The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Gates at 3:15pm, in the William Strickland Conference Room in J.G. Greer on Monday, March 14, 2016. Senators Doll, Dunston, Frye, Hageman, Ortiz, Rardin, Rice, and Stanovsky were not in attendance.

I. Announcements

A. Chair Gates welcomed Senators and asked visitors to introduce themselves. Visitors were Audrey Austin (IRAP), Renee Gamble (Faculty Senate), Jennifer Cecile (Chemistry), Anna Oakes (Watauga Democrat), Greg Lovins (Business Affairs), Pam Kidder-Ashley (Psychology), and Tim Burwell (Academic Affairs).

II. Minutes

A. Chair Gates asked for a motion to approve the minutes for January 11, 2016. Senator Elicka Peterson-Sparks moved and Senator Andy Koch seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion to approve the January 11, 2016 minutes passed. (Vote #1)**

B. Chair Gates asked for a motion to approve the minutes for February 8, 2016. Senator Elicka Peterson-Sparks moved and Senator Andy Koch seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion to approve the February 8, 2016 minutes passed. (Vote #2)**

III. Visitors’ Reports

A. Pam Kidder-Ashley, of the Calendar Committee, came as a courtesy to answer questions about the 2017-2019 calendar, which has been drafted and input is requested. Senator West asked about whether extra time spent in a class could count as class time for a different day. Pam wasn’t certain of the answer and will look into it. Senator Zrull thanked her for her work on the calendar.

B. Greg Lovins, of Business Affairs, discussed the following parking topics: parking policies concerning graduate students and graduate assistants, access to Holmes Center Lot and JET lot, and times that gated lots open.

Graduate Assistants can park in any student parking lots and are not restricted to a certain lot. Graduate Students’ parking permits assign them to a specific parking lot. Discussion of access to the Holmes Center Lot and the JET Lot centered on the parking permits of graduate students who are also adjunct faculty, and Resident Directors who have access to the lots. Due to this input, Mr. Lovins will look further into the issues of parking in the Holmes Center Lot and JET Lot. Gated Parking Lots open at 4:45pm, to assist with traffic flow for people leaving the lots. The library parking deck is an exception and opens at 5:30pm, due to traffic issues. It was noted that the Student Recreation Center gate goes up at 3:45pm, and Mr. Lovins will check on it, due to this feedback.

C. Ayako Nakano – Student Voting. An organizer of Student Power, notified everyone
that Student Government Association elections are occurring this week. She requested that faculty remind students about the upcoming SGA elections. Students can vote in the Student Union or online. There was a question posed as to why SGA didn’t send a representative about this topic. She stated that SGA hasn’t passed any resolutions this year and is dysfunctional.

IV. Provost’s Report

A. Provost Kruger updated the faculty senate on the three Dean searches occurring. The committees met and have narrowed the pools down, so they can conduct round-one interviews this week and round-two interviews in April. He is thankful to the committees on their work and the committee chairs are happy with the applicant pools. Each of the committees will be interviewing upwards of 10 people in the round-one interviews.

V. Chair’s Report

A. The Office of Sustainability is conducting a massive book sale that includes all the library books being withdrawn from the library’s collections, they are being sold at 1 cent each (plus any additional donations). All of the income from this will go towards recycling bins for the library. Each Friday books will be put up for sale. Any books not sold will be donated to various organizations.

B. Comments have been made to Chair Gates about a lack communication within departments regarding topics discussed at Faculty Senate meetings. He would like everyone to be aware of these issues and to remind everyone to keep their departments informed about Faculty Senate discussions/decisions.

C. Elections Officer Beth Frye is at a conference, so Chair Gates brought up the topic of Faculty Senate elections. The Faculty Senate is a little behind on Senate Elections, but there is still time to catch up and to seat newly elected senators on April 25th. Nominations officially begin this week and voting will follow until April 8, 2016. Department Senators are determined by their departments. At-Large Senate seats are elected.

D. Administration has proposed a meeting with the Faculty Senate about the Campus Master Plan on March 25, 2016 at 2pm, in Rm. 224 IG Greer. This is an opportunity to learn and ask questions. This meeting is a listening session, so a new master plan won’t be presented at the meeting; instead the meeting is a time for faculty to provide input for the new master plan. It was suggested that anyone concerned about parking should go to the meeting, since the current draft of the master plan doesn’t handle parking for faculty very well. Senator Peterson-Sparks asked if there was a copy of the current draft that could be viewed prior to the meeting. It was recommended that interested senators should read the current master plan and the strategic plan to get an idea of the topics in the new master plan. A master plan is done approximately every 10 years.

E. Faculty Assembly this month: The changes to post-tenure review have been approved, but the requirements for Dean Reviews and Video Training may be removed. Margaret Spellings attended the meeting. Her letter from March 1st brings up certain points that
Faculty Senate should be aware of, including: she pledges to give campuses autonomy, to keep the board of governors out of campus politics, and to keep the General Assembly from interfering with the University of NC.

Vice President of Academic Affairs Julius Gonzalez talked about faculty salaries as a top budget priority but mentioned that only a 2% pool would be likely from the assembly. He is also asking for assistance replenishing the recruitment and retention funds.

Matt Brody, Vice President for Human Resources, says he expects a premium increase and an increase in out-of-pocket copays in the 80/20 Health Plan, but there won’t be an elimination of that plan. The TSERS retirement plan is solid, but the state’s 6% ORP contribution is not competitive, so they are working on getting an 8-9% contribution from the state for current employees and potential recruits.

There is a new General Administration Initiative, a faculty fellow program, wherein a faculty member is chosen for an administrative experience.

Chair Gates brought up the idea of doing a Campus Morale/Climate Survey sometime soon. Chair Gates then opened up this question to the Faculty Senate for discussion. This type of survey has been done before and a template should be available. It would be for current employees, since exit surveys are already done regularly. Senators discussed when such a survey would best take place. Doing a survey sooner would collect important information about recent events/appointments, as well as providing baseline data before other changes take place. However, waiting might allow the Dean searches to be completed before the survey. There was support for doing a morale survey on a regular basis, possibly every three years for consistency. Nothing was determined, but Chair Gates asked that the Faculty Senate consider this topic.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policies Committee (Crepeau, Behrent, Ortiz, Osinsky, Waldroup, Wheeler)

1. Working on Handbook changes. They met before the break and will meet again on March 21st.

B. Agenda Committee (Gates, Aycock, Frye, Spaulding)

No Report

C. Budget Committee (Strazicich, Dunston, Madritch, Schug, Stallworth, Szeto)

No Report

D. Campus Planning Committee (Stanovsky, Salinas, Hageman, Doll)

No Report

E. Campus Technology Committee (Fenwick, Cook, Reed, Rice, Shulstad, Spaulding)
F. Committee on Committees  (Frye, Morehouse, Villanova, Weddell)

No Report

G. Faculty Governance Committee  (Gates, Frye, Howard, Koch, Rardin)

1. The Faculty Handbook discussion was led by Dr. Edwards, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Proposed changes are shown in red on documents sent out previously and can be seen in Appendix B. There are 11 proposed changes, most important being search committee functions.

Dr. Edwards reviewed the proposed changes. At 4.1.3.1b Chair Gates clarifies that, the term “promotions” is a necessary addition because of the new position of senior lecturer. At 4.4.8 Senator Campbell asks if the wording “it will include” makes it a requirement. Senator Reed offers an amendment to change the wording to “it will include any”, seconded by Senator Zrull. Amendment to change the wording in 4.4.8 of the Faculty Handbook to “it will include any” passed. (Vote #3).

At 4.1.6.4, Senator Aycock moved for an amendment, since the wording of “during while” is redundant, and that the word “during” should be removed. Seconded by Senator Zrull, and the vote passed. Amendment to remove the redundant word “during” from section 4.1.6.4 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #4).

At 4.1.9.1, Senator Campbell brought up an issue that has been presented to him by others, that this change (along with certain other changes throughout the university) moves us in an un-democratic direction, since a non-tenured faculty member is no longer able to voice their opinion on tenure decisions. No motion was proposed.

At 4.1.9.3a, a question is brought up about search committees using digital communication as opposed to “face-to-face”. It is explained that digital communication may not be secure and that the deliberations of search committees have to be confidential/secure. However, it seems digital communications have been used by recent search committees. An amendment was proposed by Senator West, stating, “shall be held in face-to-face or by secure digital communication”, seconded by Senator Erickson. Technology experts would have to be consulted to determine what is considered a ‘secure digital medium’. Amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to add, “by secure digital communication”, passed. (Vote #5).

Senator Campbell brought up the point that the language is misleading because it doesn’t delineate the difference in confidentiality requirements between the meeting of a search committee for an interview, versus a meeting for deliberation. Senator Shulstad proposed an amendment to insert the phrase “involving deliberation”, so that it reads, “All meetings of search committees, involving deliberation, shall be” and was seconded by Senator West. Amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to read, “All meetings of search committees, involving deliberation”, passed. (Vote #6).
Senator Spaulding proposed an amendment, that the word “appropriately” be inserted before “secure digital mediums”, so that it would read “by appropriately secured digital communication”, the amendment was seconded by Senator Reed. **The amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to read, “appropriately secured digital communication” passed. (Vote #7).**

Senator Reed was troubled by the amendment made to 4.1.9.3a because of its implications to 4.1.9.3b, specifically that if meetings through digital mediums are allowed, how would the requirement in 3b of paper ballots be fulfilled? Senator Reed moved to amend 4.1.9.3b and 4.1.9.3c to remove the word “paper” from “paper ballot”. Senator West seconded the amendment. Questions/discussion arose about options for non-paper ballots, digital voting, mailing in paper ballots, confidentiality, whether the candidates name must be on the ballot, and the need for a paper trail of votes cast. Senator Aycock moved that Section 10 of the Faculty Handbook be sent back to the Governance Committee for further discussion and clarification, motion was seconded by Senator Erickson. **Motion FS 15-16/03-01 to send Section 10 of the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook to the Governance Committee passed. (Vote #8)**

Dr. Flanders (sitting in for Senator Waldrup) brought up 7.5.21.3. The current make-up of the University Research Council doesn’t have any representation from the Arts (except a representative from the Music department). She believes that the current range of faculty on that council isn’t fair to the arts. She doesn’t know if the current council has the background to understand proposals from all areas. URC is divided into three groups: Arts, Business Ed., and Sciences. Senator Szeto added that her Theatre & Dance department has a difficult time getting funding also. There was a question as to whether there is any evidence of bias in funding provided by the URC. Dr. Flanders provided an anecdote of other faculty in her department having issues getting funding. There was a request for more information from the URC and the funding they provide, in order to look for any trends or bias.

Senator West moved to postpone section 7.5.21.3 till the next meeting, and Senator Flanders seconded the motion. Senator Reed, pointed out that section 7.5.21.3 can be voted on at this meeting as is. He stated that the concerns about that section can be addressed with a separate resolution or moved to committee, since the proposed language of the change to that section is irrelevant to the concerns that have been brought up. After further discussion, Senator West and Flanders agreed and withdrew the motion.

Senator Koch moved that they accept all the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook, except Section 10. The motion was seconded by Senator Aycock. **Motion FS 15-16/03-02 to accept all the proposed changes, except Section 10, to the Faculty Handbook as amended (see Appendix B), passed. (Vote #9)**

H. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Erickson, Albinnson, Hester, McGaha, Peterson-Sparks, Phillips, Pitofsky)

1. Emeritus Resolution
   Proposed changes can be seen in Appendix A. The primary changes being suggested is that faculty members that resign due to a long-term
disability could be eligible for emeritus status (in addition to faculty that retire). A question was brought up about whether someone with a long-term disability could leave, gain emeritus status and return to the University as faculty later on. The inclusion of the term “resign” makes resignation a requirement before they can be eligible for emeritus status. Chair Gates stated this is a motion from the Faculty Welfare Committee and does not need a second. The Motion FS 15-16/03-03 to recommend the changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding Emeritus Faculty Eligibility (Appendix A) passed.  (Vote #10)

2. Salary Resolution Update
Visitor Tim Burwell from Academic Affairs brought some information on this topic. He passed out two charts, entitled Comparison of Faculty Salary Benchmarks, these charts can be seen in Appendix D. These charts show the latest salary data, one chart shows salary comparisons with 129 similar institutions and the other with 18 peer institutions. The official set of 18 peer institutions do not have the same breadth of disciplines that we have here. The 129 similar institutions provide salary data for all of the disciplines we have here. In this way, comparable faculty salary data can be provided for all faculty members.

The target is to bring salaries for each rank and discipline up to the 80th percentile as compared to these 129 similar institutions. Market level is now considered to be between the 50th and 75th percentile. The average faculty salary at ASU is far below the averages of our peers and the 129 similar institutions, as shown on the graphs. Salaries and salary increases are not at the same level across departments, ranks, and disciplines.

Senators and Mr. Burwell discussed the salary increase distribution of 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile of last year; 70th percentile for assistant and associate rank, and 50th percentile for full professor rank. As shown on the graph, the salary for the rank of full professor has the largest disparity between salary at ASU and other comparable institutions. There is concern within the Faculty Senate about the disparity between the current full professor salary and the targeted salary for that rank.

Mr. Burwell explained that, 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile is not the goal, the goal is 80th percentile, 80th percentile, 80th percentile. There is a concern about the flight of faculty. Most of the flight was in the assistant rank, Arts & Sciences, and the associate rank, in that order. Very little flight has been seen at the full professor rank. Also, most hiring is done at the assistant level, so salary must be closer to market rates to be able to acquire new faculty. So, the 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile, distribution came from those needs and was only for that year. The need to prevent flight informed the distribution of salary increase for that year more than the amount of salary disparity between each rank and its comparable target salary.
A question arose as to the cost of recruiting a new faculty member, in order to compare the cost of flight of faculty to the cost of providing raises. Each faculty search varies, but the average cost is $50,000-$60,000.

Data, such as the graphs provided, is important to show necessary parties, such as the legislature, where we stand in comparison to other similar institutions in regards to salary. We may be far from our goal, but having a goal and data is important to moving in the desired direction.

Senators make the point that while salary increases may be necessary to retain faculty at the assistant and associate level, it is also strategic to provide a better long-term goal for faculty. To retain them by showing that if someone stays and becomes a full professor, the university will pay them well.

Chair Gates brought up a matter of parliamentary procedure that at the February meeting a Salary Resolution was referred to the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee for consideration and would then be brought back to the floor for a vote during the March meeting. There was a question as to whether the resolution should say 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile, or should match the goal of 80th percentile, 80th percentile, 80th percentile. It is proposed that they make a point with the resolution that 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile, is not acceptable for the future and the distribution should be more even. It is a troubling message to show faculty that in the long-term they will make less than their peers. It shows a lack of concern for full professors.

A number of senators have left the meeting at this point, and it is brought up as to whether a vote should be taken with the diminished number still in attendance or whether it would be better to vote at the next meeting. There are many agenda items for the next meeting. Waiting to vote may compress that meeting too much.

Focusing the discussion back onto the resolution, Senator Erickson offered an amendment to the resolution from the committee taking into account the information from Mr. Burwell and the concerns that the 70th percentile, 70th percentile, 50th percentile was only for that year and that the target is 80th percentile, 80th percentile, 80th percentile. The Salary Resolution can be seen in Appendix C.

The Salary Resolution isn’t about making a change; it is about making a statement. The amendment to the Salary Resolution has two objectives, to acknowledge that this was a temporary benchmark, and that we aspire to elevate all tenure track faculty across all ranks to above the 50th percentile of UNC peers. Senator Erickson moved to change the wording to amend the resolution, Senator Aycock seconds, see Appendix
The motion to amend the wording in the Salary Resolution passed. (Vote #11).

The Faculty Welfare Committee moved to vote on the Salary Resolution as amended. Motion FS 15-16/03-04 regarding the Salary Resolution as amended passed. (Vote #12).

I. Welfare of Students Committee (West, Fiske, Gross, Hamilton, Westerman, Zrull)

No Report

VII. Unfinished Business

None

VIII. New Business

A. Senator Villanova passed along the concern of a colleague, about the rental text book system. This colleague has a book that he uses in class that was part of the rental textbook system. However, the printed version of the book is being discontinued, and is now only available as an e-book. He has to require students to purchase the e-book, but the rental system isn’t flexible enough to offer a subsidy for the purchase.

Another Senator brought up a similar issue that his textbooks are updated yearly and he would use more up-to-date versions if he didn’t have to use the rental system. Another Senator wanted to use Harvard business cases but the students would have to purchase them since there isn’t a subsidy. This issue will come up more often as more educational material is available only online or in digital formats.

There was a suggestion to refer this matter to a committee to review the rental text book policies, and see if there is a way to create a subsidy for alternative media, or to reexamine the continuation of the text book rental system. Chair Gates assigned this to be jointly considered by the Academic Policy and Welfare of Students Committees and it is referred to both committees for discussion of the concerns raised.

B. Senator Zrull was asked by faculty in his department whether the Faculty Senate would discuss policies/issues of consistency among program directors on topics such as, course release, and expectations from individual departments. Chair Gates informed everyone that this is under discussion within the Governance Committee. The current discussion is being approached from the direction of, who makes the rules governing program directors that may not be housed in the department where they are teaching. Senator Zrull is mostly concerned with how they are handled within departments, but Chair Gates said they are looking at the overall program director set up because it has begun to vary as the university changes.

C. Senator Reed noted that there is some confusion as to why the Faculty Senate was able to pass a resolution regarding the Connect NC Bond, since in the previous election when there was an amendment to the ballot, they were not allowed to weigh in on it in any way. There were requests from some senators that General Counsel come to the
Faculty Senate and explain why that was different than other political issues. Chair Gates said that a partial answer would be that Faculty Senates are exempt from the ‘no political stricture’ that applies to other state employees, and that a more in depth answer can be provided from the General Counsel.

IX. Adjourn (time approximated)

A. Senator Aycock moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded by Senator Spaulding. Motion to adjourn passed. (Vote #13). Meeting adjourned at 5:55pm.

Faculty Senate Voting and Attendance Record for March 14, 2016

Y for Yes; N for No; A for Abstain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pia Albinsson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Aycock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Alexander-Eitzman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Campbell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitzi Cook</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crepeau</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Doll</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Dunston</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Erickson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fenwick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Fiske</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanan Fitts</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Frye</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Hartley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Hester</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Howard</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Koch</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Madritch</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Marshall</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy McGaha</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanga Mohr</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Morehouse</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ortiz</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel Osinsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicka Peterson-Sparks</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Phillips</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Pitofsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Rardin</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Reed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dea Rice</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Salinas</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Shulstad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Spaulding</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stallworth</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stanovsky</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-Yan Szeto</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Villanova</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Waldroup /April Flanders</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Weddell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie West</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Westerman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Wheeler/Jennifer Cecile</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zrull</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion to approve the January 11, 2016 minutes passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motion to approve the February 8, 2016 minutes passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amendment to change the wording in 4.4.8 of the Faculty Handbook to “it will include any” passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Amendment to remove the redundant word “during” from section 4.1.6.4 of the Faculty Handbook passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to add, “by secure digital communication”, passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to read, “All meetings of search committees, involving deliberation”, passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The amendment to change section 4.1.9.3a of the Faculty Handbook to read, “appropriately secured digital communication” passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Motion FS 15-16/03-01 to send Section 10 of the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook to the Governance Committee passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motion FS 15-16/03-02 to accept all the proposed changes, except Section 10, to the Faculty Handbook as amended (see Appendix B), passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Motion FS 15-16/03-03 to recommend the changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding Emeritus Faculty Eligibility (Appendix A) passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The motion to amend the wording in the Salary Resolution passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Salary Resolution voted on and passed as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Motion FS 15-16/03-04 regarding the Salary Resolution as amended passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A    March 14, 2016

Emeritus Faculty Eligibility Change to Faculty Handbook:

The Welfare and Morale Committee is asking for Faculty Senate to vote on changes to the eligibility criteria for emeritus status. If approved, we suggest these changes to the handbook be taken up by the Faculty Governance Committee.

Current Wording of Emeritus Status in Faculty Handbook

3.12 Emeritus Status Emeritus faculty status may be awarded to honor a retired faculty member who has had a distinguished professional career and has made significant contributions to Appalachian State University. Successful candidates for consideration to the emeritus rank will have:

(1) permanent tenure and at least ten years of full-time employment at Appalachian State University prior to retirement. The emeritus rank is that held at retirement; and

(2) a consistent record of quality performance as demonstrated by one or more of the following:

(a) a substantive record of scholarly achievement commensurate with national and international standards within the specific discipline;

(b) a recognized record of outstanding teaching and educational contributions; and

(c) evidence of significant service to the University and to the respective discipline.

3.12.1 Emeritus Status Procedure The candidate initiates application for emeritus status no later than September 15 in the year of consideration. A letter will be submitted to the departmental promotion and tenure committee with supporting documentation including a comprehensive curriculum vitae and record of the faculty member’s achievement and contribution to the University and the appropriate discipline. The committee will review the application and make approval, or non-approval, as provided for other personnel decisions to the department chair.

The department chair will forward his/her recommendation, with the supporting materials, to the appropriate dean. The dean will forward his/her recommendation, with the supporting materials, to the provost and executive vice chancellor by December 15. The provost and executive vice chancellor, after his/her review will forward his/her recommendation as well as the recommendations of the other reviewing individuals/bodies to the chancellor by February 15. Upon approval of the chancellor, the provost and executive vice chancellor will submit the candidate’s documentation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for consideration at the spring semester meeting. Candidates whose emeritus rank has been approved by the Board of Trustees are notified promptly. The chancellor will confer the rank during the August annual meeting of the University. A letter of commendation and an emeritus faculty medallion shall accompany the emeritus faculty designation from the chancellor upon official notice of the faculty member’s full retirement from the University, i.e., at the end of any phased retirement service period or upon immediate, full retirement.
Proposed Changes to the Wording of Emeritus Status in Faculty Handbook (indicated in bolded underline)

3.12 Emeritus Status Emeritus faculty status may be awarded to honor a faculty member who is retired or resigns due to a long-term disability and has had a distinguished professional career and has made significant contributions to Appalachian State University. Successful candidates for consideration to the emeritus rank will have:

(1) permanent tenure and at least ten years of full-time employment at Appalachian State University prior to retirement/resignation. The emeritus rank is that held at retirement/resignation; and

(2) a consistent record of quality performance as demonstrated by one or more of the following:
   
   (a) a substantive record of scholarly achievement commensurate with national and international standards within the specific discipline;

   (b) a recognized record of outstanding teaching and educational contributions; and

   (c) evidence of significant service to the University and to the respective discipline.

3.12.1 Emeritus Status Procedure The candidate initiates application for emeritus status no later than September 15 in the year of consideration. A letter will be submitted to the departmental promotion and tenure committee with supporting documentation including a comprehensive curriculum vitae and record of the faculty member’s achievement and contribution to the University and the appropriate discipline. The committee will review the application and make approval, or non-approval, as provided for other personnel decisions to the department chair.

The department chair will forward his/her recommendation, with the supporting materials, to the provost and executive vice chancellor by December 15. The provost and executive vice chancellor, after his/her review will forward his/her recommendation as well as the recommendations of the other reviewing individuals/bodies to the chancellor by February 15. Upon approval of the chancellor, the provost and executive vice chancellor will submit the candidate’s documentation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for consideration at the spring semester meeting. Candidates whose emeritus rank has been approved by the Board of Trustees are notified promptly. The chancellor will confer the rank during the August annual meeting of the University. A letter of commendation and an emeritus faculty medallion shall accompany the emeritus faculty designation from the chancellor upon official notice of the faculty member’s full retirement/resignation from the University, i.e., at the end of any phased retirement service period or upon immediate, full retirement.

Please note that there is no mention in the handbook regarding the benefits for emeritus status nor whether or not this status is permanent. The handbook (in sections 4.1.7, 4.1.8, and 4.4.6) merely discusses the procedures by which the PTC convey emeritus status on a faculty member.
Appendix B

Proposed Faculty Handbook Changes – March 14, 2016

Faculty Handbook Revisions for 2016 to be considered by Faculty Senate

Red indicates new language

1) This change is to correct a reference in 3.13.2

Proposed language:

3.13.2 Faculty members who are appointed as visiting faculty members, adjunct faculty, lecturers, artists-in-residence, writers-in-residence, practitioners-in-residence, executives-in-residence, clinical faculty, research faculty, postdoctoral fellows, or other special categories are regarded as “special faculty members” for purposes of the University Code. Such appointments are non-tenure-track appointments. Prior to appointment or reappointment, the credentials of candidates for Special Faculty appointments will be reviewed by the departmental personnel committee (see Section 4.1.3.1). Among special faculty, only Lecturers or Senior Lecturers have unit or university voting rights as specified in Article II of the Faculty Constitution.

Current language:

3.13.2 Faculty members who are appointed as visiting faculty members, adjunct faculty, lecturers, artists-in-residence, writers-in-residence, practitioners-in-residence, executives-in-residence, clinical faculty, research faculty, postdoctoral fellows, or other special categories are regarded as “special faculty members” for purposes of the University Code. Such appointments are non-tenure-track appointments. Prior to appointment or reappointment, the credentials of candidates for Special Faculty appointments will be reviewed by the departmental personnel committee (see Section 4.1.3.1). Among special faculty, only Lecturers or Senior Lecturers have unit or university voting rights as specified in Article I of the Faculty Constitution.

2) This change to 4.1.3 Functions of Departmental Personnel Committees, 4.1.3.1a, clarifies that the Departmental Personnel Committee has authority to handle only certain types of positions.

Proposed language:

4.1.3.1a reviewing the credentials of all applicants for new or vacant non-tenure eligible positions including special faculty appointments, interviewing selected candidates, and making a recommendation to the chair of two or more qualified persons to fill the position (except in the case of special faculty appointments or when circumstances make only one candidate acceptable), and through the chair to the dean and the Provost and Executive Vice chancellor. The personnel committee may or may not submit nominations in rank order of preference. Search committees may be established to assist or supplant the departmental personnel committee in performance of these functions (see SEARCH COMMITTEE section 4.1.9). Each member of a search committee shall be subject to the same confidentiality obligations that apply to departmental personnel committees.

Current language:

4.1.3.1a reviewing the credentials of all applicants for new or vacant positions including special faculty appointments, interviewing selected candidates, and making a recommendation to the chair of two or more qualified persons to fill the position (except in the case of special faculty appointments or when circumstances make only one candidate acceptable), and through the chair to the dean and the Provost and Executive Vice chancellor. The personnel committee may or may not submit nominations in rank order of preference. Search committees may be established to assist or supplant the departmental personnel committee in performance of
these functions (see SEARCH COMMITTEE section 4.1.9). Each member of a search committee shall be subject to the same confidentiality obligations that apply to departmental personnel committees.

3) This change to 4.1.3 Functions of Departmental Personnel Committees, 4.1.3.1b, clarifies the functions of the Departmental Personnel Committee.

Proposed language:
4.1.3.1b reviewing all non-tenure eligible and special faculty (see sections 3.13-14) and making recommendations regarding appointments, reappointments and promotions. The committee shall make a recommendation to the chair, who in turn shall make a recommendation to the dean; the dean will make a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and make known to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor the recommendation of the chair concerning the future employment of such faculty. The recommendations described above shall be accompanied by the results of the departmental personnel committee's vote, supporting material, and all documents submitted to the committee.

Current language:
4.1.3.1b reviewing all special faculty (see sections 3.13-14) and making recommendations regarding appointments. The committee shall make a recommendation to the chair, who in turn shall make a recommendation to the dean; the dean will make a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and make known to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor the recommendation of the chair concerning the future employment of such faculty. The recommendations described above shall be accompanied by the results of the departmental personnel committee's vote, supporting material, and all documents submitted to the committee.

4) This addition to section 4.4.8 adds language to show that if vote justification forms are used, they need to accompany the recommendation and dossier submission for tenure and/or promotion.

Proposed language:
4.4.8 The dean of the college/school shall forward his or her recommendation (with reasons for that recommendation) with the dossier, including vote justification forms, to the provost and executive vice chancellor. The faculty member shall get a copy of this letter at the time the dossier is forwarded to the provost and executive vice chancellor.

Current language:
4.4.8 The dean of the college/school shall forward his or her recommendation (with reasons for that recommendation) with the dossier to the provost and executive vice chancellor. The faculty member shall get a copy of this letter at the time the dossier is forwarded to the provost and executive vice chancellor.

5) This addition to 5.3 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment updates the reference to the ASU Policy Manual and references the applicable UNC policy number.

Proposed language:
5.3 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment
The University’s Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment is set forth in ASU Policy Manual 604.3 http://policy.appstate.edu/Conflict_of_Interest_and_Commitment and UNC policy 300.2.2.1[R].

Current language:
5.3 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment
Proposed language:

7.3.4.4 Awards Committee
Members on Committee: 20–15 faculty (3 from Arts and Sciences, 2 from Business, 2 from Education, 2 from Fine and Applied Arts, 2 from Music, 2 from College of Health Sciences, and 2 from the Library); 2 staff; and 2 students (one undergraduate and one graduate). Faculty composition can be any faculty, including adjunct and part-time. In the event a member of the committee wishes to seek an award, an alternate from her/his area will be recommended to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on Committees to serve for the duration of the awards process. The chair of the Faculty Senate or his/her designee, will convene the first meeting and facilitate the selection of a chair, or co-chairs, from among the voting members of the committee;

Current language:

7.3.4.4 Awards Committee
Members on Committee: 20–16 faculty (3 from Arts and Sciences, 2 from Business, 2 from Education, 2 from Fine and Applied Arts, 2 from Music, 2 from College of Health Sciences, 1 from University College, and 2 from the Library); 2 staff; and 2 students (one undergraduate and one graduate). Faculty composition can be any faculty, including adjunct and part-time. In the event a member of the committee wishes to seek an award, an alternate from her/his area will be recommended to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on Committees to serve for the duration of the awards process. The chair of the Faculty Senate or his/her designee, will convene the first meeting and facilitate the selection of a chair, or co-chairs, from among the voting members of the committee;

Proposed language:

7.5.21.3 The elected members of the University Research Council shall be composed of twelve (12) faculty members:

- College of Arts and Sciences: one Arts and Humanities member, one Social Sciences member, and one STEM member;
- College of Business: one member;
- College of Education: two members representing different departments;
- College of Fine and Applied Arts: two members representing different departments;
- College of Health Sciences: two members representing different departments;
- School of Music: one member;
- University Library: one member.

Current language:

7.5.21.3 The elected members of the University Research Council shall be composed of thirteen (13) faculty members:

- College of Arts and Sciences: one Arts and Humanities member, one Social Sciences member, and one STEM member;
- College of Business: one member;
- College of Education: two members representing different departments;
- College of Fine and Applied Arts: two members representing different departments;
- College of Health Sciences: two members representing different departments;
- School of Music: one member;
- University College: one member;
- University Library: one member.

Proposed language:
7.5.23 Intellectual Property Development Advisory Council

(a) Members on Council: 11-13 – Seven faculty will be recommended by the appropriate deans and will be appointed by the provost and executive vice chancellor as follows: one (1) faculty representative from each of the following University entities: College of Arts and Sciences, Walker College of Business, Reich College of Education, College of Fine and Applied Arts, Hayes School of Music, College of Health Sciences, University College, and Belk Library and Information Commons. The Faculty Senate will appoint one additional voting member. All faculty will be voting members and will serve 3-year terms. One (1) representative each from Research and Graduate Studies and the Small Business and Technology Development Center will be voting members. A representative from the Office of General Counsel will advise the council upon request. The provost and executive vice chancellor may at her/his discretion appoint up to three (3) additional non-voting members, which may include non-ASU affiliated individuals. All members should be appointed based on her/his area of expertise and commitment to furthering the intellectual property development efforts of both the faculty and University;

Current language:

7.5.23 Intellectual Property Development Advisory Council

(a) Members on Council: 11-14 – Eight faculty will be recommended by the appropriate deans and will be appointed by the provost and executive vice chancellor as follows: one (1) faculty representative from each of the following University entities: College of Arts and Sciences, Walker College of Business, Reich College of Education, College of Fine and Applied Arts, Hayes School of Music, College of Health Sciences, University College, and Belk Library and Information Commons. The Faculty Senate will appoint one additional voting member. All faculty will be voting members and will serve 3-year terms. One (1) representative each from Research and Graduate Studies and the Small Business and Technology Development Center will be voting members. A representative from the Office of General Counsel will advise the council upon request. The provost and executive vice chancellor may at her/his discretion appoint up to three (3) additional non-voting members, which may include non-ASU affiliated individuals. All members should be appointed based on her/his area of expertise and commitment to furthering the intellectual property development efforts of both the faculty and University;

7. Addition of language to clarify involvement of tenured faculty on OCSA and FMLA in PTC

Proposed language:

4.1.6.4 – Tenured faculty members on OCSA or FMLA are not required to serve on the PTC during while on full paid or unpaid leave (6.2.3.3). However, they are eligible to serve should they decide to do so.

8) The changes to 4.1.9.1 Regulations of Search Committees for Tenure Track Faculty clarify regulations.

Proposed language:

4.1.9.1 Regulations of Search Committees for Tenure Track Faculty

The composition, functions, and procedures of search committees for tenure track faculty as outlined in this section of the Faculty Handbook are the official guidelines for these committees and must be followed in all cases. The departmental personnel committee reviews the credentials of all applicants for new or vacant special faculty appointment (see 4.1.3.1.) The provost and executive vice chancellor shall be responsible for seeking interpretations of any relevant regulations or policies. (See 4.13.4 for information on Departmental Chair Search Committees.)

In accordance with the guidelines outlined here, departments shall establish a standard method for creating search committees. Each department shall determine the size and membership of the committees. In all cases, no reviewing group or persons may substitute their judgment for that of a
search committee on matters relating to the professional qualifications of the individual involved, i.e., the individual’s ability to fulfill adequately the professional requirements of the position.

In cases where search committees make recommendations to hire a candidate for a tenure track open-ranked position whose rank along the tenure track must be confirmed by a specific departmental unit, the departmental promotion and tenure committee shall determine whether or not the candidate’s recommended rank is eligible to hold the recommended rank. If this is a joint appointment, at this time the "base" departmental unit of the faculty member must be determined in order for the base department’s promotion and tenure committee to determine the candidate’s recommended rank (see section 3.10).

Current language:

4.1.9.1 Search committees that recommend to the departmental chair are established by the department or by the departmental chair with departmental approval. Search committees that recommend to the DPC are established by the DPC, with departmental approval. In departments where search committees make recommendations directly to departmental chairs, no reviewing group or persons may substitute their judgment for that of a search committee on matters relating to the professional qualifications of the individual involved, i.e., the individual's ability to fulfill adequately the professional requirements of the position. In cases where search committees make recommendations to hire a candidate for a position whose rank along the tenure track must be confirmed by a specific departmental unit, the departmental promotion and tenure committee shall determine whether or not the candidate is eligible to hold the recommended rank. If this is a joint appointment, at this time the "base" departmental unit of the faculty member must be determined (see section 3.10).

9) Change to section 4.1.9.2 under 4.1.9 on Search Committees

Proposed language:

4.1.9.2 Functions of Search Committees
The search committee is responsible for reviewing ASU Policy Manual 601.8 “Hiring of EHRA Employees.” After the department has determined the general responsibilities for a faculty vacancy, the search committee shall prepare or review the job announcement which contains minimum and preferred qualifications and shall develop selection criteria based on the position requirements. In accordance with ASU PM 601.8, the search committee shall oversee all aspects of advertising the position and receiving applications; review all applications; conduct reference checks and preliminary interviews; and schedule and conduct on-campus interviews. Whenever possible, the search committee shall recommend at least two candidates for hire and may provide a ranked list of the candidates.

Confidentiality shall be maintained throughout the search process, including, but not limited to, the identity of applicants, submitted application materials, reference checks, interviews, committee discussions and deliberations, short list determinations, and final offers. Information gathered during the search process shall not be shared with others in the department or unit who do not serve on the search committee without written permission from the applicants. Search committee members should not engage in discussions about the applicants or the submitted application materials outside the confines of a search committee meeting which is “the only legally-privileged setting for discussion of confidential information related to a search”. (quoted from ASU PM 601.8 section 4.5.3.)

Current language:

4.1.9.2 All meetings of search committees shall be held on campus. Every member of an academic department must be notified in writing of all meetings and agenda items of the search committee. The announcement should clearly state the time and place of the meeting and it should become a part of the
department’s permanent records. All department members who so desire may present their views before the committee.

10) Changes to 4.1.9.3 under 4.1.9 Search Committees to clarify procedures of search committees.

Proposed language:
4.1.9.3.a All meetings of search committees shall be held face-to-face on campus. Every member of an academic department must be notified in writing of all meetings and agenda items of the search committee. The announcement should clearly state the time and place of the meeting and it should become a part of the search committee’s records. All department members who so desire may present their views before the committee. (present 4.1.9.2)

4.1.9.3.b The minutes of the search committee should record all persons in attendance at the meeting and all members absent. A record should be kept of each personnel action considered; however, this should not include individual comments. All personnel actions shall be determined by anonymous paper ballot votes. The written record should state that the search committee formally considered the personnel action. The minutes should show the vote (the number of affirmative and negative votes) on each action, but not the votes of individual members of the committee. All motions must be phrased in the affirmative. (present 4.1.9.3)

4.1.9.3.c A file of all minutes of the search committee shall be maintained with the search committee file (see ASU Policy Manual 601.8, Section 4.10.) In addition, the paper ballots for each vote should be kept in sealed, labeled and dated envelopes with the search committee file. Nothing in these guidelines shall violate the confidentiality of the search committee minutes. (present 4.1.9.5).

4.1.9.3.d All minutes of search committee action must be approved and, if necessary, modified by a majority of the assembled committee. Such action will normally take place at the next meeting of the committee except that, following the last meeting of the committee in a given academic year, the recorder shall be responsible for gaining the approval of the minutes from the voting members of the committee. (present 4.1.9.4)

Current language:
4.1.9.3 The minutes of the search committee should record all persons in attendance at the meeting and all members absent. A record should be kept of each personnel action considered; however, this should not include individual comments. The written record should state that the search committee formally considered the personnel action. The minutes should show the vote (the number of affirmative and negative votes) on each action, but not the votes of individual members of the committee.

11) Changes to 7.3.4.8 on Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee are to clarify procedures.

Proposed language:
7.3.4.8 Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee
(a) All proposals originate within the program and are approved by both the department and the college review committee prior to submission to the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.

Former language:
(a) The Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee formulates and recommends policies governing the administration of graduate studies and provides final faculty review of graduate curriculum proposals.
Old Salary Resolution:
Whereas the administration at Appalachian State University has established a policy setting differing peer-based average salary targets of 70% for assistant professors, 70% for associate professors and 50% for full professors, and

Whereas this difference means that campus-initiated tuition increase funds not distributed to full professors will be used to meet the higher percentage for assistant and associate professors, raising questions of fairness in the university’s salary structure, and

Whereas this policy aggravates the long-standing issue of salary compression, and

Whereas this policy sends a negative message to full professors, implying that they are not as valued as assistant and associate professors, and

Whereas this policy could negatively impact retention as faculty may reasonably foresee a reduction in salary competitiveness as they progress through the faculty ranks, and

Whereas such a policy will have a negative effect on morale among the senior faculty at the rank of full professor, therefore

Be it resolved that the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate calls on the university administration to establish a peer-based salary target of 70% for all tenure-track faculty ranks.

Recommended Revision to Salary Resolution:

Whereas the administration at Appalachian State University has established a policy setting differing peer-based average salary targets of 70% for assistant professors, 70% for associate professors and 50% for full professors during the 2015-16 academic year, and

Whereas this difference means that campus-initiated tuition increase funds not distributed to full professors will be used to meet the higher percentage for assistant and associate professors, raising questions of fairness in the university’s salary structure, and

Whereas this policy aggravates the long-standing issue of salary compression, and

Whereas this policy sends a negative message to full professors, implying that they are not as valued as assistant and associate professors, and

Whereas this policy could negatively impact retention as faculty may reasonably foresee a reduction in salary competitiveness as they progress through the faculty ranks, and

Whereas such a policy will have a negative effect on morale among the senior faculty at the rank of full professor,

Be it resolved that the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate calls on the university administration to establish a policy to maintain a consistent salary target of at a peer-based salary target of 80th percentile for all tenure-track faculty ranks.
Comparison of Faculty Salary Benchmarks
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Comparison of Faculty Salary Benchmarks
University
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[Graph showing salary comparisons across different ranks and categories for the academic year 2015-16, with different lines representing ASU Average, ASU Target 80th, 129th, UNCGA Peers 50th, UNCGA Peers 75th, UNCGA Peers Average.]
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