

**Appalachian State University  
Faculty Senate Minutes**

**March 20, 2017**

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, March 20, 2017. Senators Albinsson, Dunston, Gambrel, Ignatov, Lee, Pitofsky, Rice, Salinas, Villanova, Weddell, and West were not in attendance.

**I. Announcements**

A. Chair Gates welcomed Senators and visitors to the meeting. Visitors were Kacey Howard (Watauga Democrat), Heather Langdon (Director IRAP), Phyllis Kloda (Dean, College of Fine & Applied Arts), Leroy Wright (Vice-Chancellor for Student Development), Paul Forte (Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs), Sue Edwards (Academic Affairs), Jim Denniston (Chair, Psychology), and Rick Rheingans (Chair, Sustainable Development).

**II. Minutes**

A. Chair Gates asked for a motion to approve the minutes from February 13, 2017. Senator Peterson Sparks moved and Senator Marshall seconded the motion to approve the minutes. **Motion to approve the February 13, 2017 minutes passed. (Vote #1)**

**III. Visitors' Reports**

**IV. Provost's Report**

A. Provost Kruger said that the Calendar Committee has completed their survey, and the results will be used for future calendars. A proposed change based on the survey results, would be to observe Memorial Day on the Tuesday after Easter.

March 23-31, the university will host a Free Speech Summit; featured speakers will include Dr. David Pilgrim founder of the Jim Crow Museum, and Dr. Lee Bird author of "*The First Amendment on Campus*".

The second annual round of Budget Presentations will be held in the Plemmons Student Union, Parkway Ballroom Room 420, Friday March 31 from 8am till 4pm. More information is available at: <https://irap.appstate.edu/institutional-effectiveness/budget-presentations>

**V. Chair's Report**

A. Chair Gates said that on March 14 a bill was filed in the NC senate - S247- sponsored by Sen. Tom McGinnis that bears mentioning. The bill is similar to a

bill filed last year that would mandate an increased teaching load for university faculty.

While nothing has yet been filed, there has also been talk about a bill that would legislate ideological balance on UNC campuses. This potential legislation has been described as specifying that no campus be allowed to have a faculty of greater or less than 2% of the ideological balance of North Carolinians. Application of such a bill would require that faculty disclose political affiliation and personal political views.

Last month a question had arisen as to how many other institutions had endorsed the Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-3 On SAC-SCOC Compliance. As of the end of February, six other university's senates, in addition to the Appalachian Faculty Senate, have endorsed the resolution.

## VI. **Committee Reports** (Committee Chair's name is in **bold**.)

- A. Academic Policy Committee (Crepeau, Fiske, Osinsky, Pitofsky, **Wheeler**, Waldroup)  
No Report.
- 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, Marshall, Madritch, Salinas)
  - 1. Howard Hall Furniture – Some decisions have been made regarding Howard Hall furnishings, including offering standing desks, chairs with casters, curved classroom desks, and white boards located separately from projector screens so both can be used at once. Some furniture has been ordered, however there are still decisions to be made on chair options. Senator Doll plans to visit a showroom and bring chair options to campus for display.
- E. Campus Technology Committee (Spiceland, Spaulding, Rice, Hartley, Cook, **Fenwick**, Reed)
  - 1. The Campus Technology Committee is preparing a report for next month's meeting.
- F. Committee on Committees (**Frye**, Sibley/Weddell, Gambrel, Dubino, McGaha)
  - 1. The University Committee Election Ballot was sent to voting eligible faculty today. Senators were encouraged to vote and to remind their colleagues to vote. Voters are allowed to vote for as many nominees as there are vacancies per committee.
- G. Faculty Governance Committee (Frye, **Gates**, Collier, Dalton, Rardin)
  - 1. Jim Denniston, representing the Ad Hoc Electronic Student Evaluation

Committee, provided context on the questions posed in Appendix A of the February agenda. The SAC-SCOC had previously requested that the methods used for faculty evaluation and teaching evaluations become standardized. It was found that there were 192 different questions being used across campus for teaching evaluations. The Ad Hoc Electronic Student Evaluation Committee tested various evaluation and testing software products, and most were found to be difficult to use. The committee plans to test an evaluation system, CoursEval, and would like input on questions that are broad enough to be used throughout campus.

2. Changes to the Faculty Handbook, as shown in Appendix E, were passed by the Faculty Governance Committee and will be discussed at the April Faculty Senate meeting. Chair Gates provided some background on these changes. ASU is currently the only university in the UNC system that doesn't require external review letters. The first section of Appendix E, proposed 3.8.5.15, would make external review letters a requirement during faculty review for tenure. The other section of Appendix E, proposed 4.8.1, concerns college-level promotion and tenure committees, which would only review policies and standards.

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

1. The Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee has been working on standardizing peer review rules, since different departments have been conducting reviews in various ways. The committee voted to make the resolution, as shown in Appendix B, a statement. Provost Kruger and Dr. Edwards have agreed to work with the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee on moving forward and changing peer review policies. There were questions about what the new evaluation rules would require of faculty. The previous policies were too restrictive for many departments. They plan to create a new standardized policy (to replace the current guidelines) that all departments can follow. A committee will be formed to work on that standardization.
2. The Childcare Survey is currently underway; it will end March 24. Senator Hester encouraged senators to remind their colleagues (faculty and staff) to take the survey. Results will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
3. The Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee has also been working on issues involving international faculty and faculty conducting research abroad. They have been working with the Office of International Education and Development (OIED) and have been troubleshooting ways to make certain processes less cumbersome. They will be working with OIED and the IT department in order to create a decision tree website, which asks broad to specific questions. Then provides situation specific documents and contact information to assist people in working through various procedures. They

are also working with international faculty to address their concerns regarding green cards, visas, and other immigration status issues.

I. Welfare of Students Committee (Zrull, **West**, Shulstad, Hamilton, Fitts/Goodson-Espy, Ortiz)

1. The Welfare of Students Committee has been looking into faculty concerns regarding the textbook rental system. The current system is not inclusive enough for new materials such as e-books. In order to collect more information about the deficiencies of the current system, a survey is planned.
2. Senator West was out of town, and will provide an update on student/faculty listening sessions at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

**VII. Unfinished Business**

**VIII. New Business**

- A. The Senate discussed the Resolution Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development, as shown in Appendix C. Chair Gates, with the permission of SD Department Chair Rheingans, made some minor changes to the resolution, shown in Appendix D, before discussion began. The resolution was introduced by Senator Thaxton, and was seconded for discussion by Senator Howard. Dr. Rheingans provided some background on this resolution: students have been concerned about recent political developments, such as decreased funding to the EPA, which could be detrimental to their ability to do what their department is training them to do and to find jobs in their field upon graduation. The Appalachian mission statement starts with, “Appalachian State University prepares students to lead purposeful lives as engaged global citizens who understand their responsibilities in creating a sustainable future for all.” In recognition of that mission, SD faculty decided they should speak out on these issues in order to support their students. The resolution was drafted to re-affirm the principles of evidence-based policy making.

Some senators said that their departments’ faculty members found the second paragraph and first two sentences of the third paragraph to be inflammatory and political. Other senators responded that those sections are factual and not inflammatory. Some senators said that the resolution doesn’t use strong enough language; funding cuts to research can damage scientific endeavor for years to come. A senator questioned the purpose and possible outcomes of this resolution. They are hopeful this resolution will spur conversation on these topics, they do not have a specific set of requests, but to be leaders for their students and to not remain silent on these issues. Appalachian’s mission statement is important, and that political actions are being taken that reduce faculty and student’s ability to work towards the ASU mission statement.

Senator Doll proposed an amendment to remove the second paragraph and the first two sentences of the third paragraph, and was seconded by Senator Osinsky. After discussion the question was called and was seconded by Senator Dalton. **Motion to call the question passed. (Vote #2)**

The motion to amend proposed by Senator Doll was opened for discussion. **After discussion the amendment to remove the second paragraph and the first two sentences of the third paragraph of the resolution failed. (Vote #3)**

Senators questioned whether there should be more resolutions in the future to address other political topics, and/or whether this resolution should include more topics. Senators discussed that there is a danger in waiting as more events occur. There was also a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of trying to include more topics in a single resolution. Senator Reed moved to send this resolution to committee, and was seconded by Senator Zrull. **Motion to send resolution to committee passed. (Vote #4)**

#### **IX. Adjournment at 4:30pm**

- A. Senator Spaulding moved to adjourn the meeting and Senator Reed seconded the motion. **Motion to adjourn passed. (Vote #5)**

<b>Vote Number</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<b>Motion to approve the February 13 minutes passed.</b>
2	Motion to call the question passed.
3	<b>After discussion the amendment to remove the second paragraph and the first two sentences of the third paragraph of the resolution failed.</b>
4	Motion to send resolution to committee passed.
5	<b>Motion to adjourn passed.</b>



## **Appendix A- Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017**

Paul,

Below are the questions used in the online course evaluation pilot. We will need a senate committee to review these and recommend university level questions.

Thanks,

Jim

James C. Denniston, Ph.D.  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Psychology  
Appalachian State University  
[\(828\) 262-2272 x402](tel:(828)262-2272x402)

### Likert-Scale Questions

1. Overall, I consider this individual to be an effective instructor
2. Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience for me.
3. The instructor provided timely evaluation of student work.
4. The instructor was available to students for help and support.
5. The course contributed to my knowledge of the subject matter.

### Open-Ended Questions:

1. What were your instructor's strengths?
2. How could your instructor improve his/her teaching?

## **Appendix B - Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017**

### Faculty Senate Resolution: Peer Observation of Teaching Policy

Whereas the matter of instructional quality is central to the mission of Appalachian State University (ASU);

Whereas the manner of assuring instructional quality is of material and central importance to the purpose of faculty governance;

Whereas peer observation of teaching is currently required of all University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses as mandated by Administrative Memorandum #338 issued by UNC System President Spangler in 1993 (see Attachment 1);

Whereas in 1994 the Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations (hereafter, the Guidelines) were adopted by an ad hoc committee comprised of ASU Faculty Senate and the ASU Office of Academic Affairs established mandated that academic departments develop procedures in consonance with the Guidelines (see Attachment 2);

Whereas the ASU Faculty Handbook (revised August 3, 2015, section 4.3.1) acknowledges that peer observation of faculty includes direct observation of classroom teaching and is a necessary component of faculty evaluation;

Whereas the Guidelines as currently constituted are often inexplicit, indefinite, and prone to various interpretations;

Whereas, based on the recent solicitation of departmental responses by the faculty welfare and morale committee, it is apparent that the implementation of the Guidelines are not consistently applied across academic departments so that departments are at great variance in their peer observation practices;

Whereas also based on the recent solicitation of departmental responses by the faculty welfare and morale committee, it is commonly reported that various departments across campus have found the process of abiding by the current ASU guidelines to be burdensome;

Whereas it is desirable that peer observation practices maintain some common features across departments so as to provide greater assurance of proper, comparable, and fair implementation of this requisite process in faculty evaluation and;

Whereas, a more universal practice should not unreasonably encumber departments from adopting peer observation practices best suited to meeting the mission of instructional quality;

Therefore, be it RESOLVED that a peer observation committee composed of an equal number of administrative and faculty senate representatives be convened by the Provost to amend the current ASU guidelines so that they are more consistent with the following features.

1. Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observation by peer(s) in at least one course prior to any promotion or post-tenure review for all tenured faculty.
2. Probationary, non-tenure track faculty, and teaching assistants are subject to peer observation in at least one class on an annual basis and prior to any personnel decision involving a probationary faculty member.
3. Peer(s) is to be defined by each individual department.
4. Peer observations require direct classroom observation using an instrument designated for that purpose by the department.
5. Peer observations require a written narrative of their observation, assessment, and recommendations.
6. Written narratives and the instrument used by the department as a formal record of peer observation must be conveyed to the observed faculty member in a timely manner.
7. A copy of the written narrative and instrument prepared by the peer observer(s) must be presented to the department chair of the faculty member being observed.
8. Observed faculty members may exercise the option of electing a second peer observer at their discretion.
9. Departments may adopt recourse to appeals procedures as they deem appropriate.

## **Appendix C- Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017**

### **Resolution Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development**

Appalachian State University is committed to advancing knowledge, providing high-quality education, and contributing to a just, healthy, and sustainable future. For centuries, advances in the natural and social sciences have helped us understand and steward our world in the face of increasing human impact on the environment. However, scientific inquiry, open and transparent discourse about science, and evidence-based policy-making seem to be threatened by proposed actions by the United States government. In order to uphold our mission as a public-serving institution of higher education, we therefore commit to protecting evidence-based inquiry and its ethical application.

While politics can play an important role in ensuring the thoughtful and ethical application of evidence, recent events have created unprecedented attacks on science and evidence-based inquiry and its application to environmental policy and management. These attacks have included the attempted political control of research, censoring of data and results on critical issues, veiled and open threats against academic and agency scientists involved in key environmental research, and undermining the use of scientific evidence in environmental decision-making. Most notably, it has included threats to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency, and to eliminate funding for climate change research and communication. Collectively, these actions would limit scientific progress, significantly constrain healthy scientific debate, and weaken policy-making at local, state, and national scales.

This concerted effort to undermine research and its responsible application to social and ecological problems also constitutes a direct threat to ASU. Among other points, it undermines our mission to prepare students “to lead purposeful lives as engaged global citizens who understand their responsibilities in creating a sustainable future for all.” This mission requires the critical and ethical application of evidence and reason to address problems, as well as a commitment to engagement, action, and service.

As a faculty we reaffirm this commitment. It is our responsibility to ensure that scholars are not silenced just because their research questions powerful interests, that research on critical issues related to society and the environment are not undermined through withdrawal of funding, and that environmental and other policies must be based on the ethical application of available evidence.

In short, we affirm our commitment to Appalachian as a protector of science and its responsible application in order to create a just, healthy, and sustainable future. This includes taking concrete actions such providing an open forum for researchers who are targeted, presenting on behalf of scientists who are silenced, and supporting research in areas that are politically targeted with defunding.

## **Appendix D- Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017**

### **Resolution Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development**

The Appalachian State University Faculty Senate is committed to advancing knowledge, providing high-quality education, and contributing to a just, healthy, and sustainable future. For centuries, advances in the natural and social sciences have helped us understand and steward our world in the face of increasing human impact on the environment. However, scientific inquiry, open and transparent discourse about science, and evidence-based policy-making seem to be threatened by proposed actions by the United States government. In order to uphold our mission as a public-serving institution of higher education, we therefore commit to protecting evidence-based inquiry and its ethical application.

While politics can play an important role in ensuring the thoughtful and ethical application of evidence, recent events have created unprecedented attacks on science and evidence-based inquiry and its application to environmental policy and management. These attacks have included the attempted political control of research, censoring of data and results on critical issues, veiled and open threats against academic and agency scientists involved in key environmental research, and undermining the use of scientific evidence in environmental decision-making. Most notably, it has included threats to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency, and to eliminate funding for climate change research and communication. Collectively, these actions would limit scientific progress, significantly constrain healthy scientific debate, and weaken policy-making at local, state, and national scales.

This concerted effort to undermine research and its responsible application to social and ecological problems also constitutes a direct threat to faculty professional effectiveness. Among other points, it undermines our mission to prepare students “to lead purposeful lives as engaged global citizens who understand their responsibilities in creating a sustainable future for all.” This mission requires the critical and ethical application of evidence and reason to address problems, as well as a commitment to engagement, action, and service.

As faculty we reaffirm this commitment. It is our responsibility to ensure that scholars are not silenced just because their research questions powerful interests, that research on critical issues related to society and the environment are not undermined through withdrawal of funding, and that environmental and other policies must be based on the ethical application of available evidence.

In short, we affirm our commitment to Appalachian as a protector of science and its responsible application in order to create a just, healthy, and sustainable future. This includes taking concrete actions such as providing an open forum for researchers who are targeted, presenting on behalf of scientists who are silenced, and supporting research in areas that are politically targeted for defunding.

## Appendix E- Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017

Current:

### 3.8.5 Assistant Professor

**3.8.5.15** The failure to give the required notice of a decision not to reappoint at any point herein required has the same effect as a decision at that time to offer a terminal appointment for one academic year at the same rank. The decisions herein required shall be made as provided in [section 4.4](#).

Proposed **3.8.5.15** An assistant or associate professor under review for tenure shall have their research/creative activity subject to external peer review. Candidates for tenure (3.8.6.9) shall by May 15 (or the first business day thereafter) submit the names of five (5) faculty members holding tenure at an external four-year degree granting institution of higher education or its international equivalent (reference guidelines for external reviewers). The chair in consultation with the dean will select three faculty members to serve as reviewers. Two of the three reviewers must be from the list of potential reviewers provided by the candidate for tenure. The third reviewer selected by the chair need not be from the list provided by the candidate but must meet the previously described qualifications. The candidate must submit the scholarly/creative activity section of their dossier by 5 p.m. August 15 or the first business day thereafter except for scholarship under review or in press at the deadline. The candidate may submit these additions to their dossier until October 15.

**3.8.5.16** The failure to give the required notice of a decision not to reappoint at any point herein required has the same effect as a decision at that time to offer a terminal appointment for one academic year at the same rank. The decisions herein required shall be made as provided in [section 4.4](#).

Current:

### 4.1.8 Procedures of Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees

**4.1.8.10** The results of the PTC vote, written vote justification statements, the candidate's supporting material, and all related documents submitted to the committee chair, shall be forwarded to the departmental chair who will include these materials along with her or his own recommendation to the dean, and through the dean to the provost and executive vice chancellor.

**4.1.8.11** The departmental chair shall notify the faculty member of the results of a departmental PTC vote on reappointment, emeritus status, tenure, or promotion within three working days following the date of the PTC vote, except under extenuating circumstances. Notification to the faculty member of the chair's recommendation to the

dean on promotion, tenure, reappointment, or emeritus status should be made in a timely manner as defined by the college or school, not to exceed five working days, except under extenuating circumstances.

Proposed **4.1.8.10** The results of the PTC vote, written vote justification statements, the candidate's supporting material, and all related documents submitted to the committee chair, shall be forwarded to the departmental chair who will include these materials along with her or his own recommendation to the dean, ~~and through the dean to the provost and executive vice chancellor.~~

4.1.8.11 The departmental chair shall notify the faculty member of the results of a departmental PTC vote on reappointment, emeritus status, tenure, or promotion within three working days following the date of the PTC vote, except under extenuating circumstances. Notification to the faculty member of the chair's recommendation to the dean on promotion, tenure, reappointment, or emeritus status should be made in a timely manner as defined by the college or school, not to exceed five working days, except under extenuating circumstances.

**4.1.8.12** Immediately following the departmental chair's notification to the faculty member of the chair's recommended action, the faculty member's dossier will be forwarded by the department chair to the college/school PTC for evaluation of the departmental PTC's adherence to university and departmental promotion and tenure procedures and standards.

The college/school PTC will consist of nine (9) to fifteen (15) faculty members, and an ex-officio non-voting member from the college/school office selected by the dean. The number of PTC members depend on the number of tenured faculty in the college/school, and the members will serve staggered three-year terms. The college/school PTC will review dossiers in subcommittees of no fewer than three (3) PTC members who will submit their recommendation to the full college/school PTC. The college/school PTC's recommendation along with the departmental PTC recommendation, chair recommendation, and all supporting materials will be forwarded to the college/school's dean within five (5) working days of the college/school's PTC meeting, and no later than December 15. After review, the college/school PTC committee shall forward its recommendation to the dean, and through the dean to the provost and executive vice chancellor.