Appalachian State University
Faculty Senate Minutes

November 14, 2016

The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Gates at 3:15pm, in the William Strickland Conference Room, Rm. 224 I.G. Greer, on Monday, November 14, 2016. Senators Campbell, Dunston, Gambrel, Goodson-Espy, Hamilton, Lee, Madritch, Thaxton, and Zrull were not in attendance.

I. Announcements
   A. Chair Gates welcomed Senators and visitors to the meeting. Visitors were Chancellor Everts, Heather Langdon (Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning), Debbie Covington (Chancellor’s Office), Allan Hauser (Athletics Council), Doug Gillin (Athletics Director), Holly Hirst (Scholarship Advisory Council), and Tim Burwell (Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs).

II. Minutes
   A. Chair Gates asked for a motion to approve the minutes from October 10, 2016. Senator Kelley moved and Senator Cook seconded to approve the minutes. Motion to approve the October 10, 2016 minutes passed. (Vote #1)

III. Visitors’ Reports
   A. Holly Hirst, Chair of the Scholarship Advisory Council (SAC) visited the Faculty Senate to discuss the SAC report, which can be seen in Appendix A. Last year SAC was tasked with increasing faculty membership on the Council and reporting to the Dean’s Council and Faculty Senate. Dr. Hirst provided their report showing the progress SAC has made in the past year and their plans for future improvements. SAC has increased their faculty membership, advised Enrollment Management, increased the number of volunteers during scholarship interview days, centralized communication to prospective students about scholarships, and has been working to find ways to maintain the Chancellor’s Scholars program. SAC works directly on new student and merit-based scholarships, but advises other institutional organizations regarding other types of scholarships. The SAC report contains detailed information on SAC improvements and Dr. Hirst answered questions regarding SAC and their report. Senators had questions regarding diversity scholarships and the retention rate of those students. Merit diversity scholarships are relatively new, but they have already achieved beneficial student retention rates, especially at the graduate student level. SAC is still looking into the best methods for increasing student diversity through the use of scholarships.
B. Doug Gillin, Director of Athletics, handed out a document showing the GPA averages for various student sports teams. This document has been attached as Appendix I. The information showed the women’s soccer team as having the highest average team grades last semester, with a cumulative GPA of 3.50, and the football team as having the lowest team cumulative GPA of 2.76 last semester, with other sports teams having cumulative GPAs falling somewhere within that range. The cumulative GPA from the Spring 2016 semester for all student athletes was 3.05, which was the eighth semester in a row where the cumulative GPA for all student athletes was over 3.0.

Mr. Gillin said that the core values of ASU athletics are: academic integrity, social responsibility, competitive excellence and providing a good experience for students. There was discussion about students’ academic performance improving when their time is more structured, such as during their sport’s season. There was concern among faculty that student athletes miss too much class time due to sports-related events, including a recent student athlete field trip to Fort Bragg. The Athletics Council at ASU is concerned about this as well and is open to working with faculty on this issue.

The Athletics Council has been working to create more opportunities to collaborate with students, faculty and staff. They have worked with institutions on campus to create a live broadcast practicum class with communication students, a concessions project with the Center for Entrepreneurship, facilities projects with the Recreation Management Department, an economic impact study with the School of Business, and have expanded their working relationship with WASU, AppTV, and the Hayes School of Music. Senators also inquired as to the highest-paid coach on campus and were told that the highest coach salary is Scott Satterfield (football) at $525,000.

IV. Provost’s Report

A. Provost Kruger reported that finalists for the three current dean searches will be on campus in the spring. Searches are progressing well, and the applicant pools continue to grow. Interviews for the positions of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Director of IRAP will begin this semester and Spring 2017. Two additional dean searches will begin in the Spring 2017 semester. Greenwood-Asher has been working with ASU on dean searches and it is estimated to cost $170,000 this current year and a total of $280,000 for all five recent dean searches.

Operating budgets were increased this year. New faculty positions and supplemental requests are currently being discussed.
The University Planning and Priorities Council (UPPC) has been reviewing campus strategic plans and metrics and will provide feedback on these plans annually, beginning with a budget presentation in Spring 2017. A draft campus master plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the December 9, 2016 meeting. Afterwards there will be an opportunity for further input, before the Board of Trustees action at the March 2017 meeting.

V. Chair’s Report

A. Chair Gates brought up faculty questions regarding an email sent on Thursday, November 10, 2016, which was sent to some faculty regarding political activity prohibitions. The email was mostly received by faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences. Provost Kruger responded that wasn’t their intent, it should have gone to all faculty. However, there may have been distribution problems. UNC policies allows faculty to discuss political issues in class as long as the matter is relevant to the class. Provost Kruger added that the classroom is the domain of faculty but asked that faculty be judicious in determining what is academically relevant. Faculty are allowed to engage political protests outside of class time.

Chair Gates gave an update on the possibility of moving future Faculty Senate meetings to the Plemmons Student Union. It was determined that the Plemmons Student Union meeting rooms would not fit the needs of the Faculty Senate, mainly because they do not contain auditory recording equipment. Chancellor Everts interjected that if a new permanent meeting place was chosen by the Faculty Senate, the funds to upgrade the room to meet our technological needs would be made available.

Chair Gates reminded the senators that Senate representation is needed on the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee and the Bookstore Committee.

The UNC strategic planning survey is still open for feedback. As of three weeks ago, there were already 4,000 responses.

Friday, November 18, 2016 will be the next Faculty Assembly meeting, and it will be the second session for discussing the UNC Strategic Plan.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policy Committee (Campbell, Crepeau, Fiske, Osinsky, Pitofsky, Wheeler, Stephenson)
1. The Academic Policy Committee has been reviewing the Confucius Institute Proposal. The Resolution Concerning the Establishment of a Campus Confucius Institute, Appendix B, has been withdrawn by Academic Policy Committee Chair Wheeler. The committee plans to revise the resolution.

B. Agenda Committee (Frye, Gates, Reed, Spaulding, Provost Kruger)

No report.

C. Budget Committee (Mohr, Dunston, Kelley, Szeto, Wright)

No report.

D. Campus Planning Committee (Doll, Ignatov, Madritch, Salinas)

1. The Campus Planning Committee has made progress and was invited to assist with the University Space Committee.

2. The Traffic Policy Committee Faculty Senate Representative, Senator Ignatov, reported that the Office of Parking and Traffic will be proposing a parking fee increase. The last increase was in 2003. The State of North Carolina does not provide any money to the University for parking. There are deferred maintenance and renovation projects that need funding. A lack of funding for the Traffic and Parking Office has resulted in a reduction in safety training to dangerous levels and continued deferment of maintenance would make repairs progressively costlier over time. They are proposing a parking fee increase of approximately $36/year. The Traffic Policy Committee has requested another Faculty Senate Representative to serve on their committee. They will be collecting reports on traffic issues from faculty, so please submit a report if you have input. Another topic they have discussed is the possibility of accepting credit cards or providing an ATM in the campus parking garages.

E. Campus Technology Committee (Spiceland, Spaulding, Rice, Hartley, Cook, Fenwick, Reed)

No Report.

F. Committee on Committees (Frye, Sibley, Gambrel, Cockerill, Lee)
1. Nominees for confirmation onto the Tuition Appeals Committee, University Scholarships Selection Committee (USSC), the Gifts Acceptance Committee, the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee and the Undergraduate AP&P Committee can all be seen in Appendix C. All of the nominees have been approved by the Committee on Committees.

Motion FS 16-17/11-01 to confirm nominees to the Tuition Appeals Committee passed. (Vote #2)

The USSC is a new committee. Motion FS 16-17/11-02 to confirm nominees to the University Scholarship Selection Committee (USSC) passed. (Vote #3).

Motion FS 16-17/11-03 to confirm the nominee to the Gifts Acceptance Committee passed. (Vote #4)

Motion FS 16-17/11-04 to confirm the nominee to the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee passed. (Vote #5)

Motion FS 16-17/11-05 to confirm the nominees to the Undergraduate AP&P Committee passed. (Vote #6)

G. Faculty Governance Committee (Frye, Gates, Collier, Dalton, Rardin)

1. The Faculty Governance Committee has proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook, as shown in Appendix D.

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 7.3.4.15 would add the new University Forum Committee to the Handbook. Motion FS 16-17/11-06 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 7.3.4.15, as shown in Appendix D, passed. (Vote #7)

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6 would allow materials to be submitted electronically. Motion FS 16-17/11-07 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D, passed. (Vote #8)

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3 creates a time frame wherein the faculty member could request a conference with the dean. Motion FS 16-17/11-08 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section...
Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.7.2, shown in Appendix D, creates a time limit for providing notice of proceeding with a grievance. Senators questioned when the time limit would begin for this requirement. An amendment was proposed by Senator Crepeau and seconded by Senator Spaulding, to change the line, “at this point, the grievant must notify the chair of the faculty grievance committee in writing within 5 working days” to instead read, “upon notification of the failure of mediation, the grievant must notify the chair of the faculty grievance committee in writing within 5 working days.” **Motion to amend section 4.11.3.7.2 to read, “upon notification of the failure of mediation, the grievant must notify……”, passed. (Vote #10)**

**Motion FS 16-17/11-09 to approve changes, as amended, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.7.2 passed. (Vote #11)**

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9 would keep lawyers from acting as both witnesses and advisor/advocates during a grievance hearing due to conflicts of interest. **Motion FS 16-17/11-10 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9, as shown in Appendix D, passed. (Vote #12)**

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5 removed the term “Equal Opportunity Associate” since that role no longer exists, and replaced it with “dean of the college.” **Motion FS 16-17/11-11 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5, as shown in Appendix D passed. (Vote #13)**

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.6 would remove a section that was only applicable for a specific time period and is no longer applicable. **Motion FS 16-17/11-12 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D, passed. (Vote #14)**

Proposed changes to Faculty Handbook section 6.2.2.1.3 adds the term “tenure-track” to the description of which faculty members determine and approve OCSA requests. Senators discussed how this would prevent non-tenure
track faculty from being part of that process. While non-tenure track faculty often bear the weight of faculty members on OCSA, they are not eligible for OCSA and therefore shouldn’t be included in that decision for other faculty members. **Motion FS 16-17/11-13 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 6.2.2.1.3, as shown in Appendix D, passed.** (Vote #15)

H. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Albinsson, Hageman, **Hester**, Howard, Newmark, Phillips, Thaxton, Villanova)

1. The Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee had been researching peer review guidelines and practices. Senator Hester explained the background documentation on peer review practices within the UNC system and ASU, provided in Appendices E, F, and G. The committee requested that senators show those documents to their departments’ faculty members and collect feedback on whether those guidelines are being followed, whether the guidelines are a burden, and any other opinions on peer review regulations. Senator Hester would like to receive feedback in order to determine best practices for peer reviews and to create a policy that can be implemented consistently across departments. There was discussion from senators regarding a lack of faculty knowledge concerning peer review guidelines, difficulties with imposing strict guidelines and the desire for peer review policies to not be restrictive or burdensome.

2. The Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee created a Childcare Availability Survey for ASU faculty and staff. The text of the survey and the email that would be sent out with the survey can be seen in Appendix H. The survey will appear differently to different respondents; different questions will be supplied based on their responses. All possible questions can be seen in Appendix H. The committee has reviewed the survey numerous times and has approved it. The committee requested a vote to approve the survey for distribution in the Spring 2017 semester. **Motion to approve the Childcare Survey from the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee for distribution in the Spring 2017 semester passed.** (Vote #16)

J. Welfare of Students Committee (Zrull, **West**, Shulstad, Hamilton, Goodson-Espy, Ortiz)
1. The Welfare of Students Committee reported on the Let’s Talk Program. The first listening session was attended by about 50-60 people, approximately half were underrepresented students and half faculty members. Underrepresented students who attended the first session requested more faculty training; information about bias incident reporting to be provided on class syllabi; for willing faculty to include a statement on their syllabi indicating their willingness to discuss issues; for every university website to use preferred names; a more diverse psychology faculty; the use of diverse student pronouns by faculty; more flexible attendance policies with regard to mental health/anxiety issues or attending protests; a more open dialogue in the classroom; for certain classes to include more current events that give representation to the diversity of our modern world; to institute App 101; for faculty to alert students to upcoming events; for faculty to not ask individuals to speak for a whole demographic (ie. one African-American student can’t speak for all African-American students); creation of a listserv that anyone can opt into for sharing information and upcoming events; for faculty to be aware of and reduce the occurrence of tokenization, micro-aggressions, and incursions into personal space. Students would also like the opportunity to use storyboards or video production to tell their story, so they don’t have to continually relate it to different people. The committee plans to begin some steps towards action, such as creating faculty training programs, and to host more listening sessions.

K. Ad Hoc Faculty Morale Survey Committee

1. The Faculty Morale Survey received 736 responses; 55% of faculty responded. Responses were not weighted based on rank. A summary of survey results can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Website at: Faculty Morale Survey 2016 Result Summary
https://facsen.appstate.edu/sites/facsen.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Survey%20-%20Summary%20Presentation%201.pdf

The committee would like this information to be reviewed by university deans and administrators. The committee requested a vote to archive all original and unedited survey responses with Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP). Motion to archive all original and
unedited Faculty Morale Survey responses with IRAP, passed. (Vote #17)

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment at 5:57pm

A. Senator Spaulding moved to adjourn the meeting and Senator West seconded the motion. **Motion to adjourn passed.** (Vote #10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion to approve the October 10, 2016 minutes passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-01 to confirm nominees to the Tuition Appeals Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-02 The USSC is a new committee. Motion to confirm nominees to the University Scholarship Selection Committee (USSC) passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-03 to confirm the nominee to the Gifts Acceptance Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-04 to confirm the nominee to the Faculty Grievance Heating Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-05 to confirm the nominees to the Undergraduate AP&amp;P Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-06 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 7.3.4.15, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-07 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-08 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Motion to amend section 4.11.3.7.2 to read, “[u]pon notification of the failure of mediation, the grievant must notify…..”, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-09 to approve changes, as amended, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.7.2 passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-10 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-11 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-12 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.6, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/11-13 to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook section 6.2.2.1.3, as shown in Appendix D, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Motion to approve the Childcare Survey from the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee for distribution in the Spring 2017 semester passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Motion to archive all original and unedited Faculty Morale Survey responses with IRAP, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Motion to adjourn passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Albinsson</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristan Cockerill</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Collier</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitzi Cook</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crepeau</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Dalton</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Doll</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Dunston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fenwick</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Fiske</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Frye</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Gambrel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Goodson-Espy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hageman</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Hartley</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Hester</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Howard</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatoli Ignatov</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Kelley</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Madritch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanga Mohr</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Newmark</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ortiz</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel Osinsky</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Phillips</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Pitofsky</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Rardin</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Reed</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dea Rice</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Salinas</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Shulstad</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Sibley</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Spaulding</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Spiceland</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stephenson</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-Yan Szeto</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Thaxton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Villanova</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie West</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Wheeler</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Wright</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zrull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) RECONFIGURATION
In consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate in 2015, the Provost and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management agreed to revise the SAC membership and charge as follows:
- The membership was expanded to include faculty representatives from the Faculty Senate (Pavel Osinsky), the Wilson Scholars Program (David Marlett), and an at-large member (Holly Hirst) who agreed to chair the SAC for the 2015-16 academic year.
- The charge to the reconstituted Council included: Meet once each month to advise the Director of Scholarships, evaluating recommendations and monitoring progress toward meeting strategic plan objectives; review the annual scholarship budget; identify appropriate funding levels to better attract targeted students; review scholar yield rates; articulate scholarship needs; and oversee implementation of Scholars Day, reviewing evaluations and making recommendations.

2) ACCOMPLISHMENTS
The SAC met six times between November and May to discuss items related to its charge. The highest priority was given to review and approval of the 2016-17 Scholarship Budget and to oversight of implementation of Scholars Day. Specifically, the SAC:
1. Reviewed and approved the 2016-17 Scholarship Budget, with the recommendation that: (a) the SAC be involved earlier in the discussion in future; (b) the Diversity Scholars program be funded at full tuition and fees plus a study abroad stipend; (c) the administration continue to aggressively pursue funding for scholarships, especially unrestricted dollars.
2. Advised the Director of Scholarships on details related to timing and logistics for the 2016 Scholars Day, both prior to the event and after reviewing the evaluations from the students, parents, and faculty who participated. The SAC charged the Director of Scholarships to investigate concerns raised by some of the faculty and also to investigate ways in which: (a) popular presentations could be repeated or timed so that more students/parents could attend; (b) more than one guest for each student could be accommodated at lunch, a common suggestion from the parent evaluations; (c) parking could be reserved for students and faculty committee members.
3. Reviewed freshman scholarship data on the numbers of students who were (a) eligible, (b) invited to interview, and (c) awarded scholarships to ensure that University dollars are being invested to meet the strategic initiatives for recruitment and enrollment. The SAC members agreed that the college distribution of freshmen scholarship awards was fair, but should continue to be monitored.
4. Reviewed the state of the recommendations made by the then ad hoc Scholarship Advisory Council in its 2012 Report. Many of these recommendations have been accomplished or are on-going by nature. Some were not fully addressed, and the SAC
made recommendations on which should continue to be pursued with what priority. A more complete description of the state of the recommendations is appended to this document.

5. Provided input to the Faculty Senate on the creation of a University Scholarship Selection Committee, the faculty committee that will assume responsibility for screening applicants for in-coming student scholarships. (Approved by the Faculty Senate in April)

6. Began discussion of development of Case Statements prioritizing scholarship funding needs.

3) RECOMMENDATIONS
In addition to the general recommendation of continuing to work on the items listed in yellow in the Appendix, the SAC presents the following recommendations as priorities for the upcoming summer and academic year:

- The University has some scholarships that list very specific applicant characteristics, that make finding eligible students challenging. The Director of Scholarships and University Advancement staff should continue to pursue working with the donors of these scholarships to make requirements more flexible to improve the chances of making an award each year.

- The Director of Scholarships should work in consultation with the Colleges and Schools to find ways to better communicate scholarship opportunities to continuing students.

- A subgroup of the SAC should be convened this Summer (2016) to work in consultation with the University Advancement staff to develop case statements for the following potential scholarship funding opportunities:
  - Individually named Chancellor's Scholars (undergraduate) and Chancellor's Fellows (graduate)
  - Transfer student scholarships, perhaps through expansion of the existing Daniels Scholarship
  - Increased funding for Plemmons Leadership Scholarships
  - Endowment for the Diversity Scholarships (undergraduate and graduate)

APPENDIX
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2012 SAC REPORT

1. Appalachian does not have sufficient resources to implement a large-scale overhaul of scholarships to achieve Strategic Plan Initiative 1.

2. Appalachian is not effectively disseminating information about the availability and value of merit scholarships to prospective and returning students.

3. Appalachian is not communicating effectively regarding the positive effects of expanding our scholarship offerings.

4. Appalachian is not awarding scholarships strategically, nor is it awarding them to the full extent possible.

5. Current means of communication and coordination between departments, University Advancement, the University Foundation, Financial Aid, and the Office of Scholarships creates inefficiency and an inability to collect sufficient data by which to establish appropriate reporting and evaluation structures for decision making.
STATE OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN 2012

Key to color coding:
- Red – no longer a priority
- Yellow – on-going
- Green – completed or system in place

1) USE SCHOLARSHIPS STRATEGICALLY AND EVALUATE RESULTS

1A. ESTABLISH A PERMANENT SCHOLARSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL
The Provost should convene a permanent Scholarship Advisory Council. This Council should continue to work to achieve a sound structure and utilization of scholarship resources at Appalachian. The following have been identified as some of the responsibilities for the Scholarship Advisory Council:

- Meet as a full Council at least once per semester to review and evaluate recommendations and progress towards meeting enrollment goals as outlined in the strategic plan (i.e., award scholarships strategically).
- Research and identify the appropriate funding level (i.e., “magic number”) for merit scholarships compared to cost of attendance for students to better attract targeted students to Appalachian. NOTE: Minimums have been raised to $4000 per scholar; the SAC will continue to monitor yields.
- Review and approve requests for funding from unrestricted funds for merit scholarships based upon strategic initiatives.
- Monitor scholarship yield rates over time and make adjustments in scholarship allocations based upon evaluation results of effectiveness of scholarships in yielding targeted students.
- Recommend innovative scholarship programming and targeted recruitment of students who demonstrate particular attributes (transfer, diversity, sustainability, leadership, etc.). NOTE: Some progress has been made on targeted recruitment and discussions are underway on innovative programming for scholars.
- Advise the Director of Scholarships in identifying processes and procedures for more effectively administering the continuing student scholarships that are awarded by academic departments. NOTE: Progress has been made in communication with units regarding administering continuing student scholarships, and some technology is in place to help with funding allocation (see below – second bullet under 1B).

1B. BETTER DEFINE AND EMPOWER THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOLARSHIPS POSITION
The Director of Scholarships will, with input from the Scholarship Advisory Council, be responsible for the following tasks:

- Develop and implement a streamlined process for awarding merit scholarships for new students.
Develop and implement a streamlined process for awarding merit scholarships for continuing students. Note: OIED, RCOE, and BCHS are using the online portal for this purpose.

Coordinate all new student scholarships to ensure scholarship dollars are being used to meet goals set forth in Strategic Initiative 1. NOTE: Central coordination of new student scholarships has been implemented and is ongoing.

Centralize communication for all new student scholarships. NOTE: With the exception of some communication for Chancellor’s Scholars, communication is coordinated centrally.

Communicate with academic units regarding scholarships for returning students and manage communication with financial aid and University. NOTE: On going.

Create a “policies and procedures” manual for all scholarship processes. NOTE: In progress.

Provide annual training to representatives from the academic units about the scholarship awarding process.

Manage under-load approval for new merit scholarship students and academic checks for new merit scholarship recipients at the conclusion of each academic year. NOTE: A system should be in place this summer.

Explore opportunities to combine current scholarship programs to create larger programs. NOTE: This is complete in the sense that centralized coordination allows for more success with “stacking” scholarship dollars for a student.

Provide better marketing information about Appalachian’s scholarship awards compared to cost of attendance.

2) UTILIZATION OF TECHNOLOGY

Seek IT solutions to facilitate data entry for scholarships. Identify possible Banner functionality to permit posting of scholarships through Banner forms. NOTE: Forms for review of scholarship applications and submission and monitoring of financial awards are in place.

Create a new Scholarship website with clear navigation for new and returning students regarding scholarship opportunities.

Explore the creation of a “Scholars” webpage to highlight scholarship programs on campus. NOTE: Wilson and Chancellors Scholars pages are in place already.

3) FUNDING

3A. Immediate

Request permission from the Foundation Board to continue the “Good Student” allocation funding, consolidating that funding rather than dividing among the academic colleges.

Inquire with University Housing and Food Services about reducing housing and meal costs for Scholars; create a policy outlining the amount of housing support for all Scholars. NOTE: Under discussion.

Continue to fund Chancellor’s Scholarships at full institutional costs, but cap the level of funding provided to support the Chancellor’s Scholarship program at the amount established by the Scholarship Advisory Council.
Ask NRLP for additional funding at the next Endowment Board meeting; $50,000 - $150,000 over the next 3 years.

Retain $46,000 of the flexible source funding for Provost Fellowships and Diversity Scholarships for graduate students.

Recommend that the Graduate Council revise current utilization approach: collect nominations from departments; treat the fellowships as top-offs for students with assistantships; only check eligibility at the end of the year instead of at the end of each term; review the purpose and use of the diversity funding.

3B. Long Term

☐ Develop a robust plan to identify future resources to support scholarships.

☐ Create an endowed fund to assist with fluctuating market levels to assist in maintaining scholarship support. Note: after discussion with the Foundation office, it became clear that this was not a viable solution.

☐ Work with University Advancement to create “Top Off” scholarships designed to strategically affect the composition of the entering class.

☐ Work with University Advancement to establish funding levels from donors to support individual Chancellor’s Scholars. NOTE: Under discussion.

☐ Develop innovative programming and other initiatives to assist in the targeted recruitment of students and donors.

☐ Develop new scholarships and funding for different populations we are currently missing, such as transfer students, spring admits, international students, etc. NOTE: On going
Resolution on the Proposal to Establish a Confucius Institute
at Appalachian State University

WHEREAS, Appalachian State University has formulated a document entitled “Proposal to Establish the Confucius Institute at Appalachian State University” which would establish a Confucius Institute, operating under the auspices of the government of the People’s Republic of China, on its campus in Boone, North Carolina, and

WHEREAS, the Confucius Institute Headquarters (CIHQ) operates under the supervision of Hanban, a Chinese state agency located in Beijing in the People’s Republic of China, and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institutes, Chapter 3, Number 13 states, “The Confucius Institute Headquarters shall be governed by the Council. The Council shall consist of … [members]. Candidates for … [members] shall be recommended by the education administrative agency of the Chinese State Council and approved by the State Council,” and

WHEREAS, the Director of a Confucius Institute is the person in charge of the Confucius Institute, the Guide for Confucius Institute Deans states that the requirements for a Director include “being passionate about the work of Confucius Institutes with a strong sense of mission …” and that “foreign directors shall have a sound comprehension of current Chinese national issues and should ideally communicate in Chinese in their daily lives,” and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institutes, Chapter 7, Number 34 states that all Confucius Institutes shall enjoy the following rights:, specifically, “c. The right of priority for obtaining teaching and cultural materials or resources provided by the Headquarters,” and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institutes, Chapter 7, Number 35 states “All Confucius Institutes shall observe the following obligations:”, specifically, “c. The obligation to accept both supervision from and assessments made by the Headquarters,” and

WHEREAS, the Confucius Institute document entitled Acquired Resources: Regulations for the Administration of Confucius Institute Headquarters Funds states in Chapter 1, Number 1 that the regulations for the administration of Confucius Institute Headquarters funds are “… formulated, in accordance to related rules and stipulations of the Chinese government, to enhance the management of funds …,” and

WHEREAS, the Confucius Institute document entitled Acquired Resources: Regulations for the Administration of Confucius Institute Headquarters Funds states in Chapter 6, Number 21 that “the CIHQ reserves the right to interpret the "Regulations for the Administration of Confucius Institute Headquarters Funds." and in Chapter 6, Number 20 that “… all principal bodies of the various partners in cooperation shall accept the jurisdiction of the Beijing Court,” and
WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institutes, Chapter 7, Number 36 states “The Confucius Institute Headquarters reserves the right to pursue legal action to affix responsibility and invoke punitive consequences on any person/party for any of the following conduct:”; specifically, “b. Any activity conducted under the name of the Confucius Institutes without permission or authorization from the Confucius Institute Headquarters;”, and “c. Any violation of the Agreement or this Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institutes that causes losses of capital or assets or damages or tarnishes the reputation of the Confucius Institutes,” and

WHEREAS, in the article entitled “China U.”, Sahlins, Marshall, The Nation, (Oct 30, 2013), 1., the author writes that “one impediment to understanding the operations of the Confucius Institutes is that the model agreement establishing them, ratified by one or two representatives of the host university, is secret. The agreement includes a nondisclosure clause, which reads as follows (as translated from the Chinese part of the bilingual text): “The two parties to the agreement will regard this agreement as a secret document, and without written approval from the other party, no party shall ever publicize, reveal, or make public, or allow other persons to publicize, reveal, or make public materials or information obtained or learned concerning the other party, except if publicizing, revealing, or making it public is necessary for one party to the agreement to carry out its duties under the agreement.” ” and

WHEREAS, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) recommends that universities avoid involvement with Confucius Institutes unless the agreement between the university and Hanban is negotiated so that (1) the university has unilateral control, consistent with principles articulated in the AAUP’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, over all academic matters, including recruitment of teachers, determination of curriculum, and choice of texts; (2) the university affords Confucius Institute teachers the same academic freedom rights, as defined in the 1940 Statement of principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, that it affords all other faculty in the university; and (3) the university-Hanban agreement is made available to all members of the university community, and

WHEREAS, the Appalachian State University proposal does not address the concerns nor include the recommendations of the AAUP other than “The university will assign several faculty and staff as Confucius Institute staff whose annual salaries will be part of the University’s contribution to the Institute,”

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate cannot support the Appalachian State University proposal to establish a campus Confucius Institute unless it is rewritten to address the concerns, indicated above, that have been raised in the AAUP report.
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Confirmations for November 14, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting

Tuition Appeals Committee

1. Mike Madritch, Arts and Sciences
2. Kim Priode, Health Sciences

University Scholarships Selection Committee

1. Emily Lakey, Health Sciences
2. Jim Stokes, School of Music
3. Diane Marks, Education
4. TBD, another faculty member from HSOM, BCHS, WCOB, RCOE
5. Jacqui Bergman, Business
6. Brooke Hester, Physics and Astronomy
7. Kathy Schroeder, Geography and Planning
8. Laura Ammon, Philosophy and Religion
9. Pavel Osinsky, Sociology
10. Shanshan Lou, Communication
11. Morgan Pruitt, English
12. Doris Bazzini, Psychology
13. Mark Venable, Biology
14. Martha Marking, Theatre and Dance
15. Catherine Talley, English

Gifts Acceptance Committee
Allan Scherlen, Library

Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee
Tracy Goodson-Espy, College of Education

Undergraduate AP&P Committee
Jon Carter, Anthropology (to substitute for Cameron Lippard for Spring 2017)
Teressa Sumrall, Family and Child Studies
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Changes to Faculty Handbook for Faculty Senate to review and vote on:

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.

Amendment to 4.4.6 Submission of the Portfolio for Tenure and/or Promotion

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.

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.

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. At this point, 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, decide whether to pursue a formal 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT

Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina

NUMBER

338

I. Introduction

DATE September 28, 1993

At the November 1992 meeting of the Board of Governors, questions were raised about the procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure and about the evaluation, recognition, and reward of teaching, particularly in tenure decisions. The Chairman of the Board referred the questions and concerns to two standing committees, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs. The report entitled Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, adopted by the board on September 10, 1993, distilled what was learned by the committees and recommended additional steps to encourage good teaching within the University and to see that the quality of teaching continues to be a prime consideration in tenure decisions.

In its report, the board reaffirmed the concept of tenure. The central question that led to the review was whether sufficient consideration is given to the quality of teaching when tenure decisions are made. The board recognized that the relative importance given to the three major functions of teaching, research, and public service varies at specific institutions depending upon their respective missions. Nevertheless, the report confirms that, regardless of classification, "each institution should view teaching as a core requirement. The board states in its long-
range plan that teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the
UNC institutions. Thus while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole
measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution,
teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions."

II. Recommendations

This memorandum lists the recommendations adopted by the Board of
Governors and provides instructions to be followed by the constituent institutions in
complying with them.

1. That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the
Chancellors of each constituent institution to do the following:

   a. Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the
criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where necessary,
to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary
importance of teaching in the University;

   b. Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1)
that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty
performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are
provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty
member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term
of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for
reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the
review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these
discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;

   c. Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to
ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer
review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that
student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one
semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review
of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching
of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching
assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from
evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being
reviewed.

Any proposed revisions to institutional mission statements necessitated by the review
referenced in Recommendation I.a. should be submitted to the President by January 21,
1994 so that they can be acted upon prior to adoption of the revised long-range plan. A full
report on actions taken in response to Recommendation 1 with respect to criteria for faculty
personnel decisions and policies and procedures for evaluation of faculty teaching
performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels should be sent to this office by
April 4, 1994. Proposed changes to tenure policies and regulations, which require the
approval of the President and the board, should be separately identified in the report.

2. That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the
Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.
3. That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the college/school level.

Institutions that do not now have awards for outstanding teaching should submit a report on the actions taken in response to Recommendation 3 by April 4, 1994.

4. That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)

Chairman Poole has appointed an ad hoc committee to work out the details to implement the awards. Institutions are invited to submit recommendations or suggestions by December 1, 1993 for the consideration of this committee.

5. That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.

The report recognized the special efforts of many institutions to emphasize professional development activities intended to have a direct and positive impact on teaching. But it also acknowledged that greater efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of campuses, especially those with limited resources available for such initiatives. Despite financial strains, it declared that "each institution should allocate a portion of its budget for faculty development and target a specific part of that for the development of teachers and teaching." It is the board's clear expectation that an institution which does not have a special center for teaching and learning should plan to create such a center as soon as possible. The report also urged institutions to provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and non-tenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants to take advantage of these professional development opportunities. In addition, Recommendation 5 commits the board to seek appropriations in biennial budget requests to give greater support to centers and activities designed to
6. That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.

A committee from the University-wide Graduate Council is addressing this recommendation and should report to General Administration by February 1, 1994. Thereafter, the Council's proposals will be shared with constituent institutions for their reactions and comments.

Copies of the report on *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina* are being printed and will be provided to constituent institutions. Chancellors should ensure that the report is disseminated as widely as possible among the faculty, and especially among department chairs and members of department personnel committees.

C.D.

cc: Chief Academic Officer

Summary of deadlines (please submit three copies of each response):

December 1, 1993   Recommendations or suggestions to Board of Governors *ad hoc* committee on Awards for Excellence in Teaching (Recommendation 4).

January 21, 1994

April 4, 1994

Proposed revisions to institutional mission statements (Recommendation 1.a.).

Report on actions taken (or proposed, where the President's and the board's approval is required) in response to Recommendations 1 and 3.
Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations
Appalachian State University
November 7, 1994

Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observations by peers in at least two (2) courses (when possible) for all probationary faculty and in all classes taught by teaching assistants. The application of this procedure to part-time faculty is still under review.

All departments must conform to the following guidelines with respect to this process:

1. Direct classroom observations by peers must take place at a minimum before each personnel decision involving a probationary faculty member.
2. Peer observation teams must consist of at least two members.
3. Peer is to be defined by each individual department.
4. Peer observation teams will conduct direct classroom observations using a written instrument approved by the department.
5. Peer observation teams must prepare a written statement of their assessment and recommendations.
6. Written statements of assessments and recommendations prepared by peer observation teams must be conveyed to the observed faculty member in a timely manner.
7. A copy of the written statement prepared by the peer observation team must be presented to the department chair of the faculty member being observed.
MEMORANDUM TO: Deans and Department Chairpersons
FROM: R. Clinton Parker
DATE: November 7, 1994
SUBJECT: Revised Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations

Administrative Memorandum #338 regarding "Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina" issued by President Spangler requires that Appalachian establish "review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed."

An "ad hoc" committee was established by the Faculty Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs to establish general guidelines for the peer classroom observations. You will find these guidelines attached. Each department must now develop specific procedures which are in consonance with these guidelines by December 1, 1994 and implement the peer review during the Spring Semester of 1995.

Chancellor Borowski must submit to President Spangler a complete report on the peer review process by December 15, 1994. Chairpersons are requested to submit to their dean a copy of the department's peer review process by December 1, 1994. Each dean is requested to review department procedures and forward copies to me in the Office of Academic Affairs by December 8, 1994 in order that I might prepare the final report for the Chancellor.

I am fully aware that the deadlines given above are very demanding. Believe me, the dates were dictated to us. Your cooperation and understanding will be appreciated.

RCP/11

Attachment

cc: Dr. Harvey R. Durham
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Updated and revised Spring 2015

Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching/Classroom Observation

Background
UNC’s Guidelines on Tenure and Teaching (UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1 [G]) and ASU Faculty Handbook 4.3.1 include this statement:
1c. Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.
This statement and requirement originally appeared in a UNC Administrative Memorandum #338 on September 28, 1993.

Appalachian State University Guidelines
These Guidelines are a reaffirmation of “Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations” adopted by Appalachian State University on November 7, 1994.
☐ Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observations by peers in at least two courses (when possible) per year for all probationary faculty, non-tenure track faculty (full and part-time), and teaching assistants.
☐ Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observations by peers in at least one course every three years for all tenured faculty.
☐ Direct classroom observations by peers must take place at a minimum before each personnel decision involving a probationary faculty member.
☐ Peer observation teams must consist of at least two members.
☐ Peer is to be defined by each individual department.
☐ Peer observation teams will conduct direct classroom observations using a written instrument approved by the department.
☐ Peer observation teams must prepare a written statement of their assessment and recommendations.
☐ Written statements of assessments and recommendations prepared by peer observation teams must be conveyed to the observed faculty member in a timely manner.
☐ A copy of the written statement prepared by the peer observation team must be presented to the department chair of the faculty member being observed.
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Childcare Survey

Text for the accompanying email, when the survey is disseminated:
Greetings. The Faculty Senate is conducting a brief survey of faculty and staff members regarding childcare in the Boone area.

All responses will be ANONYMOUS. The purpose of this survey is to collect information to help determine whether or not childcare availability in the Boone area significantly affects faculty and staff, including snow day options.

Only aggregate data will be shared with the University.

The questions in this survey are written such that “childcare” is intended to represent the regular paid care of a dependent or dependents, as required during the working hours of the guardian(s). "Childcare" is not intended to include regular unpaid care, for example by a friend, relative, or neighbor.

Thank you in advance for your time in completing this survey.

Faculty and Staff Childcare Survey

How long have you been with Appalachian as an employee (not including this year)?

Which best describes your current employment status with the university?

○ Tenure-track faculty
○ Tenured faculty
○ Non-tenure track faculty full time
○ Non-tenure track faculty part time
○ Administrative
○ SHRA staff
○ EHRA staff
○ other (specify)

What is your age in years?

With which gender do you most identify?

○ Woman
○ Not listed (please indicate)
Did you have the need for childcare while working at Appalachian since 2000?

- Yes
- No

Did you have a need for childcare while working at Appalachian before 2000?

- Yes
- No

Tell us about how you managed childcare then.

---

Are you solely responsible for childcare or do you have a partner with whom you share this responsibility?

- Solely responsible
- Have a partner

Which of the following best describes your contribution to household income?

- primary contributor
- non-primary contributor
- split contributions equally
- other
For how many children are you the legal guardian?

Within what age range is the only/youngest child for which you are the legal guardian?

Within what age range is the second youngest child for which you are the legal guardian?

Within what age range is the third youngest child for which you are the legal guardian?

Within what age range is the fourth youngest child for which you are the legal guardian?

Within what age range is/are the oldest child/children for which you are the legal guardian? (If you have more than 5 children, you may select multiple age ranges to include all of the oldest children whose ages were not accounted for in the previous questions.)

- Newborn to 11 months
- 12 to 23 months
- 24 months to 3 years
- over 3 years to 4 years
- over 4 years to 5 years
- over 5 years to 8 years
- over 8 years to 10 years
- over 10 years to 12 years
- over 12 years to 14 years
- over 14 years to 18 years
How likely are you to have childcare needs in the future?

○ Extremely unlikely
○ Somewhat unlikely
○ Somewhat likely
○ Extremely likely

Did you move to the Boone area to start a new job at Appalachian?

○ Yes
○ No

When you were hired into that position, did you inquire about childcare options in Boone?

○ Yes
○ No
○ It was not applicable at the time.

*Was the information you received about childcare options accurate?*

○ Yes
○ Somewhat

○ No

Did you find an immediate space available into a childcare program for all your children when you first attempted to enroll them?

○ Yes
○ No

Were any of your children placed on a waiting list for a childcare facility?

○ Yes
○ No
For how many facilities was each child placed on a waiting list? Choose all that apply.

○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ More than 4

Was your child placed in a childcare program by the time of needed care?

○ Yes
○ No

How long was the average wait time until a space became available?

[Dropdown]

Who cared for your child or children while you were working?

☐ Babysitter
☐ Spouse/partner
☐ Friend
☐ Relative
☐ Child or children came to work
☐ Other

Were you able to eventually find care within a childcare facility?

○ Yes
○ No

When a space at a childcare facility did become available, was it within a facility that in your
opinion was of sufficient quality?

- Yes
- No
- Never became available

Does your present child care situation present “snow day” issues?

- Yes
- No

Please choose the most accurate response. (Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree):

Childcare availability in the Boone area has prevented me from accomplishing my job to the best of my ability.

Childcare availability in the Boone area has affected my family in a negative way.

Childcare availability in the Boone area has affected my children’s education in a negative way.

Childcare availability in the Boone area has affected my children’s social maturity in a negative way.

Childcare availability in the Boone area will affect my decision to keep my family in the Boone area and remain in my current position at Appalachian.

Regarding care on snow days when public schools are closed but Appalachian remains open, I have...

- had no difficulty in finding snow day care
- had moderate difficulty in finding snow day care
- had a good deal of difficulty in finding snow day care
had extreme difficulty in finding snow day care

Please choose the most accurate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snow day option availability in the Boone area has prevented me from accomplishing my job to the best of my ability.

- [ ]

Snow day option availability in the Boone area has affected my family in a negative way.

- [ ]

If you currently have children in childcare programs, how much do you spend monthly on childcare?

What percentage of your gross household income is spent on childcare if you currently have children in childcare?

Add a comment.

What is your annual gross household income?

Please elaborate on any issues, concerns, or priorities that have not been addressed in this survey.

Snow day option availability in the Boone area has affected my children's education in a negative way.

Snow day option availability in the Boone area has affected my children's social maturity in a negative way.

Snow day option availability in the Boone area will affect my decision to keep my family in the Boone area and remain in my current position at Appalachian.
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Cumulative Semester GPA Spring 3.05 for the 8th semester in a row

Sun Belt Honors
- Honor Roll (3.0-3.49 Academic Year GPA) – 107 student athletes
- Commissioner’s List (3.5 – above Academic Year GPA) – 87 Student athletes
- Team Honors (3.0 or higher Academic Year GPA) – 11 teams
  - Women’s Soccer
  - Volleyball
  - Women’s Golf
  - Women’s Cross Country
  - Women’s Track and Field
  - Women’s Tennis
  - Softball
  - Men’s Soccer
  - Women’s Basketball
- Appalachian State University Honor Roll (3.25 Semester GPA or higher)
- Fall – 187 student athletes, 247 total students (including cheerleaders, dance team, managers, athletic trainers, non-coaching staff)
- Spring – 143 student athletes, 222 total students

Scholar Ring 36 students from Spring semester- graduated with a 3.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Semester GPA</th>
<th>Team Ranking By Gender</th>
<th>Overall Team Rankings</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer-Women</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf-Women</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Country- Women</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track- Women</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis-Men</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer- Men</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis-Women</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball- Women</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf- Men</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Country- Men</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball- Men</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track- Men</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facts:
- 8th semester in a row we have had a cumulative GPA for all Athletes over 3.0
- Men’s Tennis ranks #1 in Male sports with a 3.18 semester GPA
- Women’s Golf ranks #1 in Female sports with a 3.53 semester GPA