Full Text of Motions and Resolutions Approved by the Faculty Senate During the 2016 - 2017 Academic Year:

September 2016

**Motion FS 16-17/09-01** to approve the Faculty Morale and University Climate survey. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on September 12, 2016)

**Motion FS 16-17/09-02** to approve the Resolution Regarding Racial Incidents on Campus. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on September 19, 2016)

**Resolution Regarding Racial Incidents On Campus**

Whereas a safe and secure campus environment is essential for the Appalachian community and particularly underrepresented students to be able to learn and grow, and

Whereas freedom of speech, a cherished hallmark of democracy, belongs to all and should be respected and protected as indispensable to education, and

Whereas harassment, intimidation of individuals, and the targeting of particular communities of students are violations of the Appalachian Code of Student Conduct (4.11), and

Whereas underrepresented students may feel isolated, alone and unheard by faculty and the administration with regard to their particular experience at Appalachian, and

Whereas it is incumbent upon the faculty, administration, and university police to ensure that underrepresented students are provided a safe learning environment which encourages, appreciates and values their contributions to the Appalachian community,

Therefore: Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate takes an unequivocal stand in support of underrepresented students, and

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls on the administration, faculty and staff to work proactively to ensure that all members of the Appalachian community, and particularly underrepresented members of the Appalachian community, are protected from harassment, intimidation and targeting by any other groups, and

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls on the administration to ensure that the university police makes the protection of underrepresented students engaging in their right of free speech among their highest campus priorities.
October 2016

Motion FS 16-17/10-01 to approve the Resolution on Bias Incident Reporting System. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on October 10, 2016)

Resolution on Bias Incident Reporting System

Whereas the Faculty Senate endorses and seeks to further the goal of a more inclusive and equitable campus for all students, staff and faculty, and

Whereas a system which seeks to record incidents of bias is an important step toward recognizing moments when the campus does not live up to its goal of inclusivity and equity, and

Whereas the right to confront one’s accuser is the foundation of any claim to due process, and

Whereas the history of anonymous reporting is one which is replete with abuses and unjustly ruined lives, and

Whereas an Appalachian system that allows anonymous reporting that names faculty members as part of its record represents just such a system with the potential for these kinds of abuses,

Therefore: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports a system which will not permit filing of bias reports naming an individual faculty member unless the report also includes the full name of the complainant, and indicate options for the complainant to follow (for a faculty complaint: contacting the faculty member, contacting the faculty member’s chair, and if a satisfactory resolution is not reached, contacting the faculty member’s dean, discussing the incident with the ombudsperson, equity office officials, etc.)

Be it further resolved that given the problems of the current Bias Incident Reporting System the Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to revise the system immediately, and any revision (now and in the future) of the Bias Incident Reporting System include two members of the Faculty Senate (one each from the Technology and Faculty Welfare & Morale committees) in its design and implementation, and that the system not be available to the larger community without consultation with and opportunity for deliberation by the Faculty Senate.

November 2016

Motion FS 16-17/11-01 to confirm nominees, Mike Madritch and Kim Priode, to the Tuition Appeals Committee. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)
Motion FS 16-17/11-02 to confirm nominees, Emily Lakey, Jim Stokes, Diane Marks, TBD, Jacqui Bergman, Brooke Hester, Kathy Schroeder, Laura Ammon, Pavel Osinsky, Shanshan Lou, Morgan Pruitt, Doris Bazzini, Mark Venable, Martha Marking, and Catherine Talley, to the University Scholarship Selection Committee (USSC). (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

Motion FS 16-17/11-03 to confirm the nominee, Allan Scherlen, to the Gifts Acceptance Committee. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

Motion FS 16-17/11-04 to confirm the nominee, Tracy Goodson-Espy, to the Faculty Grievance Heating Committee. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

Motion FS 16-17/11-05 to confirm the nominees, Jon Carter and Teressa Sumrall, to the Undergraduate AP&P Committee. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

Motion FS 16-17/11-06 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 7.3.4.15, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

University Forum Committee (Handbook 7.3.4.15) Note: This is an addition – not a change to current language.

(a) Members on Committee: 7 faculty. The vice-provost for faculty affairs shall serve as an ex-officio non-voting member and shall convene the first meeting, at which the voting membership shall elect a chair;

(b) report to: the provost and executive vice-chancellor;

(c) areas of responsibility: select and arrange for campus appearances of a variety of distinguished speakers for the purpose of enlightening and educating the campus community on issues of current interest;

(d) also administer the External Scholars Grant Program, which brings distinguished academics and scholars from across all disciplinary areas to enhance the scholarship and/or pedagogy of the faculty.

Motion FS 16-17/11-07 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

4.4.6 Submission of the Portfolio for Tenure and/or Promotion
The entire P&T Portfolio (the P&T dossier and the collection of artifacts/documentation) shall be submitted to the department chair for consideration by the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The P&T Dossier as highlighted in section 4.4.5.1 must be submitted electronically. Artifacts and documentation may be submitted electronically or in printed form or a combination. The departmental promotion and tenure committee and department chair shall use both the dossier and the collection of artifacts when evaluating the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. However, after departmental deliberations are completed, only the P&T dossier shall leave the
department and go to the dean of the candidate’s college. The collection of artifacts/documentation shall be stored in the department and be available upon request during the remainder of that faculty member’s P&T process.

**Motion FS 16-17/11-08** to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

**4.6.3 Conference with the Dean**

The dean of the faculty member’s college/school shall send the faculty member by certified mail, return receipt requested, a written notice of non-reappointment. This notice shall direct the faculty member to section 4.11 of this Faculty Handbook for information on review procedures and to this section of the Faculty Handbook regarding the right to a formal conference with the dean, and subsequently with the provost and executive vice chancellor. Within ten (10) working days after receiving a written notice of non-reappointment, the faculty member may request in writing a private conference with the dean to discuss the reasons for non-reappointment. This request shall be granted and the conference held within ten (10) working days after receipt of the request if possible, at which time the reasons for the decision shall be communicated to the faculty member.

Within ten (10) working days after the conference, the dean shall give the faculty member a written statement of whether the original decision remains in effect. Each such decision shall be communicated for information to the provost and executive vice chancellor. Following the conference with the dean, the faculty member may within **fifteen working days**, request a conference with the provost and executive vice chancellor to review reasons for non-reappointment.

At the conference with the dean and provost, on three working days’ written notice, the faculty member may be accompanied by an observer of their choosing. If the faculty member chooses an observer, the dean/provost may be accompanied by an administrator observer. Unless otherwise agreed, observers may not take part in the discussion between the faculty member and the dean/provost. Observers may not be present as attorney for either party. Because confidential personnel file information will be discussed at the conference, the faculty member and any observers must sign an Observer Waiver. This document includes the faculty member’s authorization of the observer(s) to hear such confidential information, and commits the observer(s) to maintain the confidentiality of such information unless the faculty member subsequently authorizes disclosure.

**Motion FS 16-17/11-09** to approve changes, as amended, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.7.2. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

**4.11.3.7.2** The committee discussed adding a timeframe to ensure a case is heard in a timely manner.
4.11.3.7.2 If mediation fails, no record of the mediation will be released other than an unelaborated written statement from the mediator to the chair of the FGHC that mediation was attempted and was unsuccessful. Copies of the unelaborated written statement will be provided to the parties specified in section 4.11.3.5.1, above. Under no circumstances may the mediator be called as a witness in any subsequent proceeding, nor may any statements made during mediation be used against either party in a formal grievance hearing or any other forum. The mediator will dispose of any documents used in the process. Upon notification of the failure of mediation, the grievant must notify the chair of the faculty grievance committee in writing within 5 working days of the desire to proceed with the grievance hearing. Since the FGHC has already determined that the grievant’s petition merits the committee’s consideration, the grievant’s written notification to the FGHC chair of a desire to proceed to a formal grievance hearing will be automatically granted. The grievant may end the process at any time from this point forward.

Motion FS 16-17/11-10 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

4.11.3.9 Faculty members shall be allowed to be represented at a grievance hearing by an advisor-advocate of his or her choice as long as that person is not serving as the faculty member’s attorney. If the faculty member chooses to be represented by an advisor-advocate, the respondent may likewise be represented by an advisor-advocate. However, no advisor-advocate may be called as a witness. The faculty member also shall be allowed to have an attorney present as an observer, and if the faculty member so elects, the respondent may likewise have an attorney present as an observer. Attorney-observers are not, however, permitted to speak, although a party may consult with her or his attorney-observer during breaks in the hearing as well as at any other stage in the process aside from the hearing. Presence at the hearing is limited to the members of the FGHC, the grievant, the respondent(s), the parties's advisor-advocates and/or attorney-observers, if any, and a designated recorder.

The hearing shall begin with a presentation by the faculty member or faculty member's advisor-advocate of evidence designed to support the faculty member's contentions. The presentation shall be limited to those matters specified in the request for a hearing on which the FGHC based its agreement to conduct the hearing or to such other matters specified in section 4.11.3.5.2. FGHC members may question all witnesses presented by any party, the grievant, and the respondent(s). At the conclusion of the hearing, the FGHC shall meet in closed session to consider the matter. The FGHC may consider only such evidence as was presented at the hearing and need consider only the evidence offered that it considers fair and reliable. The burden is on the aggrieved faculty member to satisfy the FGHC, by a preponderance of the evidence, that her or his contention is true. After the conclusion of the hearing, the FGHC shall complete its deliberations and produce its decision within twenty (20) working days.
Motion FS 16-17/11-11 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

4.13.4.4.5 The dean of the college department’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA) will convene the meeting. The faculty shall select a member to chair the meeting, conduct all balloting, prepare minutes of the meeting, and immediately inform the departmental faculty and the dean of the college of the ballot results. Minutes of the meeting shall only record those faculty present and the ballot results, and shall be sent to the dean of the college. The paper ballots for this vote shall be kept in sealed, labeled, and dated envelopes, and filed in the office of the dean.

Motion FS 16-17/11-12 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

4.13.4.4.6 In order to institute the reopening of the chair position in an orderly way so that all chair positions will not be reopened at the same time, the following schedule is to be implemented. Beginning with the first academic year in which the new policy is adopted (i.e., the 1999–2000 academic year), if a chair has served in that position for:

(a) 1–2 years, the first reopening would occur 5 years later;
(b) 3–5 years, the first reopening would occur 3 years later;
(c) 6 or more years, the first reopening would occur 2 years later.

Motion FS 16-17/11-13 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 6.2.2.1.3, as shown in Appendix D. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2016)

6.2.2.1.3 Procedures for Application and Approval
(a) A request for an off-campus scholarly assignment must include a detailed statement of the proposed project or activity and be submitted to the chair of the department;
(b) Departmental approval by majority vote of the tenure-track faculty and the endorsement of the departmental chair are required before an application is submitted to the dean of the college/school for action. The dean will thereafter submit the proposal, along with the dean’s endorsement or rejection, to the provost and executive vice chancellor;
(c) A request for an off-campus scholarly assignment should be submitted at least six months prior to its effective date;
(d) Every effort will be made to grant approved OCSA requests for faculty; however, all requests for OCSAs are resource-dependent.

January 2017

Motion FS 16-17/01-01 to endorse Resolution 2017-3. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on January 23, 2017)
Resolution 2017-3 On SACSCOC Compliance

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly January 06, 2017

Whereas, The Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) requires integrity to govern the operation of institutions and that those institutions provide evidence of and information on practices that might not be in compliance with the Principles of Accreditation; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the operating boards of such institutions may not be controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution’s governance structure: the institution’s mission; the fiscal stability of the institution; and institutional policy; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence; and

Whereas, The North Carolina General Assembly (NCGA) and the UNC system Board of Governors (BOG) have engaged in practices that appear to violate these and other governance principles established by the Commission on Colleges; and

Whereas, These system-wide practices may result in lack of compliance of the individual institutions of the UNC system with the Principles of Accreditation;

Resolved, That UNC Faculty Assembly has serious concerns about the implications of the actions of the NCGA and the BOG.

Compliance issues with the standards set forth by SACSCOC are listed below*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOG Actions</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>SACSCOC</th>
<th>Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UNCG Code Change</th>
<th>SACSCOC</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Tenure Review</td>
<td>400.3.3</td>
<td>3.7.5</td>
<td>Policies changed system-wide in spite of opposing resolutions from the campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor searches</td>
<td>300.1.1(IL.A.4)</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>BOG members are now active participants on CEO searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research centers</td>
<td>400.5<a href="II.E">R</a></td>
<td>3.7.5</td>
<td>Campus management prerogatives were abrogated, several centers were dissolved for reasons other than those publicly stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President search</td>
<td>200.3</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Policies for president searches changed over BOG and Faculty Assembly objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators in attendance at BOG meetings</td>
<td>Law violation NC GS 116-7(b), 116-10, 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Members of the NCGA have become active participants in BOG meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCGA Actions</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>SACSCOC</th>
<th>Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Packed” BOG</td>
<td>Violation of historical precedent</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.2.2</td>
<td>Membership of the BOG reconstituted with partisan bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators sitting at the table at BOG meetings</td>
<td>Law violation NC GS 116-7(b), 116-10, 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Member of the NCGA have become active participants in BOG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President search interference</td>
<td>Law Change Session law 2015-300; NC GS 116-14</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.2.1 2.2</td>
<td>Law enacted bypassing authority previously delegated to the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board term limit interference</td>
<td>Law Change Session Law 2015-300; NC GS 116-6(e)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Enacted without explanation during controversial President search process; practical effect was removal of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE Fraternities</td>
<td>Law Change 2013-413 PART II SECTION 6(c); 116-40.11</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Members of NCGSA interfering with campus handling of sanctions to student organization and student appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws enacted affecting admission standards, tuition, fees.</td>
<td>Law Changes Session law 2016-94 PART IX. UNIVERSITIES; NC GS 116 multiple sections</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Laws bypassed prerogative authority delegated to governing boards, and institutional financial solvency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab schools. Unfunded mandate to create 8 lab schools at 8 campuses</td>
<td>Law Change, Session law 2016-94 PART IX. UNIVERSITIES, SECTION 11.6.(a); Law violation, NC GS 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Laws bypassed prerogative authority delegated to governing boards, also disregarding principles of shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Collaboratory&quot;</td>
<td>Law violation, NC GS 116-11 (2), and (9)a; UNC Code violation 400.5[R]</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.2.2</td>
<td>Mandate to create a research center with specified duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill fine reversal</td>
<td>Law violation, Session law 2016-94 SECTION 11.9; NC GS 116-11 (2); Constitutional violation, NC Constitution Article II Section 24 (1)(i)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Law reversing actions of the BOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees selection</td>
<td>Law change, Session law 2016-126 PART II SECTION 35; NC GS 116-31; Constitutional violation, NC Constitution Article IX Section 8</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Law recognized at a national level as a politically motivated effort to restrict the power of the governor-elect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016-17 Executive Committee**

G. Lugo UNCW, Chair  
A. Morehead ECU, Vice Chair  
Caucus  
D. Green NCCU, Secretary  
H. McMurray NCCU, HMI Caucus Chair  
At-large L. Dohse, UNCA, At-Large  

T. Ives UNCCH, 5 delegate Caucus  
C. Thompson UNCW, 4 delegate Caucus  
S. Chao FSU, 3 delegate Caucus  
A. Powell NCSSM, 2 delegate Caucus  
S. Jovanovic UNCG,  

2.2 Governing Boards  
3.2.1 CEO Evaluation/selection  
3.2.2 Governing Board Control  
3.2.4 External Influence on governing Boards  
3.2.6 Board/Administration distinction  
3.7.5 Faculty Governance  
*Actions of concern are listed in chronological order*
Resolution 2017-2

On Faculty and Staff Compensation

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly, January 6, 2017

Whereas, Faculty and Staff constitute the core of the UNC system, and

Whereas, Faculty are most directly responsible for the success of the educational mission of the UNC system, and

Whereas, Faculty and Staff are most directly involved in achieving related legislative goals, including admissions, retention and graduation, and

Whereas, Faculty and Staff have received a minimal increase in compensation since 2010 which trails far behind the rate of inflation, and

Whereas, starting salaries for new Faculty continue to create salary compression, and in many cases, salary inversion for Faculty of long tenure, and

Whereas, Faculty salaries should be comparable to those in other professions that require years of intensive study, such as physicians and attorneys, and

Whereas, the ratio of compensation between Tier 1 administrators and Faculty and Staff continues to increase at a dramatic rate, and

Whereas, the success of the Strategic Plan depends entirely on the work of Faculty and Staff, and

Whereas, new metrics have been proposed to provide substantial financial rewards to chancellors meeting certain goals outlined in the Strategic Plan while the work to achieve those goals is done by Faculty and Staff, therefore

Be it Resolved that the UNC General Administration include as the highest priority on the legislative agenda a request for across-the-board salary increases for all Faculty and Staff, and

Be it Further Resolved that the UNC General Administration insert as an additional priority on the legislative agenda a request for funds for Faculty merit increases and a replenishment of the Faculty retention fund.
February 13, 2017

Motion FS 16-17/02-01 to confirm Ben Powell to the Graduate AP&P Committee for Spring 2017. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on February 13, 2017)

Motion FS 16-17/02-02 to change the name of the Council on Teachers Education to the Council on Professional Education in the Faculty Handbook. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on February 13, 2017)

Motion FS 16-17/02-03 to adopt the Faculty Senate Statement on Freedom of Speech. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on February 13, 2017)

FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Because the Appalachian State University (the “University”) is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community to discuss any problem that presents itself.

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University’s commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In brief, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or
even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.

As a corollary to the University’s commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

March 20, 2017
None

April 10, 2017
Motion FS 16-17/04-01 to adopt the Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development

The Appalachian State University faculty are committed to advancing knowledge, providing high-quality education, and contributing to a just, healthy, and sustainable future. For centuries, advances in academic inquiry have contributed to our understanding to support the stewardship of our world in the face of increasing human impact on the environment. We remain committed to unrestricted scientific inquiry, open and transparent discourse, and evidence-based policy-making. Challenges at any time from governmental actions or policy changes are viewed as counterproductive to this commitment. Our mission as a public institution of higher education includes our commitment to protecting evidence-based inquiry and its ethical application.

Any effort to undermine discovery-based research and its responsible application to social and ecological problems constitutes a direct threat to faculty professional effectiveness. Such efforts also run counter to the University mission to prepare students
“to lead purposeful lives as engaged global citizens who understand their responsibilities in creating a sustainable future for all.” This mission requires the critical and ethical application of evidence and reason to address problems, as well as a commitment to engagement, action, and service.

While politics can play an important role in ensuring the thoughtful and ethical application of evidence, recent political changes now question the importance of science and evidence-based inquiry and its application to environmental policy and management. Attempts to control research through the censoring of data or the collective conclusions of peer-reviewed results are deleterious and unacceptable and would undermine the core University mission of sustainability and environmental stewardship. To diminish environmental monitoring or decrease funding for research to understand our global climate is not consistent with the University mission of engagement in the creation of a sustainable future for all global citizens.

As faculty we reaffirm our responsibility to ensure that scholars are not silenced if their research findings question or do not support powerful interests. If warranted, we will provide an open forum for targeted researchers, advocate on behalf of faculty who have been silenced, and support research efforts politically targeted for defunding. We have a responsibility to prepare and empower our students to be ethical global stewards as they face inevitable ecological and global challenges of their future. We encourage the administration to publically reaffirm their commitment to the University mission of a sustainable future for all global citizens.

**Motion FS 16-17/04-02** to add 7.3.4.16, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

University Forum Committee (Handbook 7.3.4.16) Note: This is an addition – not a change to current language.

(a) Members on Committee: 7 faculty. The vice-provost for faculty affairs shall serve as an ex-officio non-voting member and shall convene the first meeting, at which the voting membership shall elect a chair;

(b) report to: the provost and executive vice-chancellor;

(c) areas of responsibility: select and arrange for campus appearances of a variety of distinguished speakers for the purpose of enlightening and educating the campus community on issues of current interest: administer the External Scholars Grant Program, which brings distinguished academics and scholars from across all disciplinary areas to enhance the scholarship and/or pedagogy of the faculty.

(d) also administer the External Scholars Grant Program, which brings distinguished academics and scholars from across all disciplinary areas to enhance the scholarship and/or pedagogy of the faculty.
Motion FS 16-17/04-03 to add the sentences, “[T]he P&T Dossier as defined in section 4.4.5.1 must be submitted electronically. Artifacts and documentation may be submitted electronically or in printed form or a combination”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

4.4.6 Submission of the Portfolio for Tenure and/or Promotion
The entire P&T Portfolio (the P&T dossier and the collection of artifacts/documentation) shall be submitted to the department chair for consideration by the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The P&T Dossier as defined in section 4.4.5.1 must be submitted electronically. Artifacts and documentation may be submitted electronically or in printed form or a combination. The departmental promotion and tenure committee and department chair shall use both the dossier and the collection of artifacts when evaluating the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. However, after departmental deliberations are completed, only the P&T dossier shall leave the department and go to the dean of the candidate’s college. The collection of artifacts/documentation shall be stored in the department and be available upon request during the remainder of that faculty member’s P&T process.

Motion FS 16-17/04-04 to add the phrase “within fifteen working days”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

4.6.3 Conference with the Dean
The dean of the faculty member’s college/school shall send the faculty member by certified mail, return receipt requested, a written notice of non-reappointment. This notice shall direct the faculty member to section 4.11 of this Faculty Handbook for information on review procedures and to this section of the Faculty Handbook regarding the right to a formal conference with the dean, and subsequently with the provost and executive vice chancellor. Within ten (10) working days after receiving a written notice of non-reappointment, the faculty member may request in writing a private conference with the dean to discuss the reasons for non-reappointment. This request shall be granted and the conference held within ten (10) working days after receipt of the request if possible, at which time the reasons for the decision shall be communicated to the faculty member.

Within ten (10) working days after the conference, the dean shall give the faculty member a written statement of whether the original decision remains in effect. Each such decision shall be communicated for information to the provost and executive vice chancellor. Following the conference with the dean, the faculty member may within fifteen working days request a conference with the provost and executive vice chancellor to review reasons for non-reappointment.

At the conference with the dean and provost, on three working days’ written notice, the faculty member may be accompanied by an observer of their choosing. If the faculty member chooses an observer, the dean/provost may be accompanied by an administrator...
observer. Unless otherwise agreed, observers may not take part in the discussion between the faculty member and the dean/provost. Observers may not be present as attorney for either party. Because confidential personnel file information will be discussed at the conference, the faculty member and any observers must sign an Observer Waiver. This document includes the faculty member’s authorization of the observer(s) to hear such confidential information, and commits the observer(s) to maintain the confidentiality of such information unless the faculty member subsequently authorizes disclosure.

Motion FS 16-17/04-05 to add the sentence, “[H]owever, no advisor-advocate may be called as a witness”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

4.11.3.9 Faculty members shall be allowed to be represented at a grievance hearing by an advisor-advocate of his or her choice as long as that person is not serving as the faculty member's attorney. If the faculty member chooses to be represented by an advisor-advocate, the respondent may likewise be represented by an advisor-advocate. However, no advisor-advocate may be called as a witness. The faculty member also shall be allowed to have an attorney present as an observer, and if the faculty member so elects, the respondent may likewise have an attorney present as an observer. Attorney-observers are not, however, permitted to speak, although a party may consult with her or his attorney-observer during breaks in the hearing as well as at any other stage in the process aside from the hearing. Presence at the hearing is limited to the members of the FGHC, the grievant, the respondent(s), the parties' advisor-advocates and/or attorney-observers, if any, and a designated recorder.

The hearing shall begin with a presentation by the faculty member or faculty member's advisor-advocate of evidence designed to support the faculty member's contentions. The presentation shall be limited to those matters specified in the request for a hearing on which the FGHC based its agreement to conduct the hearing or to such other matters specified in section 4.11.3.5.2. FGHC members may question all witnesses presented by any party, the grievant, and the respondent(s). At the conclusion of the hearing, the FGHC shall meet in closed session to consider the matter. The FGHC may consider only such evidence as was presented at the hearing and need consider only the evidence offered that it considers fair and reliable. The burden is on the aggrieved faculty member to satisfy the FGHC, by a preponderance of the evidence, that her or his contention is true. After the conclusion of the hearing, the FGHC shall complete its deliberations and produce its decision within twenty (20) working days.

Motion FS 16-17/04-06 to add “dean of the college” in the place of and removing “department’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA)”, as shown in Appendix A, from the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5 (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)
4.13.4.4.5 The dean of the college’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA) will convene the meeting. The faculty shall select a member to chair the meeting, conduct all balloting, prepare minutes of the meeting, and immediately inform the departmental faculty and the dean of the college of the ballot results. Minutes of the meeting shall only record those faculty present and the ballot results, and shall be sent to the dean of the college. The paper ballots for this vote shall be kept in sealed, labeled, and dated envelopes, and filed in the office of the dean.

4.13.4.4.6 In order to institute the reopening of the chair position in an orderly way so that all chair positions will not be reopened at the same time, the following schedule is to be implemented. Beginning with the first academic year in which the new policy is adopted (i.e., the 1999-2000 academic year), if a chair has served in that position for:

(a) 1–2 years, the first reopening would occur 5 years later;
(b) 3–5 years, the first reopening would occur 3 years later;
(c) 6 or more years, the first reopening would occur 2 years later.

**Motion FS 16-17/04-07** to add the term “tenure-track”, as shown in Appendix A, to section 6.2.2.13 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2017)

6.2.2.13 Procedures for Application and Approval
(a) A request for an off-campus scholarly assignment must include a detailed statement of the proposed project or activity and be submitted to the chair of the department;
(b) Departmental approval by majority vote of the tenure-track faculty and the endorsement of the departmental chair are required before an application is submitted to the dean of the college/school for action. The dean will thereafter submit the proposal, along with the dean’s endorsement or rejection, to the provost and executive vice chancellor;
(c) A request for an off-campus scholarly assignment should be submitted at least six months prior to its effective date;
(d) Every effort will be made to grant approved OCSA requests for faculty; however, all requests for OCSAs are resource-dependent.

**April 24, 2017**

**Motion FS 16-17/04-08** to confirm Elicka Sparks and Ken Muir onto the Academic Integrity Board for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-09** to confirm Cate Smith and Mark Zrull onto the Admissions Committee for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)
**Motion FS 16-17/04-10** to confirm Teresa Lee to the Arts & Cultural Programs Advisory Committee for a three-year term, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-11** to confirm Paul Orkiszewski, Angie Koontz, Nancy Wilson, Erica Slate, Yu Ju Wu, Margaret Gregor, Kevin Kennedy, Mary Ann Hofmann, and Karen Caldwell, to the Awards Committee for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-12** to confirm Will Canu, Ece Karatan, John Abbott, Marie Hoepfl, Alecia Jackson, Tracy Smith, and David Shows for three-year terms and Susan Staub to a two-year term for the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-13** to confirm C.A. Debelius, Joe Klein, Shanan Fitts, and John Wiswell to three-year terms, Ellen Cowan and Ben Powell to two-year terms, and Tanga Mohr as Dinesh Dave’s substitute for 2017-2018, to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-14** to confirm Bo Bolick, Jeff Holcomb, Jennifer Luetkemeyer and Newly Paul to the Library Services Committee for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-15** to confirm Jacqueline Hersh, Rebecca A. Battista, and Laura Mallard for three-year terms to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-16** to confirm Donna Lillian to the Registration and Calendar Committee for a three-year term, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-17** to confirm Jean-Francois Fournier to the University Bookstore Committee for a three-year term, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-18** to confirm Marian Williams and Jesse Taylor to the Faculty Due Process Committee for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-19** to confirm Scott Welsh for a three-year term to the Faculty Grievance Assistance Committee, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

**Motion FS 16-17/04-20** to confirm Stephanie West as an At-Large Faculty Senator for a three-year term, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)
Motion FS 16-17/04-21 to confirm Tom Ross and Eli Bentor to the Gifts Acceptance Committee for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

Motion FS 16-17/04-22 to confirm Julie Pedigo, Tracy Goodson-Espy and Alecia Jackson for three-year terms to the University Research Council, as shown in Appendix B. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)

Motion FS 16-17/04-23 to confirm the following candidates onto Faculty Coordinating Committees (FCC) for three-year terms, as shown in Appendix B: Chris Bartel and William Atkinson to the Integrative Learning Experience FCC, Ed Behrend-Martinez onto the Historical Studies FCC, Margot Olson onto the First Year Seminar FCC, R. Mitchell Parry onto the Quantitative Literacy FCC, Derek Mohr to the Wellness Literacy FCC, Rodney Duke and Clark Maddux to the Literary Studies FCC, Susan Lutz to the Fine Arts FCC, Ted Zerucha to the Science Inquiry FCC, Scott Welsh and Lindsay Masland to the Liberal Studies Experience FCC, and Cameron Lippard to the Social Science FCC. (Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2017)