kolb really ran the summer programs. He was named Director in 1974. In 1979, John Cudd, who was Associate Director, was named Director to replace Kolb on his retirement from the University. Cudd continues in that position.

In 1972, there was a projection that the enrollments in Summer School would begin to decline in 1978 and following years. These projections were very far off target. There were also similar gloomy predictions on the enrollment of students in universities. These projections were made on the basis of similar cohorts of high school graduates going on to college in 1972 and in 1978. They did not take into account the increased proportions of high school graduates that would attend college or of the increase in the numbers of minorities who would attend college. The factor most overlooked, and which has contributed to the greatest increase, was the very large increase in the numbers of adults who would take advantage of educational opportunity, and that colleges could actually change enough to offer courses at times that working adults could take advantage of them. In 1979, Director Kolb and Associate Director Cudd came to see me to discuss a need for making our programs available to working adults by offering evening classes in the summer sessions. We also decided that we would let students make a tuition payment in one session for those few courses that were taught over the two summer sessions or for ten weeks. We would pay the instructor in such classes in two installments of one-half of their salary in each summer session. This was a wonderful idea, and we began once again to take advantage of offering adults more courses at times suitable for them to take courses. For these and for other reasons we don't know about, our Summer Schools have continued to grow in enrollments and in the richness of course offerings.

Summer sessions are mentioned in several other sections and especially in this Chapter under *Extension and Registration and Calendar*, in Chapter Two under *Courses and Curricula*, and in Chapter Three under *Salary Administration*.

Research Office

At the time that Shirley became Dean of the Faculty we operated under policies of the UNC System's "Procedures Controlling Sponsored Research Projects." A few of NCSC's schools had the equivalent of a director of research, but we had no central research office. All research proposals required the signature of the Chancellor and the VP for Finance of UNC, and were approved by the President of UNC with a copy placed in the Provost's Office of the UNC, located in Chapel Hill. Expenditures were all approved by the Chancellor or when delegated, by the Business Manager. This policy called for indirect cost recovery on grants and contracts and for 5% of the indirect costs collected to be paid to the UNC System. That practice of a 5% assessment has continued to this day. It is very evident in the files that the system in place in the 1950s was not adequate. Some grants were obtained without having been processed through the prescribed mechanism, and in turn, did not include a budgeted item in the grant for indirect costs. In one case the NSF called to say that they had goofed and owed NCSC \$12,000 of which \$7,000 had been due 18 months earlier. Obviously new processing procedures were needed. For the 1956-57 year \$88,000 was budgeted at NCSC from the indirect costs it recovered. There are several items of interest to me in these expenditures. First, there was full cost for the College's contract auditor, travel funds of \$1500 for the Dean of the Faculty, \$5831 for labor and travel for the Library, including \$2000 for labor and equipment for Archives. The auditor was very necessary for there had been several improper expenditures from grants that were caught by the auditor. These were

corrected and we did not have to return that amount of money when the federal auditor came to audit our federal grant records. In 1960 notification of all grants awarded went to the UNC system's offices in Chapel Hill. No award notices came directly to NCSC.

In 1953 NCSC had established a Research Committee, but in 1954 there was also a proposal for a University (UNC) Council on Research. Every dean and administrator on the NCSC campus was opposed to UNC doing this, and they all objected, but it was established anyway. In 1955, "Policies and Procedures for the Administration of Research Supported Either by Contractual Arrangement or by Special Grants, Gifts, or Bequests" were established. At this time the only persons signing grant proposals on the NCSC campus were the Chancellor and the Business Manager. Deans of schools, of course, were involved in approvals for grants to faculty or units within their schools.

There was considerable discussion during the late 1950s about a "Faculty Research and Development Fund," and in 1958 it was established. At first \$17,500 was used for this purpose from state funds, and that figure remained as the appropriated amount for many years. The amount increased to \$50,000 under Chancellor Thomas and Dean Henry Smith and to \$100,000 under VC Hart and Chancellor Poulton. There was much debate about how this fund was to be managed. Procedures were established to receive and award faculty proposals from this fund under Smith, and continued under Hart and the interim VCs for Research while he was Provost.

As indicated earlier, notices of grant awards went from the federal granting agencies to UNC. In 1960, Chancellor Caldwell requested that his office be notified when NCSC received an award and he would distribute the notice and other relevant matters, including the first check, to the appropriate offices on the NCSC campus. Apparently at this time he sometimes received no notification when an award was

made to NCSC. This wasn't intentional, but it was an oversight.

In 1959, the NCSC Research Committee recommended that an administrative position for research be established. On July 1, 1961, the position of Assistant to the Graduate Dean was established for research activities. Shirley was supportive of this development and was involved with Peterson in the establishment of the position for research. Proposals would be routed through this position in the Graduate School. The deans on campus had concerns because the schools of SALS, PSAM, Engineering and Textiles already had procedures and personnel in their schools who handled grants. In a letter to the Chancellor in 1962, Peterson said that he was having difficulty getting the new position filled. He said that he had approached nine or ten persons who had indicated they were not interested. One of the problems was that the position initially would be one-half time. Later that year Frank Guthrie from the Department of Entomology filled the position and did a fantastic job setting up University procedures and records, and being helpful to faculty in preparing grant proposals. He wrote a proposal to the National Institutes of Health, and later he and a series of other faculty chaired a multiple faculty sequence of grants in the field of toxicology for both training graduate students and conducting research. These were supported on a continuous basis, with Guthrie as principal investigator for many years, and these grants have continued to be funded to others in the program today. This effort led to the development of a cadre of outstanding scientists in toxicology at NCSU. In time we offered the Ph.D., created a department and became a national center of excellence in this field. If Guthrie had not been on a one-half time basis, he may not have had the time to continue to develop the research and training proposals and activities in this field with the same vigor. At that time all research proposals were submitted directly to granting agencies through the Graduate School at NCSC.

In 1963 a policy was established that the Dean of the Faculty among others would see all proposals that required matching funds or supported instruction, before a proposal was submitted to a granting agency. In November of 1964, the position of Administrative Dean of Research was created, and in January of 1965, H. F. Robinson was appointed to the position. The Research Office reported to the Chancellor instead of to the Dean of the Faculty. There were few guidelines for communication with the Dean of the Faculty, and not much communication occurred. The Dean of Research, as expected, was trying to encourage grant proposal activity. A major responsibility was to encourage and seek additional support for organized research. The school deans were responsible for creating their own school mechanisms of supervision and clearance of grant proposals, and insure that they knew what commitments were made against future resources in their schools when grants were proposed and awarded. Deans did have to sign an internal processing approval sheet before submission of a proposal to Dean Robinson. I had followed Dean Robinson in his position as Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences and Assistant Director for Research in SALS. I spent about one-half of my time in the position in grants encouragement and administration. In SALS we carefully controlled commitments against future funds before giving approval for a grant to submit, so I assumed that all other schools did this too. After I joined the Provost's Office, I was surprised when Dean Tilman told me that a grant proposal from his school which committed resources had been sent to and funded by a granting agency, and he was unaware of the commitments included in the proposal. A commitment had been made against SHASS future resources (and in this case the Provost's resources too) for both EPA and SPA positions. I shared this with Dr. Kelly. The proposals under campus policy should have gone to both Dean Tilman and to Provost Kelly before submission, and this proposal went to neither. At

this time the policy that all proposals which committed future academic resources required the approval of the Provost was reaffirmed. As Assistant Provost I then began to read all such proposals and made certain that Provost Kelly was informed when proposals made future commitments against academic funds. In most cases I also made certain that the dean of the originating school was aware of these commitments and was willing to pick up the resources as required by the grant. Sometimes neither the school dean nor Provost Kelly were willing to commit the new and additional resources that were proposed. I began to maintain a running list of commitments with the dates of the commitment made by the Provost. I continued to maintain this list after I became Provost. I alerted Dean Tilman again that he should require all proposals from his school to have his approval, and he should concur in any commitments and maintain a record of these commitments before the grant proposal left campus.

Ralph W. Cummings was appointed to the Administrative Dean position in 1968, and in 1971, Earl Droessler became the Dean. In 1974 upon the retirement of Provost Kelly, the Administrative Dean of Research began to report to the Provost. At that time the title was changed to Vice Provost and Dean of Research. The Deans of Research who reported to me were Earl Droessler and Henry B. Smith. Smith became Dean of Research in 1979 when Droessler left NCSU.

Near the end of Chancellor Caldwell's term we were nationally classified as a research university. Under one classification scheme 50 or more doctorates a year must be awarded to be so classified. While Thomas was Chancellor the faculty on campus began to raise the issue of the importance of having the research function more visible and having the position renamed as Vice Chancellor, reporting to the Chancellor. A special committee was appointed by Chancellor Thomas to look at the issue and to look again at whether the Graduate School should continue to report to the Provost.

The committee reported about the time that Chancellor Poulton arrived, and recommended that the Graduate Dean continue to report to the Provost but that the Dean for Research become a VC and report to the Chancellor. It was recommended that the Graduate School and Research Office not be combined into a single office, as it was at many universities. Dr. Smith was approaching retirement at this time and preferred to continue to report to me until he retired in 1983. His replacement in research was Dr. Franklin Hart and he became the first Vice Chancellor for Research. Dr. Hart had also been Dr. Smith's replacement as Associate Dean of Engineering for Research. When Chancellor Monteith became Chancellor he wanted the Research Office to report to the Provost again, for he felt that the Provost should have primary responsibility for internal management of all academic areas and considered this to be one of the important academic areas. So the Research Office began to report to Provost Hart and then, when he returned to the VC for Research position, he reported to Provost Stiles. Monteith's administrative structure closely resembled the one that Thomas had been working towards before he left NCSU.

In 1979 Dean Henry Smith had a discussion with Associate VP Stedman of the UNC-BOG regarding centers and institutes. Stedman said that he would have to report to the BOG why these entities did not interfere with instruction, and requested the help of Smith and his counterpart at UNC-CH. At this time the members of the BOG did not understand what centers and institutes were. They were quite variable in function, structure, size and responsibility, even on a single campus. In some cases centers and institutes were started to satisfy the requirements for a grant proposal. Earlier the BOG had decided that all institutes and centers would require their approval. I believe this came about because NC Central University had planned to start a center concerned with organized labor. This proposal made a lot of headlines in the local papers and TV and legislators became upset, or so they said in

the newspapers. The BOG did not approve the formation of that center when it came before them for consideration. At this time, NCSU decided that all proposals for centers and institutes would go through the Office of the Dean for Research, who would be responsible for processing newly proposed centers and institutes on campus, and make certain that the proposals were prepared in the format required by the BOG. The Research office was also responsible for keeping copies of charters and making certain the periodic reports required by BOG were prepared and forwarded. Most centers and institutes were involved with research, and a much lesser number were concerned with extension or undergraduate education. The Provost's Office had provided the support needed to handle these matters and maintained the lists and records of centers and institutes prior to this time.

The interest and support of industry in research continued to increase especially in the Schools of ALS, Engineering, Forest Resources PAMS, Veterinary Medicine and Textiles, but even in Education, SHASS and Design. The concept of industry, government and universities collaborating in the support of research efforts began to be fostered by NSF while Droessler was Dean for Research. We got our first NSF grant to support such a center then. The proposals for creating centers began to increase rapidly under Smith, and several more came into being at NCSU. Most new centers involved faculty from the Schools of Engineering and PAMS.

All of the Deans and Vice Chancellors were very helpful to individual faculty in their grantsmanship endeavors. As time went on, the larger grants involving several investigators, became an increasingly important part of our research funding. This required much more talent, diplomacy, organizational know-how and persuasive ability than had been needed to help the single or individual investigator obtain grants. It also required much more time be spent in Washington learning what the agencies were planning to support in the

future. For these reasons we began to have an Assistant or Associate Dean for Research in each school responsible for grants, in addition to those already present in several schools. We felt that these could also facilitate inter-school collaboration in research and in grantsmanship. These efforts increased very much under Smith, but as I wrote to Dr. Hart on his retirement from NCSU, "Perhaps the most innovative thing that you did was to recognize, that while the individual faculty member's grants were important, that the future of research funding would be in the group or team grant effort and especially in the University, Industry and Government collaborative effort which has become a very important part of our team efforts." It was also true that so many of our problems could be solved only by a team which included multidisciplinary talents. This type of effort was very successful in research, but it was the also the best mechanism, along with the Agricultural Extension Service, to get specific companies involved in the research efforts and in getting research discoveries used sooner and more often by industry.

Support of research, research expenditures, new scientific and technological discoveries, patents, and especially those efforts supported through grants and contracts increased phenomenally while Hart was Vice Chancellor. This position is now called the Vice Chancellor for Research, Outreach and Extension.

Division of Undergraduate Studies

In 1989 Interim Chancellor Monteith expressed great concern about a problem that had been with us for many years. The major problem was our low graduation rate and especially graduation at the end of four years. Earlier, as Dean of the College of Engineering, Monteith had served as the chairman of that study of a special committee which had studied this problem. A major conclusion was that we lost a large number of students who had the ability as well as the credentials to graduate when they first came to NCSU early in the first semester (of

course many of these dropped out of school or eventually flunked out). In considering what might be done to make students' education more viable and successful, we were convinced that there had to be a significant and earlier intervention in the experiences of the freshman students. The evidence suggested that intervention as late as mid-semester of the first semester of enrollment was too late. To begin to try to address this problem, we decided to create an Undergraduate Studies unit which would report to the Provost. This was Monteith's idea and it was established soon after he became Chancellor.

One of the first things we did was to ask Rebecca Leonard of the Communication Department, who had worked with the Provost on special projects in advising, sexual harassment, racial, and other issues over the years, to join us as an Assistant Provost and develop an experimental course for a few hundred freshmen to see if we could intervene in their activities at NCSU early enough to make a difference. She visited several institutions that had programs and similar courses or were using other intervention strategies. She developed a course, selected the faculty from among volunteers, taught in it and managed it. A somewhat similar program was developed to teach all of the African-American freshmen by Associate Provost Augustus Witherspoon. It is too early to tell as of this writing which ends on July 1, 1993, how much beneficial effect these will have, but based on the early statistics they appear to be promising and have led to better retention and slightly better grades of participating freshman students.

We continued to have controversy about the summer orientation program for all new freshmen or transfers. The argument was about how much effort was to be spent on academic versus the living, social and other activity components during the very limited time available to new freshmen at summer orientation. Both had to be accomplished, but the Provost's Office and the Associate Dean's Council wanted more of the time

devoted to academic matters. This function and the staff has now been assigned to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Another group of programs that is the responsibility of Undergraduate Studies are those described in this Chapter under the section entitled *Academic Skills*.

We appointed Dr. Murray Downs Interim Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies and later under Dr. Hart, a national search was conducted and Dr. James Anderson joined NCSU as Dean of this Division on September 1, 1992.

Academic Skills

In 1983, the Academic Skills Program was implemented. There were several concerns which led to the development of this program. Upon arrival at NCSU, Chancellor Poulton was concerned about athletics. When Chancellor Poulton found out that the tutoring of student athletes was done by employees under the supervision of the Director of Athletics, he felt that we should change this as soon as possible. Another concern of the colleges/school deans, the Provost and the Chancellor was the poor performance of certain students who met minimum admission requirements, or who were admitted as exceptions. These students needed extra support and tutoring. It was also felt that many needed some compensatory (remedial) courses in the summer session prior to their first semester at NCSU. Dr. Lawrence Clark designed the program to accomplish this objective. The Learning Assistance Center was transferred to the Academic Skills Program from Student Affairs. This program was initially called Academic Support Services. As the program developed and by the time that the program began to report to Dr. Murray Downs in 1988, it interfaced with all of the tutoring programs of departments and schools on the campus and provided more University-wide coordination of tutoring. This program is now called the Undergraduate Studies Tutorial Center. Dr. Clark worked with Mr. Willis Casey, Director of Athletics, to develop a budget provided by the Athletics

Department for the program component called the Academic Support Program for Student Athletes. This was accomplished and supported the tutoring program for student athletes.

The first Director of the Academic Skills Program was Dr. Hugh Fuller who came from the position of Director of Institutional Research in Student Affairs. The program reported to Associate Provost Lawrence Clark. It took additional time and resources to add the next program component, the Program of Academic Advancement. The program served a small but selected number of freshmen, including all of the students admitted as exceptions each year, and was highly structured. It included a 6-8 week summer program with instruction in basic skills. Most of the students enrolled in this summer program took compensatory courses in English, reading, and/or mathematics, and at times a course to enhance oral communication skills. The program also included an academic year component. Dr. Thomas Conway was the chief designer of this component, but Fuller and Clark were both very much involved in the planning and implementation. This program, as did the program for student athletes, provided for the development of an academic profile, aid in the placement of students in appropriate courses during the academic year, and mechanisms to assure that the students got the tutoring they needed. This program came to be called the University Transition Program. Certain students were admitted to NCSU only if they participated in this program. Dr. Clark stated, "Emphasis will be placed on maximizing the potential among entering Black students and student athletes." A program called Assessment, Development, and Evaluation was provided at the time these programs were started. Dr. Fuller designed this component of the program, and he did most of the work in the earlier years and has continued to be involved in this area. Later a full-time additional position for assessment and evaluation was added.

One of the issues that has been debated from time to time on campus was whether we should have a general college for freshmen for the first year or the first two years of matriculation at NCSU. Chancellor Poulton asked that the question be studied. There was also much concern about the academically gifted student who did not know which school or major to choose. Until this time we made all students select a program or a school before admission to the University. The issue was finally resolved by adding to the Academic Skills Program a component called the University Undesignated Program which admitted academically gifted students who wished to start at NCSU without a major. Dr. Fuller was the architect of this program. The staff in this program advised students registered in this program, and they taught a year-long orientation course. Students were kept in the program for no more than two years, and at the end of that time they were transferred to a school and a major. At the same time, each of the schools in the University were required to establish an undeclared major in their schools. This would enable students who knew which school they wanted to attend but who did not wish to select a major as a freshman, to enroll in an undeclared program in a school. At this time the College of Engineering placed all freshmen in a common program for their first year. The University Undesignated Program (UUP) only accepted new freshmen with very strong academic credentials. This still meant that the average or below average freshman who did not have a preference for a school or major had the difficult decision about in which school should they seek admission. These students were not likely to get into the Schools of Engineering and Design because these schools had as high academic requirements for admission as did the UUP. They also would not be admitted to several other curricula which admitted only academically strong freshmen. This matter is discussed further in Chapter Six in Admissions. These programs now report to Dr.

James Anderson, Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies.

Provosts Relationships with Chancellors and Deans

The Provost's relationship with school deans has not always been clear in a variety of areas. The Provost's responsibilities have varied from Chancellor to Chancellor and with each Provost. Under Bostian, the school deans reported to the Chancellor, but for personnel, undergraduate curricula, degrees and courses they reported through the Dean of the Faculty. The relationship between Shirley and Bostian appeared to be very cordial with both seeking to reduce the Chancellor's workload. They continued to adjust the responsibilities assigned to the Dean of the Faculty on a case by case basis until each was comfortable with delegation of responsibility and what functions this Dean would perform without consultation, and what would be done after consultation. They had not decided which actions would require approval by the Chancellor. This was very tricky, for Shirley had come to his new position from the Dean of General Studies, a position viewed by the other school deans as the lowest among the deans on the totem pole. Power had resided in the school deans with considerable discretion on a school by school basis, with many NCSC-wide policies made at the Administrative Council. Power on this council resided in the deans too, for they were the majority of the membership. Of course the Chancellor could and did make the final decision. The appointment of a Dean of the Faculty would begin the review of curricula and would certainly cause some standardization in curricula, in personnel appointments and in other areas. Under the Dean of the Faculty, courses offered by departments and schools, salary recommendations, space utilization, and an unknown variety of other functions would be reviewed, studied, and even questioned by the person who had been, to them, a former colleague who came from a position with less responsibility than their own. After

all, the School of General Studies did not even offer any degrees at this time. Prior to this time the Chancellor or the UNC Provost reviewed if reviews were made or if questions were asked. Yet this appointment, while recognized as necessary by the deans, caused considerable worry and concern about what powers it would have. Deans had always reported to the Chancellor and wanted to have his ear about everything. They also were not very timid about going directly to the President of the University of North Carolina when Harrelson and Bostian were Chancellors. This was another reason why Bostian and Shirley were cautious about assignments. At this time it sometimes seemed that the Provost of the Consolidated System influenced the curriculum on the campus more than did the Chancellor or a new Dean of the Faculty. When Caldwell came to NCSC he had been used to working with an academic affairs officer and rapidly began to clarify the relationship between himself, school deans, and the Dean of the Faculty. At first, to become better acquainted with the institution and its programs, Caldwell retained more authority. There was a system in N. C. with its own President, and that made the responsibilities of a Chancellor less clear than those at the University of Arkansas, where the campus did not have to report to a system.

Chancellor Caldwell defined his and the school deans relationship with Dean Shirley in a memorandum of September 14, 1960: "Deans of schools report directly to the Chancellor. For the purposes covered here, the Dean of the Faculty is the *alter ego* of the Chancellor." He then went on to describe duties of the Dean to include all personnel actions, space studies and allocations, review of all academic budget matters, recommendation of faculty members to all committees and boards, and investigations of academic and faculty matters requiring solution by the administration.

Caldwell was just what we needed at NCSU. We were a developing college that would now be classified as a comprehensive

university with aspirations to become a research university. We planned to add many additional graduate programs of top quality. Caldwell had a "presence," and he made excellent and eloquent speeches. He made these from one end of the State of North Carolina to the other and gained for NCSU additional respect and appreciation from the citizens within the State as he told the NCSC story. He was also well known in national educational circles and helped us to gain recognition at that level as we were in our period of most rapid (on a proportional basis) growth. The greatest increase in numbers of students came during Poulton's tenure. For example, at the time that I retired as Provost in 1990, I had participated during my sixteen years as Provost in the graduation exercises of more than 55% of the graduates of NCSU since it opened its doors in 1889.

Shirley left NCSC to become the VP for Academic Affairs at the University of Delaware, and the search by Caldwell brought in a new Dean of the Faculty who had worked for NSF and who had no administrative experience on a college campus. For this reason Caldwell continued to perform more functions than he might have if this person had been a dean with more university experience. When Dr. Kelly came, relationships with everyone seemed to go smoothly. However Dr. Kelly, with his experiences in Japan and in governmental positions, carried an expectation of bureaucracy that the Deans had not experienced under Shirley. Of course all universities are bureaucracies, but different individuals in the universities seem to be more sensitive to and need a more strict adherence to line reporting. At another place in this document (in the Functions section in Chapter One) I referred to Dr. Kelly's dog house. Fortunately, when Dr. Kelly got upset with a school dean, he did not retain his anger long. Usually he kept no more than one dean at a time in his dog house. Dr. Kelly worked well with the Business Office and with Student Affairs, but his relationship with the Graduate School

and later with the Dean of Research soon got out of kilter. These offices never seemed to collaborate with Dr. Kelly any more than they had to. Dr. Kelly was frequently not consulted about matters that he felt should have involved him. He also learned about such matters which either overlapped with his area of responsibility or which he felt that he needed to know about, after they had already been discussed with and at times decided upon by the Chancellor. Some of the problems with deans also involved a dean reporting some matter directly to the Chancellor or to the Deans of the Graduate School or of Research, when Dr. Kelly felt he should have been consulted first, or certainly at least simultaneously. At one time the school deans decided that they would like to get together at a breakfast meeting from time to time to discuss mutual concerns. Dean Eric Ellwood arranged the breakfast meeting and this was one incident which put Ellwood in the dog house for a longer than normal period of time. Dr. Kelly would not talk to Dean Ellwood for some time, and I had to make certain that actions from Ellwood's school were handled and approved. Dr. Kelly was upset because he felt that the deans were going around him instead of talking to him. The deans wanted the meeting because the Administrative Council now had so many members that they felt they needed an opportunity to discuss deans' business without others being present. I cannot say that none of their desire was to discuss how best to deal with Provost Kelly.

In 1962 Dr. Kelly tried to meet with the faculty in departments. It didn't work, for some deans felt that the Dean of the Faculty was intruding and going around them to talk to faculty in their territory. It was true that the faculty present at these meetings did have many concerns about school policies and practices and wanted to talk about them. Of course, Kelly recognized that many issues discussed were not University-wide matters or procedures. He had felt that these departmental meetings would get him

to know NCSC better, and vice versa. In 1974 I tried to do this same thing, but I had the same problem. The meetings that I had with school faculties at school faculty meetings and with the deans present did not bring much discussion, but the deans all encouraged me and wanted me to attend these school meetings. In fact, they would likely place me on the agenda for a short statement. These meetings did give me some opportunity to learn directly of the faculty's problems. The best way that I found to meet and to talk to faculty was to go to the Faculty Club and to join a small faculty group for lunch. Dutch, of course! It was later that Poulton and I, and sometimes with Karen Helm and Frank Hart, met with all of the University's department heads about twice a year. I felt that these were very profitable sessions, most of the time. We usually had John Riddle of University Studies serve as organizer and Master of Ceremonies at the meeting. Chancellor Poulton and I always brought a few items for the agenda, however it was our purpose to listen, at least for a part of the time. We tried not to talk too much, but sometimes we did. It was later, with John Riddle and Karen Helm again spearheading the effort, that we started the new department head training sessions. These were very successful but were dropped around the time that Chancellor Poulton resigned. I believe that they have now been started again.

My favorite memorandum from a dean was one from Cahill to Caldwell and Kelly in 1964 entitled "The Enrollment Problem."

You are aware, I am sure, that I do not regard the discussion on Monday as either satisfactory or conclusive. What follows is yet another attempt to outline the situation as I see it with the view of underscoring the absence of real alternatives.

- a. I should say at the outset that I can understand the position of the great majority of my brethren. Obviously the Dean of Agriculture is in no position to do anything that would

appear to restrict admissions, nor are, I imagine the Deans of Textiles, Forestry, or Engineering. And, on the whole, I agree with them; I do not want to restrict admissions, either. It could be pointed out, of course, that these gentlemen are not responsible for teaching all of their freshman programs and have resources which I do not have which gives them greater flexibility. But I accept their position and as I have said, sympathize with it. But that is not the point. The real issue is knowing what we are going to have in sufficient time to do something about it.

- b. I realize also that Dean Stewart's attempt to give us earlier and more valid estimates is an offer to do what he can. But whether this is a real help depends on two things: how early the estimates can be valid; and whether they can be used as a basis for getting the additional teaching personnel. As I have said before, it is at the least awkward to have on Monday morning some hundreds of students more than you are prepared to teach. Contrariwise, it is equally difficult to know in July that there will be in September several hundred more than you are allowed to staff for. And in all of this, we should bear in mind that year-before-last we over-estimated and last year we under-estimated.
- c. Since all of this tends to hit the liberal arts early and hard we have been casting about for alternatives. But there are not many as would appear at first sight.
 1. We can, I suppose, argue that there are enough housewives around the premises who have master's degrees to cover our needs. This is Dean Menius' position as I understand it. To regard this as any sort of a permanent solution, even as a permanent emergency solution, does not strike me as satisfactory. To be sure we may have some mute inglorious Miltons in the Faculty Women's Club (a club made up of the wives of faculty) but certainly their number is limited. More important, however, their attention is divided; I would hazard that most of them have not kept up with their fields; certainly they lack the professionalism which we hope is characteristic of our faculty; and finally their continuous or recurring employment dilutes the quality of the faculty in terms of those indices which are used by accrediting agencies. What we do here, it seems to me, is to gather up the least prepared and shove them into classrooms sometimes during the first week of classes; they can never be more than one day ahead of the class and are more likely to be a day behind.
 2. We could limit registrations to what we are prepared to teach. But this seems arbitrary and is in a sense an abdication because presumably the students are admitted in order that they might be taught. But it might dramatize what I suspect to be a growing tendency — the separation of the admissions process from the educational process. It makes a great deal of difference how you say it: the faculty are here to teach the students admitted puts the emphasis on the wrong place and does not mean the same as the students are admitted so that the faculty can teach them.
 3. We can begin to broaden our system of excusing students from requirements. It may be that this is acceptable and even desirable on other grounds but it is not a solution to the present problem. Perhaps we can solve part of our problem in English by skimming off the top 300 although if we do we must be prepared to face a rise in the flunk rate. We face an immediate problem of identifying these people early or we will have

impossible scheduling problems. And we still have them on our hands. It does not help much to have solved the problem in English only to be faced with it again in history or economics.

4. We could expand the size of the classes. Even here, however, problems arise. For one thing, you cannot do this across the board. I do not think it at all feasible in composition courses, for example, or elementary languages. In these, the teacher must know what the student is doing. Then, too, unless you have graduate students, or some sort of auxiliary help, you do not save any teaching time unless you go to the straight lecture pattern and I am not certain we are ready for that or would think it wise, even if we were. Finally, we do not have many places to put large sections. Without pursuing the economics of the matter in depth, I would suspect the rooms in Harrelson to be not quite large enough; the number of such places elsewhere on campus is very limited.
 5. We might, and probably ought to, explore more vigorously the use of TV, and the like. But I have yet to see much convincing evidence that it differs very much from a large lecture (with its attendant problems) or that it really saves a lot of time if the many hours of preparation are taken into account. Part of my attitude may derive from the fact that I don't like television very well, especially amateur television, but in any case it is no way to meet a sudden influx as that of last fall and this is what I am really worried about.
 - d. This list may not be exhaustive although it includes everything that I can think of this morning. I should point out; however, that our present registration procedures pretty well eliminate even that degree of flexibility which may exist in the various schemes. We have to know by the spring before what we are going to be doing in the fall. We are rapidly eliminating our room for improvisation because of the long lead-time the machine process evidently takes.
 - e. From all that I can gather we are fairly well aware of what the A Budget holds for us. At least I have received a preliminary allocation. It is, as you will have noticed, short of what Dr. Hartley alone says that he needs. But is it not true that the A Budget was based on some sort of estimate of student registrations? And if such an estimate has been made, why are we under such difficulty to say it will or will not bear some relation to what we will actually get in the fall? I think, in general that the budget practices in this state are deplorable and, as evidence, point to the recurring surpluses. I know that this is beyond our control. But I hope we are not contributing to it. The purpose is not to make us look good downtown. Rather, I had thought the purpose of the budget was to enable us to get our work done.
 - f. I think this is about enough on this subject. I am fully aware that one usually exhausts the audience before he exhausts the subject. And it may be that I have merely succeeded in demonstrating my ignorance. But it seems to me we have all talked crisis so long that we have lost our belief in it. I am deeply concerned now that it is palpable here, that the vast majority of my colleagues think either it is not going to happen or that we can somehow avoid facing it. As I say, I understand and sympathize; I merely cannot agree.
- This letter describes so many of the problems of the day. Problems included: allocating positions to units without a carefully planned basis for position allocations; accepting all the qualified new students with no restrictions related to budgeted enrollments; no preregistration in the spring; no advanced placement system; where do you

find faculty at the last moment, et cetera. We did learn to live with some of these problems. Others are still causing difficulty. Many of these problems and their solutions or what we did to lessen the problems are described and discussed throughout this history. I wonder what these deans would have done in those years if the Legislature had met every year and left for home in late July or in August as they do now. After all, this memo was written in December of 1964 and Dean Cahill had already received his allocation of new positions for the fall semester of 1965.

In 1965, Chancellor Caldwell decided to make the stationery of the Dean of the Faculty a part of the Chancellor's stationery. It showed the Dean of the Faculty's office as a subhead of the Chancellor's office. Kelly expressed his concern over this prospect and the Chancellor wrote back the following. "I do not understand the point of view that my concept of the letterhead shows even the slightest demotion of your office. Indeed my concept was to show the Dean of the Faculty and the other two as parts of the Chancellor's office, speaking for him when they wrote. However, it is clear that no one in this office understands my concept or agrees with it. Since I do not feel strongly about it, I am withdrawing my suggestion."

The Provost did not have a separate budget. He operated out of Chancellor's budget. I noted in 1966-67 that the Chancellor's budget showed a separate amount of \$2350, excluding personnel, for the Dean of the Faculty's budget. I am certain that Kelly did not run his office on this sum. I am certain that when he had needs sources were found to support these by Mr. Wright, with the Chancellor's concurrence. I know that when I became Provost we had a separate budget, but it was inadequate for operational purposes of my office. All budget lines were insufficient and at this time we had a lot of budget lines. Like Kelly, I continued to try to get additional funds as needs arose. This procedure never bothered me very much. It did mean that we lived from hand-to-mouth all of the

time, and were constantly trying to get the school deans, who had many more resources, to pay for things that they wanted the Provost to pay for. Deans would tell me that the University should cover a part of this or that project of theirs, too. I never had funds to contribute, but I got the Chancellor or Mr. Worsley to help to fund these projects. In this way the deans thought that I had contributed, and the University's administration had. This practice of getting the deans to help fund a project was good, for the deans would now have an investment of resources in these University-wide activities and they helped to make certain that the projects succeeded. I know that Dr. Clark would have never gotten many programs to work as well as they did if the deans had not invested in them.

Of all the deans I suspect that Dean Brooks James was the most influential in getting the University administration to support things that he felt needed to be accomplished. Dean Fred Cahill had the best wit, and could really say something with a bit of humor, or more often write Zthe most clever comments. Dean Henry Kamphoefner was the most obstinate and stubborn and he did things the way he wanted and was most able to avoid NCSU and UNC rules and regulations. He ruled his school with an iron hand, in his way. His school had the most independent and outspoken faculty on campus, yet they had less faculty influence in school matters than the faculty in any other school. Actually the school was operated as if it were a department with a very strong head. Using this style, he developed an outstanding school with outstanding and nationally recognized faculty and programs. When he retired I had to make certain that we awarded tenure to faculty who had been appointed to two or more five-year terms as Associate Professors. Associate Professors who had completed one five year term were supposed to gain tenure or have been given a final years notice at the end of their fourth year. His school would not teach any students from other schools, except for a few students that he personally

permitted to take courses. We finally gave the School of Design several new positions to teach some courses which would allow students from other schools to take some School of Design courses. The Chancellor and the Provost had learned that they could not make Henry do anything that he did not want to do. I was glad that he retired before I became Provost.

Dean Fadum was very involved in external activities including a commitment to engineering education on a national basis, the National Academy of Engineering, some consulting, Chairman of the NCSU Faculty Committee on Athletics which involved many Atlantic Coast Conference activities, and other matters. I remember Caldwell and especially Kelly complaining about things frequently coming in late from the School of Engineering. Notes in the files from both suggested the other talk to Dean Fadum about his being absent from the campus so much. Neither did, or at least I found no record of it. However Kelly indicated that he had asked Dean Fadum to make certain that the person appointed as Acting Dean would be empowered to sign all documents in his absence. I saw no correspondence to Dean Fadum on any of this.

The Schools of Engineering and Agriculture were always rivals. For years the School of Engineering seemed to be trying to compete with SALS, and they were envious of SALS, which had substantial State and federal funding for research and extension. When Monteith became Dean of Engineering he said that Engineering had been looking at the wrong group for a model. He said that we should be looking at the best Schools of Engineering in the nation and should be trying to emulate them rather than SALS at NCSU.

We had line item budgets with very little flexibility, and it was very difficult to transfer funds to a different line. For this reason deans would swap funds from their school in one budget line with another school in a different budget line. The most common swaps were personnel, equipment and supplies. Such swaps enabled programs to

accomplish a temporary goal, for there was no permanent change in the schools' continuing budgets or in the lines in the next year's budgets based on these changes. Of all the deans, I considered Dean A. C. (Buck) Menius to be the sharpest "con man" and the most frequent trader. In these trades each got what they needed most, and no one lost.

Shortly after Tilman arrived in 1971 he wrote a memorandum to the Provost entitled: "The Mysteries of Bureaucracy." He did not understand the State purchase and contract system and believed a company's agent. I quote:

I am having trouble buying the piece of dictating equipment I want, and I obviously need help (or advice) from a higher echelon of the system. Here is the problem: Mr. Durham insists that I consider only the brands stocked at Central Stores (Edison and IBM); I insist on Norelco (North American Phillips); and Mr. Fleming is caught in the middle. I know the IBM, and I tried an Edison in my office that should have been retired years ago, but even had it been operable it would still have failed the test. When compared with Edison and IBM the Norelco, to me, is simply a vastly superior piece of equipment on almost all counts.

The Norelco representative has been most helpful, and he seems honestly confused by the problem. He informs me that his firm has the appropriate State contract and that there are a number of Norelco units on campus. Yet we cannot get a purchase order. What can be done to break this logjam? Mr. Fleming wants me to give Edison another try in the hopes I will be converted, but this looks like a useless waste of time to me. I know what I don't like about the Edison and I can write the memo I'll eventually send right now without going through a second trial.

Kelly wrote to Mr. Wright and said: "Can we give our new Dean a hand here?" After some discussions further with Tilman, Mr. Wright said that after weighing the matter it

was decided, in this case, a one-time exception would be made. I recall a time when the IBM had come out with a new typewriter that had a few lines of memory which could be checked and corrected before they appeared on paper. We needed a new typewriter right then in my secretary's office, for our old one was considered unrepairable. The IBM was not on State contract at the time, but we knew that on rare occasions exceptions were made for the purchase of items not on contract. It only cost a few dollars (less than \$10) more, and when our request was turned down I offered to pay the difference. It was a real innovation and would save the secretary valuable time. My secretary, Mrs. Gloria Johnson, really wanted it, too. We wrote a special justification which was turned down. In a matter of a very few months the IBM was on contract, but we had already made our purchase and did not have enough equipment money in the budget to buy another typewriter. I now wish that I had screamed and yelled and cursed, but at the time it probably would have done no good.

In 1970 we were in troubled times. Students elsewhere were using the campuses as a place to protest the U. S. involvement in Vietnam, and any other issues which was anti-university administration. We did not have many problems at NCSU. However, at the General Faculty Meeting we did have considerable excitement, for there were some students and others in attendance who were not eligible to vote. We were not able to vote on any issues on the agenda because several legitimate faculty protested that there were those ineligible to vote casting votes. Instead several speeches were made. This faculty meeting was the best attended and the biggest circus that I ever attended at NCSU.

We did organize a retreat on campus and suspended classes for a day late that spring and had debates pro and con on the Vietnam War. It really was a worry, but it released a lot of steam and was a good thing on our campus. Chapel Hill had more troubled times, and out of their protests and as a reaction to their voices, the Legislature

later passed legislation which has caused NCSU grief ever since. This was a reaction to out-of-state students. Prior to the passage of this legislation, all Graduate Assistants who were employed on a one-third or more basis got to pay in-state tuition. There was a bill that had been introduced which would make all out-of-state students pay the full out-of-state tuition. Athletic supporters from all of the campuses came to the rescue. Because of their efforts a bill passed which enabled exceptions to be made for some graduate students, athletes and a few others recruited for special talents. They would be eligible for tuition remission which would enable them to pay in-state rates. After the law was passed we were allocated only a specific number of dollars per year that could be used for tuition remission for these graduate students assistants, for the athletes and for students admitted with special talents. This would enable those students to pay in-state tuition, but no additional state funds could be used to pay remission for out-of-state tuition for others when those funds were exhausted. Since that was the amount we needed at that time, and we were growing rapidly at the graduate level, it became a real problem and administrative headache for all graduate programs and for the Graduate School. It was also a problem to a lesser extent for the athletic programs, because we were increasing our number of athletes, especially women on scholarships, and were becoming more effective in out-of-state recruiting. We all believed that it was a retaliatory gesture by the Legislature to those "wild graduate students at Carolina." The legislators' rationale was that N. C. tax dollars should not pay for out-of-state student's education. Now every academic year we seem to reach another shortage of tuition remission funds.

At the fall meeting of the general faculty in 1970 Dr. Kelly made one of his best speeches to the faculty. It was also short. I quote:

Several weeks ago I attended a meeting called by the National Association

of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges for the purpose of discussing how to keep our Universities open during the coming year.

It was very sobering experience. Presidents of Universities that had severe physical disruptions and even student killings on their campuses spoke of Molotov cocktails, hand grenades, secret hide-aways for the President, emergency telephone lines, and other procedures we normally associate with war. The meeting gave me the impression of military planning, rather than academic planning.

Unreal as this sounds, this is happening at some of our sister institutions. Some private institutions have their problems compounded by such serious financial difficulties that there is talk of bankruptcy.

Now I have no knowledge or even hints of any such serious threats to our campus. I do believe though, that many important questions will be raised by some students and faculty members. Many of the issues to be raised are indeed worthy of consideration, study and action, for they would help make this a greater University. Others may be insignificant and even mischievous. However, all of them demand discussion even if there is no threat of violence.

One of the lessons that I learned from colleagues in our troubled sister institutions is the need for all faculty members to do three things:

- 1) Keep open communication with students
- 2) Establish empathy with student problems
- 3) Give students adequate chance to state their case.

I also learned from our troubled colleagues that the few people who are determined to destroy the University cultivate differences among various faculty and student groups and the administration. Now is a time that will test our confidence and trust in each other. Chancellor Caldwell and President Friday have mine. If we should get

into difficulty, I hope we will share yours. This means that your advice and guidance is even more necessary now than in the past. I know our Chancellor will welcome your counsel as expressed through your Senate or individually.

But our job is not just to stay open, vital as that is. To fulfill our role for the advancement of learning and meeting the needs of our society, we have to be a university that teaches effectively and wisely. Scholars have major responsibilities in helping create conditions for world peace and solving the grave problems resulting from the rapid advances in technology. At North Carolina State University, we should pay special attention to those problems at the interface of science and technology and the humanities and social sciences. Most important, we must help in solving these problems while preserving independent pure scholarship in all disciplines.

We must not think that our problems are all caused by questioning young people. Economic factors are also causing problems. Pure scholarship does not have the financial support it once enjoyed and the voices of anti-intellectualism seem to be growing louder. In some quarters, the respected term 'professor' is a nasty derisive word.

Our economic problems are also caused by a lack of resources at all levels to meet national need. Now, more than ever before, higher education is having to compete for its funds with numerous other high priority needs. We can no longer assume that we shall get all the resources we require. Some hard decisions may lie ahead as we adjust our priorities.

But come what may, universities even if alone, must shield and protect scholarship. We can meet these new problems together and we will keep our University open and viable.

So PEACE, WISDOM, TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP to you.

Dr. Kelly felt this deeply and much of what he said could apply to his every day attitude in the University. Several of the

characteristics of Dr. Kelly have been inferred and described earlier. But he was complex, and in some ways demonstrated contradictory characteristics as he did his job. He was a most sensitive individual and had great concern about what the technological university should and could contribute to the betterment of humans, but he also thought, and tried to foster through programs, the responsibility of NCSU to make equal contributions to the improvement of the human condition. He was in many ways a very generous man and could not tolerate oppression of students or the underdog. He became very much interested in trying to help any student who appeared oppressed or who needed a second chance. I recall his helping a student near graduation get his degree, but who would die before graduation from leukemia.

In 1977, salary increase recommendations for senior administrators were required to be submitted to the UNC-BOG administrators along with a job description for each administrator. We asked all of the deans and the VCs to write their job descriptions. I rewrote them to make them compatible with the job of being dean of a school and tried to retain each dean's varied special functions in his own school. I did this for the school deans and others who reported to me. Chancellor Thomas did the same for the Vice Chancellors. We had to include an evaluation of how well we thought these individuals had performed during the past year. The UNC had established a salary maximum for each position. Thomas was trying to get the maximum raised, especially for International Programs, Research, Extension and Public Relations, because these salaries were all very low. He was able to get two positions dropped from the salary maximum guidelines. These were the Dean for International Programs (Rigney) and the Dean for Research (Droessler) who now reported to me and not to the Chancellor. This was a breakthrough in salary for both positions. We were able to begin making a little progress each year, to move the salaries in these positions more in line with

what they should have been. Each year Chancellor Thomas asked me to give him the increases that I thought each of the school deans should get within the guidelines of salaries and the salary increase funds available. He then showed me his proposed salary increases. We were always close in our recommendations for each dean. We continued this practice of exchanging the increases that we thought each should receive. Chancellor Poulton also continued to seek my opinion of the salary increase for each dean. We too were usually very close to each other. Both Thomas and Poulton would ask me to rank each dean's performance or to put them into best, average and below average categories. Although all did very well, I had to put some in each of the three groupings. This usually meant ratings of superior, outstanding and very good for their performances, for we had no poor ones. So this meant that the differences in the percentage of salary increase was not very much. It was amazing how close we were in our evaluations almost all of the time.

One of the things that hurt Dr. Kelly's feelings when he retired was that the search committee looking for his replacement never asked him for advice or opinions about the job of Provost. He was one of my references and he told me, after I had accepted the position, that he was glad for me, but he had hoped that the committee would have given him the opportunity to tell them that he thought I would be a very good Provost. When I retired, the committee looking for my replacement did not formally ask me about the position either, although several members of the committee did ask. The Faculty Senate had just completed a study with recommendations of what the Provost's functions should be while the first search for a Provost was under way. It generally seems that nomination or search committees prefer not to seek much input from the departing administrator. This is probably good, for it helps you understand that your time in the job has ended, and you can just be proud of your accomplishments.

It always turns out that the things that took so much of your time continue to be major problems for your successors and occupies most of their time and effort. Most of the important functions never get completed and problems never are completely solved and never end around a university.

I seemed to have had very positive relations with each of the four Chancellors during my 16 years as Provost. With Caldwell you would listen, but he was always willing to hear your side of the debate when there was disagreement. I remember when faculty in a department came to his office to complain about their department head. I listened as he vented his anger to me about what the faculty had told him. I told him that the dean and I were on top of the problem and that we had already talked to the same faculty and that we had the matter in hand. Some years later he referred to the incident and commented about how calm I was and how I took the steam out of him, for I had just smiled. Perhaps Thomas and I saw things the most nearly alike. When he made a point he frequently used a botanical reference or analogy. These were sometimes perplexing and not always immediately understandable to others, but to me they were absolutely precise, clear and on target. As a plant pathologist I understood. Each Chancellor had pet interests that they got involved in and sometimes they did not communicate adequately with me on these projects. Unless the project was crucial you let them have it and didn't bother them about it. Sometimes they even had a good idea.

Thomas showed a special interest in athletics, so did Poulton, although Poulton did have a number of reservations and concerns about big time athletics being "too big." I was not very involved with athletics under the first two Chancellors. That was OK with me for I had no great interest or desire to become involved in athletics anyway, and was glad to see the Chancellors run the show. In fact I felt that they should. Later I became more involved under Poulton. I have discussed much of my in-

volvement under *Admissions* in Chapter Six and *Academic Skills* earlier in this Chapter. Dr. Talley did have a number of debates on this subject with Caldwell, Thomas and Poulton. Near the end of Poulton's and under Monteith's terms, all of the vice chancellors became much more involved in athletics' issues. Athletics had become a crisis issue at this time.

Each of the four Chancellors' goals and my goals for the University were almost always identical, at least in the areas of Provost's interest and responsibility. It was not at all unusual for us to differ on the best approach to solve problems. I always understood that there were several ways to get there and sometimes you had to make several detours to reach the desired goal. All of the Chancellors usually called the Provosts in to talk about an issue that had arisen. With both Caldwell and Poulton it was especially wise to go talk to them periodically when you knew an issue was brewing. Once they had made a decision and stated that decision, it was usually too late to get them to make a change. Of the four, Thomas delegated best and would let the Provost make more of those decisions that were in his area of responsibility. This did not mean that he was not interested, and he did not hesitate to tell you how he thought an issue should be handled. This ability to tell you how an issue should be handled has not been a deficiency of any of the four Chancellors. Of the four that I worked under, Poulton and Monteith had the most suggestions of things that you should do and how they should be done. At least while Kelly was Provost, Caldwell may have made more of the Provost's decisions than any of the other Chancellors.

I always tried to help the deans accomplish the goals and objectives that they and their departments and faculty had established for their schools. In reading the files this was a major goal of each Provost. After all, the Chancellors, the deans and Provosts had agreed in almost all cases with these goals. Along with Worsley's help, I would try to find a way that goals could be accom-

plished. I believe that we were innovative and frequently very helpful. It was in this area that I probably made the most contribution. I know that my colleagues at the other campuses frequently asked me how in the world we had done this or that.

Among the deans, the best planners were probably Barnhardt, Curtin, Dolce, James, Legates, Monteith, Tombaugh, and Whitten. Certainly the deans who fed me the most reams of data were Monteith and Dolce. None of the other deans were even close. As with Shirley and Kelly, both Hart and I experienced the same problem of what the deans should cover with the Provost, what should they cover with the Chancellor, and what with both. It was hard to get us all scheduled sometimes. At other times you were involved in a discussion before you realized that this should be discussed jointly with the Chancellor. Obviously the deans enjoyed reporting to both, for this was a way they could insure that their programs, problems and successes were known and understood. This is likely to continue, but the problem comes when both the Chancellor and the Provost should know and the dean tells only one. Then the Chancellor or Provost assumes that the deans have told the other one too. Problems usually arose when deans sought resources or extracted promises from the Chancellor that did not get recorded and distributed in a memorandum. Misunderstandings arose, and at times caused hard feelings. Examples included the dean's thinking that their school was to get some new resource. They then told me that the Chancellor said so and so, and when I asked the Chancellor he would say that he did not remember, or that he did not make such a promise. At times the resources expected by a dean did not even exist. I do recall a number of examples of conflict and disagreement, and these almost always resulted in a disappointed and unhappy dean.

One thing that was sort of petty and very funny to me, yet it was considered to be serious by Chancellor Poulton. This was the use of the 3-D labels. This was a set of labels

printed by the Computing Center, which included department heads, deans and directors and all other administrators. Use of these saved secretaries an enormous amount of time for addressing envelopes. At one time I had to approve the use of this list since the Computing Center reported to me. I had stopped long before this and my staff just told people to ask the Computing Center. I think that everyone who got the labels must have sent the Chancellor a copy of what they were distributing, and many times it was not needed or wanted by the Chancellor or was of no interest to him. I got them too, so I knew how he felt. Persons seemed to think that their information would inform and certainly would be of great interest to the Chancellor and to the rest of us, rather than being a part of the information overload that administrators seemed to get. So the Chancellor put out a directive that said all such request for the 3-D lists had to be approved by his office. The Library made such a request to my office and it was transferred to the Chancellor for approval. He turned it down. The Chancellor's office said that they told the Library explicitly that this was not an appropriate use of the 3-D labels, and that their request had been denied. In the meantime, whoever in the Library planned to use the labels learned that all they had to do was to request the labels from the Computing Center and they would be provided. I suppose that no one informed the person in the Computing Center who prepared the 3-D lists about the Chancellor's memorandum. So the Chancellor received a copy of this material from the Library using the label addressed to him. He wrote me saying: "I expect you to take the necessary actions to assure this disregard does not occur again." Neither Director Nutter of the Library, the Director of the Computing Center nor I knew anything about the matter until I got the letter and sent a copy to Nutter. Today the 3-D lists are unimportant for every unit (and it seems that most individuals) has its own lists of addresses on its own departmental computers. We now get much more mail

on the computer that we don't want and we still can't seem to be able to get off those lists that we don't want to be on. Today's administrators and most of the faculty and staff all seem to get more mail (much of it on the computer) that they don't want or wish to receive.

As I wrote this history and read the memoranda in the files and the hand written or typed lengthy, short, curt, cryptic, humorous, angry and often very interesting comments, I wonder with E-Mail and Z-Mail how much information there will be in the files for the writer of the next chapter in the Provost's history, which I hope will someday follow this one.

The deans have all varied in personality and technique in getting their agendas before the Chancellor and the Provost and in getting their school to improve in all categories. I can recall only one school dean who was asked to resign during the tenure of the four holders of the Provost's or Dean of the Faculty's position. We always reminded the deans and other University administrators when they were approaching 65. Most of the deans were looking forward to getting the reminder that they knew was coming, because they felt that they had done their

jobs well and now was the time to have someone else take over those responsibilities. Some did not wait until they were 65 to decide that they were no longer as enthusiastic about continuing as dean, and returned to the faculty or to other positions early. Others left for other campuses and other positions. The amazing thing to me was how much progress and improvement in the quality of our faculty, students, curricula, research and extension programs was made over this time. I knew best of that which occurred while I was Provost, but I was a faculty member beginning in 1953 and I saw and experienced the changes and the improvement that occurred continuously from 1953 until 1993. The development of NCSU into a major research university could only have been accomplished with the leadership, dreams, goals, plans and ideals of all of the deans. All of the deans are listed in Chapter Eight. It was my job and that of the other Provosts not to direct the deans often, but to try to help in any way possible so that their plans might be accomplished. Shirley, Kelly, Hart and I were indeed fortunate to have such a cadre of leaders to work for and with.

APPENDIX

Personnel: Those Who Did the Work

Deans of the Faculty and Provosts

John W. Shirley
Dean of the Faculty, 1955–1962

JOHN W. SHIRLEY

AB STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, 1932

PH.D. STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, 1937

Dean Shirley came to North Carolina State College from Michigan State University as Professor of English and Dean of General Studies. Another field of interest was the History of Science. He left in 1962 to become Vice President at the University of Delaware.



Harry C. Kelly
Dean of the Faculty, 1962–1967
Provost and Vice Chancellor, 1967–1974

HARRY C. KELLY

B.S. LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, 1931

M.S. LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, 1933

PH.D. MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 1936

He taught at Montana State College and at M.I.T. Kelly was Chief of the Scientific and Technical Division, Army of Occupation, Tokyo, Japan. He maintained an active relationship with Japanese Science all of his life. He came to N.C. State College from the National Science Foundation as Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Physics. He retired in 1974.





Nash N. Winstead
Provost and ViceChancellor, 1974–1990

NASH N. WINSTEAD

B.S. NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, 1948
M.S. NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, 1951
PH.D. UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, 1953

At NCSU he was Professor of Plant Pathology and Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences at NCSC/NCSU. He became Associate Dean of the Faculty in 1967 for two weeks and then the title was changed to Assistant Provost and later Associate Provost. He was Acting Chancellor for 1981–1982. He retired in 1990.



Franklin D. Hart
Provost and Vice Chancellor, 1990–1993

FRANKLIN D. HART

B.S. NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, 1959
M.S. NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, 1961
PH.D. NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1964

He was Professor of Mechanical Engineering at NCSU. He became Associate Dean of Engineering for Research and later became Vice Chancellor for Research at North Carolina State University. In 1993 he returned to the Vice Chancellor for Research position.

Phillip J. Stiles
Provost and Vice Chancellor, 1993-1998

B.S. TRINITY COLLEGE, 1956

PH.D. UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, 1961

He came to North Carolina State University as Provost and Professor of Physics from Brown University where he was Professor of Physics and Engineering, Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean of Research.



Persons Who Reported to the Provosts

ASSISTANTS TO THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY AND TO THE PROVOST

Kenneth H. Topfer - Shirley 1960-61

William H. Simpson - Kelly, Winstead 1962-1989

ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROVOSTS

Nash N. Winstead - Kelly 1967-1974

Leroy B. Martin Jr. - Kelly, Winstead 1969-1984

Lawrence M. Clark - Winstead, Hart, Stiles 1974-To date

Murray S. Downs - Winstead, Hart, Stiles 1974-To date

Henry S. Schaffer - Winstead, Hart 1984-1992

Augustus M. Witherspoon - Winstead, Hart, Stiles 1989-To date

Rebecca Leonard - Winstead, Hart, Stiles 1990-To date

William E. Willis - Hart, Stiles 1993-To date

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICERS

Clauston L. Jenkins - Kelly

William H. Simpson - Kelly

Lawrence M. Clark - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICERS

Barbara Anne Peters - Clark
Claudia Pattison - Clark
Carol Maidon - Clark
Karin Wolfe - Clark
Joanne Woodard - Clark

COORDINATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES AND PLANNING

Clauston L. Jenkins - Kelly
Marvin Gehle - Kelly, Winstead
This position was transferred to Institutional Research in 1976.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Elsie Stephens - Shirley, Kelly, Winstead, Downs
Gloria Johnson - Kelly, Winstead, Hart
Rachel Dupree - Hart, Stiles
Connie Steed - Downs
Carolyn Ingram - Clark
Gayle Hinnant - Downs

MANAGERS OF THE PERSONNEL OFFICE

S. A. Chick - Shirley, Kelly
K. R. Ganzer - Kelly
Mary Strickland - Kelly, Winstead
Linda Snyder - Winstead, Hart
Karin Wolfe - Hart, Stiles
Beverly Cable - Administrative Officer, Wolfe

DATA PROCESSING COORDINATORS OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Linda Snyder- Strickland, Winstead
Beverly Cable - Snyder, Wolfe
Tara Britt - Cable, Wolfe

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING TRUSTEE REPORTS AND WRITING APPOINTMENT LETTERS

S. A. Chick - Shirley, Kelly
K. R. Ganzer - Kelly
Mary Stickland - Kelly, Winstead
Linda Spencer - Winstead
Rebekah Ingle - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

COURSES AND CURRICULA

William Simpson - Kelly
Nash Winstead - Kelly
Murray Downs - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

COURSE AND CURRICULA RECORDS

Elsie Stephens - Kelly, Simpson, Winstead, Downs
Connie Steed - Downs
Gayle Hinnant - Downs
Susan Sherry - Downs

SECRETARIAL AND PERSONNEL STAFF - STAFF WHO WERE SUBJECT TO THE PERSONNEL ACT

Cornelia Webb, Secretarial - Shirley 1955-1958
Jo Womble, Secretarial - Shirley 1958-1960
Landrum Bennett, Secretarial - Shirley 1960
S. A. Chick, Personnel - Shirley, Kelly 1961-1963
A. J. Harrell, Secretarial - Shirley 1961-1962
Elsie B. Stephens, Secretarial - Kelly, Winstead, Downs 1962-1981
K. R. Ganzer, Personnel - Kelly 1963-1965
Mary Strickland, Personnel - Kelly, Winstead 1965-1989
Gail Brown, Secretarial - Simpson 1967-1968
Florence Baird, Secretarial - Winstead 1967-1968
Zelda Ponder - Secretarial - Kelly 1968-1970
Peggy Price, Secretarial - Kelly 1968-1969
Betty Randall, Personnel - Strickland 1968-1969
Doris Anderson, Secretarial - Kelly 1970-1971
Cecelia Austin, Secretarial - Winstead, Jenkins 1970-1971
Barbara Moore, Personnel - Strickland 1970-1972
Sandy Sturgis, Secretarial - Simpson 1971-1971
Judy Godwin, Personnel - Strickland 1970-1971
Charlotte Hughes, Secretarial - Jenkins 1971-1972
Gloria Johnson, Secretarial - Simpson, Kelly, Winstead, Hart 1971-1991
Siew Tan, Secretarial - Winstead 1971-1972
Sarah McGinnis, Secretarial - Simpson 1971-1972
Sandra Emerson, Secretarial - Winstead, Clark 1971-1974
Susie Hunter, Personnel - Strickland 1972-1973
Leslie Shelton, Secretarial - Simpson 1972-1976
Lavern Clemmons, Secretarial - Jenkins 1972-1973
Veronica Gooch, Secretarial - Jenkins, Gehle 1973-1975
Gaynell Maynard, Personnel - Strickland 1973-1975
Sylvia Jamison, Secretarial - Clark, Downs 1974-1976
Julia Hale, Secretarial - Simpson 1976-1978

Mary Watson, Personnel - Strickland 1976-1977
 Sharon Lawrence, Secretarial - Clark 1976-1977
 Becky Sherrill, Personnel - Strickland 1976-1977
 Lori McCahan, Secretarial - Simpson 1977-1980
 Cindy Wagner, Secretarial - Clark 1977-1980
 Linda Snyder, Personnel - Strickland, Winstead, Hart 1977-1992
 Susan Moore, Personnel - Strickland 1978-1979
 Loraine Wilson, Personnel - Strickland 1978-1979
 Sandy Isleib, Secretarial - Downs 1979-1981
 Kimberly Bauer Crutchfield, Personnel - Strickland 1979-1984
 Connie Steed, Personnel- Strickland, Secretarial - Downs 1979-1991
 Lelsie Burrell, Secretarial - Clark 1980-1982
 Beverly Cable, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder, Wolfe 1981-To date
 Kim Carson Shoulars, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder 1982-1988
 Fran Coats, Secretarial - Simpson 1982-1986
 Eunice Chappell, Personnel - Strickland 1984-1987
 Rebekah Ingle, Secretarial - Downs, Personnel - Snyder, Wolfe 1984-To date
 Carolyn Ingram, Secretarial - Clark 1983-To date
 Vickie Meyers, Secretarial - Simpson 1986-1990
 Tara Britt, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder, Cable, Wolfe 1987-To date
 Gail Finch, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder 1987-1992
 Kathryn Roddy, Personnel - Strickland 1987-1988
 Mary Yohe, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder 1987-1990
 Linda Spencer, Personnel - Strickland 1987-1989
 Angie Dunn, Secretarial - Winstead, Johnson 1988-1990
 Liz Riley, Secretarial - Clark 1988-1990
 Lisa Smith, Secretarial - Clark, Witherspoon 1988-1992
 Linda Wilkins, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder, Wolfe 1988-To date
 Doris Dupree, Personnel - Strickland, Snyder, Wolfe 1989-To date
 Gayle Hinnant, Secretarial - Downs 1989-To date
 Marilyn Hardee, Secretarial - Clark 1990-To date
 Anne Peters, Secretarial - Winstead, Hart, Johnson, Downs 1990-1992
 Vickie Porter, Personnel - Snyder, Wolfe 1990-To date
 Anita Johnson, Personnel - Snyder, Wolfe 1991-To date
 Kathy Brand, Secretarial - Downs 1991-1992
 Rebecca Williams, Secretarial - Leonard 1991-1993
 Rachel Dupree, Secretarial - Hart, Stiles 1991-To date
 Barbara Leonard, Secretarial - Hart, Stiles 1992-To date
 Todd Driver, Personnel - Snyder, Wolfe 1992-To date
 Teresa Hall-Fowler, Personnel - Wolfe 1993-To date
 Carolyn Cameron, Personnel - Wolfe 1993-1992
 Susan Sherry, Secretarial - Downs 1993-To Date
 Amy Mullen, Secretarial - Downs 1993-To date
 Glenda Johnson, Secretarial - Leonard 1993-To date

OTHERS

CHANCELLORS

Carey H. Bostian - Shirley
John T. Caldwell - Shirley, Kelly, Winstead
Joab L. Thomas - Winstead
Bruce R. Poulton - Winstead
Larry K. Monteith - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

COLLEGE AND SCHOOL DEANS

Agriculture and Life Sciences

Dean W. Colvard - Shirley
H. Brooks James - Shirley, Kelly
J. Edward Legates - Kelly, Winstead
Durward F. Bateman - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Design

Henry Kamphoefner - Shirley, Kelly
Claude Mckinney - Kelly, Winstead
J. Thomas Regan - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Education

J. Bryant Kirkland - Shirley, Kelly
Carl J. Dolce - Kelly, Winstead
Joan J. Michael - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Engineering

John H. Lampke - Shirley
Ralph E. Fadum - Shirley, Kelly, Winstead
Larry K. Monteith - Winstead
James K. Ferrell - (Interim) Winstead, Hart
Wilber L. Meier - Hart
Tildon H. Glisson - (Interim) Stiles

Forest Resources

Richard J. Preston - Shirley, Kelly
Eric L. Ellwood - Kelly, Winstead
Larry W. Tombaugh - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

General Studies

C. Addison Hickman - Shirley

Graduate School

R. James Peeler - (Interim) Winstead
Vivian T. Stannett - Winstead
Jasper D. Memory - Winstead
Debra W. Stewart - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Humanities and Social Sciences

Fred V. Cahill - Shirley, Kelly
Robert O. Tilman - Kelly, Winstead
William B. Toole - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Management

Robert L. Clark - (Interim) Hart
Richard J. Lewis- Stiles

Physical and Mathematical Sciences

Arthur C. Menius - Kelly, Winstead
Garrett Briggs - Winstead
Jerry L. Whitten - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Textiles

Malcom E. Campbell - Shirley, Kelly
David W. Chaney - Kelly, Winstead
Dame S. Hamby - Winstead
Robert A. Barnhardt - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Veterinary Medicine

Terrence M. Curtin - Winstead, Hart
Oscar J. Fletcher - Hart, Stiles

OTHER UNITS

Academic Skills

Hugh Fuller - Clark, Downs, Anderson

Admissions

Anna P. Keller - Winstead
George R. Dixon - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Adult Credit Programs and Summer School

Jack Suberman - Shirley, Kelly
This program was transferred to University Extension in 1964.

John F. Cudd - Hart, Stiles
In 1991 this program was returned to the Provost.

Archives

Stuart M. Noblin - Shirley (part-time)
I. O. Schaub - Kelly, (a volunteer)
Maurice S. Toler - Kelly, Winstead
This function was transferred to the D. H. Hill Library in 1989.

Computing Center

Paul E. Lewis - Kelly
Kevin R. Jones - Kelly
Leroy B. Martin - Kelly, Winstead
Henry E. Schaffer - Winstead, Hart
William E. Willis - Hart, Stiles

Continuing Education

Edward W. Ruggles - Shirley, Kelly
Transferred to University Extension in 1967.
In 1990 this program, as a part of Outreach Extension and Continuing Studies,
was transferred to the Vice Chancellor for Research which in turn began to report to the Provost.

Sandra L. Kirsch - Hart, Stiles

Cooperative Education

William D. Weston - Downs (Winstead, Hart, Stiles)

Fort Bragg

Horace D. Rawls - Kelly
Millard P. Burt - Kelly, Winstead

Institutional Research

Richard Howard - Winstead, Hart—This position was transferred to the Provost in 1989.

International Programs

Jackson A. Rigney - Winstead
J. Lawrence Apple - Winstead, Hart
Edward W. Erickson - Hart, Stiles

Libraries

Harlan C. Brown - Shirley, Kelly
I. T. Littleton - Kelly, Winstead
Susan K. Nutter - Winstead, Hart, Stiles

Radiation Protection

Thomas L. Carruthers - Winstead
D. William Morgan - Winstead—The program was transferred to Research in 1989.

Research

Earl Droessler - Winstead
Henry B. Smith - Winstead
William L. Klarman - (Interim) Hart
Franklin D. Hart - Stiles

Student Affairs

Thomas H. Stafford - Hart, Stiles

Undergraduate Studies

Murray S. Downs - (Interim) Winstead, Hart
James Anderson - Hart, Stiles

University Planning and Analysis

Karen Helm - Hart, Stiles
This function was established by combining the
Planning Office and the Institutional Research Office
and was assigned to the Provost in 1992.

University Studies (Multidisciplinary)

John R. Lambert - (Acting) Kelly
Albert Carnesale - Kelly
Clayton Stalnaker - (Acting)-Kelly
A. C. Barefoot - Kelly, Winstead
John Riddle - Winstead
The program was transferred to CHASS in 1986.

Faculty Senate Chairmen

W. J. Peterson - School of Agriculture, 1955
W. N. Hicks - School of General Studies, 1956
W. W. Austin - School of Engineering, 1957
W. W. Austin - School of Engineering, 1958
R. J. Monroe - School of Agriculture, 1958-59
L. W. Seegers - School of General Studies, 1959-60
J. S. Doolittle - School of Engineering, 1960-61
D. D. Mason - School of Physical Sciences and Mathematics, 1961-62
A. Holtzman - School of General Studies - 1962
C. H. Bostian - School of Agriculture, 1962-63
J. Fulton Lutz - School of Agriculture, 1963-64
W. J. Block - School of Liberal Arts, 1964-65
H. W. Garren - School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1965-66
A. S. Knowles - School of Liberal Arts, 1966-67
J. W. Duffield - School of Forest Resources, 1967-68

- F. E. McVay - School of Physical Sciences and Mathematics, 1968-69
- L. B. Martin, Jr. - School of Physical Sciences and Mathematics, 1969-70
- M. S. Downs - School of Liberal Arts, 1970-71
- K. S. Petersen - School of Liberal Arts, 1971-72
- J. F. Ely - School of Engineering, 1972-73
- J. M. Riddle - School of Liberal Arts, 1973-74
- James B. Wilson - School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, 1974-75
- Samuel B. Tove - School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1975-76
- Richard M. Myers - School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1976-77
- Roger C. Fites - School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1977-78
- Charles Smallwood - School of Engineering, 1978-79
- Ernest E. Burniston - School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, 1979-80
- John A. Bailey - School of Engineering, 1980-81
- R. D. Mochre - School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1981-82
- K. L. Moazed - School of Engineering, 1982-83
- M. M.. Sawhney - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1983-84
- R. M. Fearn - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1984-85
- Sandra L. Kirsch - School of Forest Resources, 1985-86
- Thomas L. Honeycutt - School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, 1986-87
- James E. Smallwood - College of Veterinary Medicine, 1987-88
- Elizabeth Suval - College of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1988-89
- Raymond Long - College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1989-90
- C. Frank Abrams Jr. - College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 1990-91
- Robert H. Dorff - College of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1991-92
- Myron W. Kelly - School of Forest Resources, 1992-93

Commonly Used Abbreviations

AAUP:	American Association of University Professors
AAUW:	American Association of University Women
ACE:	American Council on Education
AI:	Admissions Index
AID:	Agency for International Development
BA or B.S.:	Bachelor of Arts and Science Degrees
BHE:	Board of Higher Education
BOG:	Board of Governors
BOT:	Board of Trustees
CALS:	College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
CCC:	Courses and Curriculum Committee
CEEB:	College Entrance Examination Board
CHASS:	College of Humanities and Social Sciences
CLEP:	College Level Examination Program
CQI:	Continuous Quality Improvement
CO-OP:	Cooperative Education Program
CR:	A grade of credit for a course. Most often for credit by exam or advanced placement. Also the same as a grade of P or passing.
CRC:	Cooperating Raleigh Colleges
DVM:	Doctorate in Veterinary Medicine
ECU:	East Carolina University
EEOC:	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
EPA:	Personnel Exempt from the Personnel Act
FSU:	Fayetteville State University
FTE:	Full time equivalent
GPA:	Grade Point Average
IR:	Institutional Research
HEW:	Health Education and Welfare
MITE:	Minorities in Technical Education
MA and MS:	Master of Arts and Science Degrees
MEAS:	Department of Marine Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
MWF:	Monday, Wednesday and Friday Classes
NASULGC:	National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
NC:	Grade of no credit means a failing grade
N.C.:	North Carolina
NCASCU:	North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities
NCA&T:	North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
NCSC or NCSU:	North Carolina State College or University

NCTF:	North Carolina Textile Foundation
NIH:	National Institutes of Health
NSF:	National Science Foundation
PC:	Personal Computer
PAMS or PSAM:	School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences
PE:	Physical Education Department or Courses
PGA:	Predicted Grade Point Average
Phd:	Doctorate of Philosophy Degree
QPA:	Quality Point Average
QPD:	Quality Point Deficiency
RA:	Research Assistant
RTI:	Research Triangle Institute
SAT:	Scholastic Aptitude Test
SLA:	School of Liberal Arts
SPA:	Personnel Subject to the State Personnel Act
SALS:	School of Agriculture and Life Sciences
SHASS:	School of Humanities and Social Sciences
SREB:	Southern Regional Education Board
TA:	Teaching Assistant
TRLN:	Triangle Research Libraries Network
TTh:	Tuesday and Thursday Classes
TTs:	Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday Classes
TUCC:	Triangle Universities Computing Consortium
TUCASI:	Triangle Universities Consortium for Advanced Studies Incorporated
UNC:	University of North Carolina
UNC-CH:	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
UNC-G:	University of North Carolina at Greensboro
UNC-W:	University of North Carolina at Wilmington
UNI.:	Division of University Studies and Now Multidisciplinary Studies
UPA:	University Planning and Analysis
UPGA:	University Predicted Grade Point Average
US:	University Studies later called Multidisciplinary Studies
USACC:	University Systems Analysis and Control Center
UUP:	University Undesignated Program
VC:	Vice Chancellor
VP:	Vice President
WCU:	Western Carolina University

The Provost's Office, North Carolina State University: An Informal History, 1955-1993

Addendum: Provosts Since 1998

The following text was created by the staff of the NCSU Libraries Special Collections Research Center to supplement Nash Winstead's original text, created in 1999, on the history of the Office of the Provost.

Kermit Hall

Provost and Vice Chancellor, 1999-2000



B.A. University of Akron
M.A. Syracuse University
M.S.L. Yale University
Ph.D. University of Minnesota

Prior to coming to NCSU, Hall had he served as dean of the College of Humanities and Executive Dean of the College of the Arts and Sciences at Ohio State University. Previous to that he had served in administrative posts and held faculty appointments in history and law at the University of Tulsa, the University of Florida, Wayne State University, and Vanderbilt University. In January 2001 he became president of Utah State University.

Stuart L. Cooper

Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 2001-2003



B.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1963
Ph.D. Princeton University, 1967

Cooper had been vice president and chief academic officer at Illinois Institute of Technology prior to coming to NCSU. He resigned as provost in January 2003 but remained on the faculty of the Department of Chemical Engineering for the remainder of that year. In 2004 he became chair of the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering at Ohio State University.

James L. Oblinger

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, 2003-2004



B.S. DePauw University, 1967
M.S. Iowa State University, 1970
Ph.D. Iowa State University, 1972

Oblinger became provost after serving as dean of NC State's College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. After serving as provost, he became NCSU's thirteenth chancellor.

Larry A. Nielsen

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, 2005-2009



B. S. University of Illinois, 1970
M.S. University of Missouri, 1974
Ph.D. Cornell University, 1978

Nielsen was appointed dean of NCSU's College of Natural Resources in 2001. He was named Interim Provost in November 2004, and he was selected as Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor effective July 11, 2005. He served until May 2009.

Warwick A. Arden

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, 2010-



B.V. Sc. (Honors) University of Sydney, 1981

M.S. Michigan State University, 1989

Ph.D. University of Kentucky, 1993

After serving on the faculty of Michigan State University and the University of Kentucky, Arden became dean of NC State's College of Veterinary Medicine in 2004. He was named Interim Provost in 2009, and he was selected Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor in 2010.