I. Announcements
   A. Chair Gates welcomed Senators and visitors to the meeting. Visitors were Phillip Ardoin (Council of Chairs), Kelly McBride (University Libraries), Mark Bachmeier (Director Human Resources), Tim Burwell (Vice-Provost for Resource Management), Heather Norris (Dean, College of Business), Hank Foreman (Chief of Staff, Office of the Chancellor), Leroy Wright (Vice-Chancellor for Student Development), and Rick Rheingans (Chair, Sustainable Development).

II. Minutes
   A. Chair Gates asked for a motion to approve the minutes from March 20, 2017. Senator Sparks moved and Senator Villanova seconded the motion to approve the minutes. Motion to approve the March 20, 2017 minutes passed. (Vote #1)

III. Visitors’ Reports
   A. Mark Bachmeier, HR Director & Sue Edwards, Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs – Office of Relocation and Dual Career Assistance
      1. Mr. Bachmeier informed the senate of a new program created by Human Resources and Academic Affairs, called the Office of Relocation and Dual Career Assistance. The impetus for this project came from both a housing survey conducted by a consultant last year and from patterns found in exit interview data. They both found that a major issue facing employees -- especially new hires moving to the area -- was finding housing and local work for other family members. The Office of Relocation and Dual Career Assistance has now been created to provide potential new employees, new hires and current employees with dedicated assistance with these matters. They have created networks with local housing companies, the Chamber of Commerce and local businesses that can benefit employees. The Office of Relocation and Dual Career Assistance has also begun managing the University Marketplace website, a buy/sell/rent/trade website for the ASU community. A senator mentioned that OIED has been working on a relocation assistance website for international faculty. Mr. Bachmeier said that he will contact them to work in collaboration.

   B. Hank Foreman, Acting Chief of Staff, Chancellor’s Office – Events Tab
1. Mr. Foreman showed the senators a website that is in development, and should launch this summer, called “Events at Appalachian”. This events website will be more integrated and cohesive than the current event listings available. It will provide more categories to allow for easier searches and will pull together event listings from around campus, helping to spread the word about events to various groups. The website will accept event submissions and post them on all necessary calendars. A senator mentioned that she often wants to integrate events into her class schedule and encourage students to attend events. However, it is difficult to do that when events post after syllabi have been distributed for that semester. In response, he said that once there is a date set for an event it can be posted, but it is often difficult to negotiate a date far in advance of the event.

C. Tim Burwell, Vice-Provost for Resource Management – Faculty Salary Comparisons – Appendix B & I

1. Dr. Burwell provided multi-year salary charts to the senators, as shown in Appendix B & I. On the graphs, the green line shows the ASU average faculty salary target, and the black line shows the actual average salary of ASU faculty. In 2008-2009, ASU was above their target, but faculty salaries are now below the target amount. Faculty salaries have been inching closer to our target in the past few years under Chancellor Everts’ leadership. Tuition increases in the past few years have assisted with increases in faculty salaries. However, there are more constraints now on further faculty salary increases, since the state legislature voted for fixed tuition and limited tuition increases. Sometimes faculty positions aren’t filled in order to provide funds for salary increases and operating expenses.

IV. Provost’s Report

Provost Kruger reported that the final two candidates for Dean of the Hayes School of Music are on campus this week. In an effort to get more diverse pools for faculty position searches they have increased the number and types of advertising outlets.

Budget presentations were held Friday, March 31. The presentation was live-streamed and had more than 200 viewers. A recording of the presentation can be found on the IRAP website at: https://irap.appstate.edu/institutional-effectiveness/budget-presentations. At the presentation, they shared information on funding requests from deans which were funded this year.

The Campus Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees at their March meeting.

Dr. Sue Edwards and Senator Brooke Hester have been in discussion about peer review guidelines and will have further meetings on that topic throughout the summer.

V. Chair’s Report
Chair Gates reported that parking fees will rise in 2017-2018 by $36. A sliding scale fee based on salary and/or based on a parking areas’ distance from campus are still under discussion.

The General Assembly has been discussing guns on campus. House Bill 251 would allow licensed gun owners to carry firearms on campus, rather than having to keep them locked in a vehicle when on campus. Opposition to this is being organized around the Supreme Court’s 2008 decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, which found for the Second Amendment right to the possession of firearms, but also specifically supported the right of educational institutions to regulate firearms.

Continuing the momentum of the Free Speech Summit hosted in March, the Humanities Council is sponsoring a discussion on Free Speech in the Classroom on Friday, April 21 at noon, in the Watauga River Room of the Plemmons Student Union. Another session on Free Speech v. Hate Speech will be held June 6 at 3pm, as part of the University’s Diversity Initiative Program.

Chair Gates asked the senators to consider whether using clickers for vote counting would be preferred to the current system of hand voting. The library currently has a surplus of clickers. Senators questioned the security of voting via clicker. Other senators explained that the clickers work with an infrared receiver, so anyone responding would need to be very close to the meeting room in order for the receiver to pick up the signal. This reduces the likelihood of purposeful hacking of a vote, but may be an issue if other nearby classrooms are using clickers also since signals could be picked up from elsewhere. The clicker program would connect to the podium computer and could display the results on the projector.

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

A. Academic Policy Committee (Crepeau, Fiske, Osinsky, Pitofsky, **Wheeler**, Stephenson/Waldroup)

1. Recommended AP&P Manual Changes – Appendix C & D
   Appendix C shows an overview of the proposed changes. Appendix D shows the manual with the proposed changes. Senator Crepeau explained that the main goal was to modernize the manual using bullet style guidelines and removing out-dated, unnecessary, or duplicated sections. The Graduate AP&P Committee and Undergraduate AP&P Committee will vote on these changes respectively on April 24 and May 3, so please contact those committees before those dates if you have any feedback on these changes.

2. Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development – Appendix E
   Senator Wheeler explained that the committee had re-written the statement since the March 20 Faculty Senate Meeting; changes were made in an effort to remove the controversial portion of the statement while retaining the original intent. Near the end of the statement some new content was
added: a reaffirmation of the faculty's commitment to all students and an encouragement to the administration to publically reaffirm their commitment to the University’s mission statement. **Motion FS 16-17/04-01 to adopt the Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development passed. (Vote #2)**

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)
   No report.

E. Campus Technology Committee (Spiceland, Spaulding, Rice, Hartley, Cook, Fenwick, Reed)
   1. A summary report was provided in Appendix F.

F. Committee on Committees (Frye, Sibley/Weddell, Gambrel, Cockerill/Dubino, McGaha)
   No Report.

G. Faculty Governance Committee (Frye, Gates, Collier, Dalton, Rardin)
   1. Faculty Handbook Changes – Appendix A
      a. The addition of 7.3.4.16 would create a section for the University Forum Committee following the same format as sections in the Faculty Handbook for other University Committees. **Motion FS 16-17/04-02 to add 7.3.4.16, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #3)**
      b. **Motion FS 16-17/04-03 to add the sentences, “[T]he P&T Dossier as defined in section 4.4.5.1 must be submitted electronically. Artifacts and documentation may be submitted electronically or in printed form or a combination”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6 passed. (Vote #4)**
      c. The proposed change to section 4.6.3 would add a time period within which a faculty member can request a conference with a dean concerning non-reappointment.
Motion FS 16-17/04-04 to add the phrase “within fifteen working days”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3 passed. (Vote #5)

d. Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.7.2 addresses situations in which mediation fails. The change to this section would give faculty a time period of five working days in which to request a grievance hearing after notification of the failure of mediation. Senators questioned: whether that is five working days from notice being sent or notice being received; whether five working days would be a fair amount of time; and how notification would be sent? If notice has to be sent through the mail faculty may not receive it and have time to respond, especially over the summer or if they are traveling. Senators discussed the meaning of “writing” in this section and if email is included. Senator Spaulding moved and Senator Howard seconded to send section 4.11.3.7.2 back to committee. Motion to send section 4.11.3.7.2, as shown in Appendix A, back to the Faculty Governance Committee passed. (Vote #6)

e. The proposed addition to Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9 would prevent attorneys’ serving as advisor advocates from also being called as a witness. Senators questioned the purpose of this change and whether it would be damaging to faculty rights. The committee’s intentions in adding this was to assist with expediting the process, and to keep the role of advocate separate from the evidentiary role. This change would prevent the attorney from helping or harming the grievant as a witness. The attorney may have beneficial or disadvantageous information about the grievant, and this would keep them from being a witness for either side. Faculty can choose a different advisor advocate if they would like them to be a witness instead. Motion FS 16-17/04-05 to add the sentence, “[H]owever, no advisor-advocate may be called as a witness”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9 passed. (Vote #7)

f. The proposed change to 4.13.4.4.5 exchanges the position of “dean of the college” for the “department’s
Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA)” in that section since the position of EOA no longer exists. **Motion FS 16-17/04-06 to add “dean of the college” in the place of and removing “department’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA)”, as shown in Appendix A, from the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5 passed. (Vote #8)**

g. The proposed change to 6.2.2.1.3 would make it so that only tenure-track faculty can vote on other faculty’s request for OCSA, since only tenure-track faculty are eligible for an OCSA. **Motion FS 16-17/04-07 to add the term “tenure-track”, as shown in Appendix A, to section 6.2.2.13 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #9)**

h. The proposed change to section 3.8.3.1 would bind faculty to the requirements for tenure that are in effect at the time of their hire. Senator Doll requested that this change specify that it is departmental. Some senators wanted more time to review this with their departments’ faculty members. It was brought up by a senator that the first sentence of this section and the second sentence don’t fit together, and should be split into separate sections. Some senators spoke to the difficulty of changing requirements when applying for tenure. Senators questioned whether this Handbook change can guarantee that tenure requirements won’t change over time for faculty, whether the requirements can be included in faculty contracts, and how records will be kept of tenure requirements over time. A senator asked if instead the Handbook could allow faculty a choice between at the time of hire tenure requirements or current requirements. Another senator said, that this would create ambiguity in the requirements and could lead to liability. Senator Albinsson’s substitute Dr. James Stoddard moved and Senator Fenwick seconded to send section 3.8.3.1 back to committee. Senator Marshall requested that the committee consider along with holding faculty to time of hire departmental policies, to also hold faculty to the Handbook tenure policies from their time of hire. **Motion to send section 3.8.3.1 back to the Faculty Governance Committee passed. (Vote #10)**
Senators have not had enough time to discuss the changes to Faculty Handbook sections 3.8.5 and 4.1.8 with their departmental faculty. A senator asked if these changes would be voted on by the entire faculty at any point in the approval process. No, if this is approved by the Faculty Senate, it will then only need to be approved by the Board of Trustees, before going into effect. Senators would like this to go to a full faculty vote to get everyone’s input and on the other hand, that it is the senators’ responsibility to get input from their departments’ faculty before voting on this matter.

A senator asked why these changes were proposed. The response was that ASU is one of eight institutions without external letters, and one of five institutions without college-level PTCs. The PTC does not review the candidate’s materials, they would only review adherence to the department’s procedures and standards. Also, that external review letters are seen as additional support for the candidate. Senators said that just because other institutions do things a certain way, that doesn’t mean ASU should follow suit. ASU is special and attracts certain people because it is different; it may not be in our best interest to be the same as other institutions. It was suggested that external review letters should be optional rather than a requirement, which would support the intent of the change. A senator said that faculty don’t want another level of bureaucracy in this process, and the PTC could make the process more politicized and less transparent. Senators questioned the purpose of a PTC reviewing a department’s adherence to procedure since they can’t dispute the result of the department’s decision.

Senator Albinsson’s substitute Dr. Stoddard moved and Senator Žrull seconded to send Faculty Handbook sections 3.8.5 and 4.1.8 back to the Faculty Governance Committee. Senators requested that the Faculty Governance Committee discuss these changes and their purpose with the Faculty Senate. Senator Villanova called the question and Senator Pitofsky seconded, calling of the question on the motion to send this section back to committee. **Motion to call the question passed. (Vote #11)**  
**Motion to send Faculty Handbook sections 3.8.5 and 4.1.8 back to the Faculty Governance Committee passed. (Vote #12)**
H. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Albinsson, Campbell, Hageman, **Hester**, Howard, Newmark/Sparks, Phillips, Thaxton, Villanova)

1. A report on the recent Childcare Survey was provided in Appendix J. Senator Hester deferred discussion of the report until the April 24 Faculty Senate meeting.

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

1. An Update on Actions Taken to Respond to Student Concerns Expressed during the Faculty-Student Listening Sessions - Appendix G
   Some concerns expressed by students during listening sessions were provided in Appendix G, along with responses from the Welfare of Students Committee members to those suggestions. Some of the suggestions cannot be enforced directly, but could be recommended. Other suggestions will be pursued in various ways.

2. An Update on Suggested Changes to the Textbook Rental System – Appendix H
   Senator West said that the Welfare of Students Committee would like to send out the survey, as shown in Appendix H, either to faculty directly or to department chairs that could compile information from faculty. Some senators stated that they would prefer the survey be sent to all faculty directly. Senator West went over the survey questions allowing feedback from senators. Senators expressed concerns regarding the rental textbook system and e-books/e-resources.

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment (at approximately 5:40pm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion to approve the March 20, 2017 minutes passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-01 to adopt the Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-02 to add 7.3.4.16, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-03 to add the sentences, “[T]he P&amp;T Dossier as defined in section 4.4.5.1 must be submitted electronically. Artifacts and documentation may be submitted electronically or in printed form or a combination”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.6 passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-04 to add the phrase “within fifteen working days”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.6.3 passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motion to send section 4.11.3.7.2, as shown in Appendix A, back to the Faculty Governance Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-05 to add the sentence, “[H]owever, no advisor-advocate may be called as a witness”, as shown in Appendix A, to the Faculty Handbook section 4.11.3.9, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-06 to add “dean of the college” in the place of and removing “department’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA)”, as shown in Appendix A, from the Faculty Handbook section 4.13.4.4.5, passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motion FS 16-17/04-07 to add the term “tenure-track”, as shown in Appendix A, to section 6.2.2.13 of the Faculty Handbook passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Motion to send section 3.8.3.1 back to the Faculty Governance Committee passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Motion to call the question passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motion to send Faculty Handbook sections 3.8.5 and 4.1.8 back to the Faculty Governance Committee 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>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>Jeanne Dubino</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Dunston</td>
<td>y</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>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gates</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Goodson-Espy</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Hamilton</td>
<td>u</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>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Madritch</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Marshall</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanga Mohr</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>u</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>e</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>Elicka P. Sparks</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>Kin-Yan Szeto</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Thaxton</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Villanova</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Waldroup</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Weddel</td>
<td>u</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>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y for Yes; N for No; A for Abstain
Appendix A – Faculty Senate Meeting April 10, 2017

Changes to Faculty Handbook for Faculty Senate to review and vote on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 shall 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.
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.

3.8.3.1 A faculty member hired onto the tenure-track as an assistant professor, or as an associate professor without tenure, will be bound by the department’s criteria for promotion to associate or tenure in effect at the time of hire. Changes to the departmental requirements for promotion and tenure shall be made in a meeting of the tenure eligible academic faculty.

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 UNC system, Appalachian State 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 depends 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 (including vote justification forms) 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.
Comparison of Faculty Salary Benchmarks
Appalachian State University

Assistant Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph showing the comparison of faculty salary benchmarks for Assistant Professors from 2005 to 2017.
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Edits to Existing Sections
2. Contact Time
3. Numbering of Coursework
4. Scheduling of Courses to be Offered for Credit
5. Selected Topics Course Guidelines

Deleted Sections
1. Centers and Institutes
   The procedures outlined in the AP&P Manual are no longer accurate.
   Vice Provost for Research, Alan Utter, and Provost, Darrell Kruger, support the removal of this section.
2. Curriculum Approval Process Flow Chart
   This section is not policy. It appears on the AP&P website.
3. Change of major
   Information appears in the Undergraduate Bulletin (scheduled for editing fall 2017).
   Information appears in the Graduate Bulletin-no edits are required.
4. Incomplete grades
   Information appears in the Undergraduate Bulletin (scheduled for editing fall 2017).
   Information appears in the Graduate Bulletin-Incompletes-no edits are required.
5. Request to take coursework at another school
   Information appears in the Undergraduate Bulletin (scheduled for editing fall 2017).
6. Short-term courses for academic credit
   This information appears in the Policy Manual.

Section Additions: Bulletin Style Guide Consistency Standards
1. Alternative Years Course Offerings
2. Course Descriptions
3. Course Titles
4. Numeric Grade Representation

Section Additions: Curriculum Proposal and Scheduling Information
1. Department or Program Name Changes
2. Proposal Process Resources
3. Reorganization of Academic Units
4. Semester Offering Information

Presentation to AP&P Committees
Graduate AP&P    April 24th
Undergraduate AP&P    May 3rd
Appendix D – Faculty Senate Meeting April 10, 2017

AP&P Manual
Appalachian State University
Pending Approval
08-01-17
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Academic Policies and Procedures (AP&P) Committees

AP&P Committees Summary
Complete information about the memberships of university committees (including Graduate and Undergraduate AP&P Committees), reporting, and areas of responsibility are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

AP&P Operating Procedures
1. Proposals to be presented to an Academic Policies and Procedures (AP&P) committee must be submitted using the approved proposal forms available on the AP&P website.
2. Proposals to be considered by an (AP&P) committee must be agenda-ready and submitted prior to the published due date (approximately twenty-five [25] calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting). The AP&P committees will send the agenda to the entire faculty at least six (6) working days prior to a scheduled meeting according to the Faculty Handbook guidelines.
3. The proposal author, department chair, or dean’s office should consult with any department or unit that may be affected by the proposal prior to submission.
4. Committee members, deans’ offices, authors, department chairs, faculty and students should provide feedback and inquiries on the AP&P AsULearn forum to address proposal concerns prior to committee meetings when appropriate and possible.
5. A quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of two-thirds majority of the voting members of the committee.
6. The order of consideration of proposals before the committee shall be rotated among the colleges and schools.
7. Committee meetings are limited to two hours in length unless a vote to extend is passed. In the event of a backlog of committee business, a second meeting will be called for that month.
8. Voting on proposals/motions is by voice vote or by a show of hands. Proxy representation and absentee voting for the purpose of voting on proposals under consideration is NOT permitted. Proposal/motion decisions shall be by a simple majority of the verbal or show of hands votes cast.
9. The chairs of the AP&P committees shall be elected from the voting membership. The chairs are elected in the first fall semester meeting by the voting members. The chairs retain their right to vote on proposals/motions. The term of chair is for one year and is renewable. The chair is eligible to receive one quarter reassigned time per semester.
Primacy of Academic Governance over Academic Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty Handbook Academic Governance Summary
The basic and most important unit in determining curricula is the academic department. Each department/academic unit and college/school shall have a curriculum committee to carefully consider changes to courses, programs, policies, or structures within or affecting the academic unit. All academic units should develop and implement plans for involving students in academic governance at the departmental level.
In addition, the General Education Council, Honors Council, and Teacher Education Council shall each carefully consider changes to curriculum, policies, programs, or structures within or affecting their programs.
The Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures (AP&P) Committees are the final committees to carefully consider and recommend changes to the University’s curriculum, policies, programs, or structures.
The Provost and the Chancellor shall communicate to the University in a timely fashion their decisions on proposals/motions involving recommendations for changes in curriculum, policies, programs, or structures.

Guideline I
Any proposal for changes in a department’s courses or programs must first be acted upon by the department before being submitted to the college advisory council. Any proposal for changes (excluding course changes within existing programs) in a college’s or school’s programs or structures must first be acted upon by the faculty of the college or school concerned before being presented to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and/or the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. After a proposal for curricular or structural change has been acted upon by a college or school and after the dean of that college or school has submitted the proposal to all other necessary groups, the dean will then present the proposal to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and/or the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.

Guideline II
Recommendations for changes in general academic policies or academic programs must be submitted to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and/or the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee by any of the following:
A. Department, program, college, or school
B. Faculty Senate
C. Student Government Association
D. Graduate Student Association Senate
E. Council of Deans
F. Council of Chairs
A faculty member, student, or ad hoc faculty or student group will channel proposals through the appropriate body above.

**Guideline III**
The Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee are, in most circumstances, the final recommending bodies to the provost and executive vice chancellor and the chancellor. The faculty members and the students on these committees serve as the representatives for the faculty and students, respectively. As such, these groups should make their respective views known through their appointed representatives and should make arrangements for their respective representatives to be held accountable to them.

**Guideline IV**
If a proposal for changes in a department's courses or programs is not approved by that department, then the group initiating the proposal may appeal (within 90 days after rejection) first to the advisory council of the college to which that department belongs. If the proposal is also rejected by the college or school, then the group may appeal (as above) to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and/or the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. When a departmental proposal is not recommended at the college advisory council level, the department may appeal to the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and/or the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.

**Bulletin Style Guide**
The information below improves course information consistency and sets standards for the undergraduate and graduate Bulletins. Bulletin course description and title information will be altered to meet these guidelines before being published in the AP&P minutes and Bulletins.

**Alternate Year Course Offerings**
When courses are offered in alternate years, information listing what years the course will be offered should be provided. “Spring, Alternate years” is not acceptable. If the year cannot be determined, the course offering should be designated “On Demand”.

Examples:
- HIS 3156. History of International Terrorism (3). Fall, Even-numbered years.
- HIS 3158. Ethnic Conflict: East Versus West (3). Fall, Odd-numbered years.
- HIS 3823. American Military History (3). Fall; Spring, Odd-numbered years; Summer Session 1, Even-numbered years.
Courses may be scheduled in a regular semester “Fall; Spring; Summer Sessions” and “On Demand” if a course will be offered in one semester, but only periodically in another.

**Examples:**
- PE 1822. Tennis (1). Fall; On Demand.
- HPE 2140. Principles of Fitness and Conditioning (3). Summer Session; On Demand.

**Course Descriptions**
- Course descriptions should be concise-two to five sentences/statements total.
- Avoid information technology language that may become outdated.
- Do not use course titles within the course description or prerequisite statement.
- Ensure contact time coincides with course credit hours and course schedule type.
- Mode of instruction should not be included (e.g., online, lecture).
- Only include prerequisites for that course, not the prerequisites of prerequisite courses.
- Spell out “and” instead of using “&”.
- Spell out “laboratory”.
- Spell out numbers one through nine (e.g., Studio six hours).
- Statements such as “lecture three hours” should not be included in the course description unless the course includes multiple modes of instruction. (e.g., lecture three hours, laboratory one hour).
- Use the standard statement “Graded on an S/U basis.” when the course is graded S/U.
- Use course prefix before each number (e.g., ENG 3661, ENG 3662, ENG 3663, rather than ENG 3661, 3662, 3663).

**Course Titles**
Attempt to use course titles shorter than 30 characters-including spaces. The short title in Banner appears on the class schedule and student transcripts and is limited to 30 characters (including spaces and punctuation). The long course title appears in the Bulletins. The long course title in Banner is limited to 100 characters (including hours and semester offering).

**Numeric Grade Representation**
Grade Point Average (GPA) points should follow all letter grades listed in the bulletins, programs of study, or other university materials and documents. GPA points should follow all course or program grade prerequisites. Inclusion of “or higher” and “or above” is not necessary.

**Examples:**
- Prerequisites: completion of LLC 2510 and FRE 3510 with a minimum grade of “B” (3.0).
- Prerequisites: completion of HIS 4100 Senior Seminar with a minimum grade of “C” (2.0) is required to complete the History major.
- Course Description: A minimum grade of “C” (2.0) is required. Prerequisites: completion of HPE 2110, HPE 2120 and HPE 2130 with a minimum grade of “C” (2.0) in each.
- Major Requirement: In order to progress through the RN to BSN program, the student must achieve a minimum grade of “C” (2.0) in each nursing course before proceeding to the next nursing course.
Curriculum Proposal and Scheduling Information

Contact Time
Across the UNC system, a class must meet for a minimum of 750 minutes for every semester hour of credit. The amount of contact time remains constant, regardless of the academic term.

- One semester hour Minimum of 750 contact minutes
- Two semester hours Minimum of 1500 contact minutes
- Three semester hours Minimum of 2250 contact minutes
- Four semester hours Minimum of 3000 contact minutes

The Appalachian State University Policy Manual provides a thorough explanation of credit hour applications across different modes of instruction and contact time required. In addition, detailed information on current course schedule types (Banner course term file guidelines) can be found on the Office of the Registrar’s website.

Numbering of Coursework
The following is a summary of the restrictions imposed by university policy on the numbering of coursework. To begin, university policy stipulates the following general classifications.

Level Number Range
- Remedial 0001-0999
- Freshman 1000-1999
- Sophomore 2000-2999
- Junior 3000-3999
- Senior 4000-4999
- Master’s 5000-5999
- Specialist 6000-6999
- Doctorate 7000-7999

Numbers specified within the reserved ranges are as follows.
- General & Departmental Honors 1510-1519, 2510-2519, 3510-3519, 4510-4519
- Independent Study 1500, 2500, 3500, 4500, 5500, 6500, 7500
- Instructional Assistance 3520
- Selected Topics 1530-1549, 2530-2549, 3530-3549, 4530-4549, 5530-5549, 6530-6549, 7530-7549

Other numbers reserved by University policy are as follows.
- Bibliography & Research 5000
- Experiential Learning 1999, 2999, 3999, 4999
- Graduate Research 5989, 6989, 7989
- Internships 2900, 3900, 4900, 5900, 6900, 7900
- Thesis/Dissertation 5999, 6999, 7999

Proposals for new courses or programs are submitted to the Office of the Registrar during the proposal development process to confirm the appropriateness of course numbering.
Department or Program Name Changes
Department or program name, or prefix changes should be submitted using the Department Name Change form. This form and instructions are available on the AP&P website.

Proposal Process Resources
Resources are available on the Academic Policies and Procedures website:
http://app.appstate.edu
AP&P Approval Process
AP&P Process Flowchart
Bulletin Deadlines
Contact and Submission Information
Meeting Agendas, Dates, Deadlines, and Minutes
Proposal Forms, Instructions, and Sample Proposals
File Naming Protocol
Department Name Change Form
Semester Offering Changes Information
UNC-GA Academic Program Planning Workshop
UNC-GA Process for Planning and Establishment of New Program
UNC-GA-SACS Flowchart

Reorganization of Academic Units
Reorganization of academic units resulting in changes to where those units report requires the approval of the Academic Policies and Procedures (AP&P) committees. Proposals for such changes should be submitted through the standard AP&P approval process.

Scheduling of Courses to be Offered for Credit
Scheduling a course to be offered for credit is authorized by the department chair (or equivalent) under which the course is listed (see Faculty Handbook).
After authorizing a course to be offered, the chair will provide the schedule information to the dean’s office (or equivalent).
Provide schedule information to:
❖ The Office of the Registrar if the course is to be offered for main campus credit during a term of the regular academic year.
❖ The Office of Summer Sessions if the course is to be offered during a summer term.
❖ The Office of Distance Education for all distance education courses.

Courses beginning before 2:00pm Monday-Friday should adhere to regular meeting patterns unless approved as an exception by the appropriate dean’s office. Regular meeting patterns and additional information can be found on the schedule build/CTF section of the Office of the Registrar's webpage.
Selected Topics Course Guidelines
Selected topics are available to allow faculty to test the viability of a new course on a short-term basis. A selected topics course should not be offered more than a total of four semesters before beginning the process for adding the course permanently to the Bulletin(s).
A course under a selected topics designation should not be scheduled when a course with substantially similar content and methodology exists, without first consulting the existing course department chair(s) (or equivalent).
If departments and/or individual faculty members would like to express concerns about a selected topics course, contact should be made with the department chair (or equivalent) at least two weeks in advance of registration. The concerned party, the individual offering the course, and the department chair(s) should attempt to resolve the concern in advance of registration. If that course of action does not result in a solution, the appropriate college dean(s) will serve to arbitrate.
Graduate/undergraduate dual-listed selected topics courses must adhere to the same requirements as other graduate/undergraduate dual-listed courses.
Graduate selected topics courses must adhere to the same requirements as other graduate courses. Contact the Graduate School for additional information.
See the Numbering of Coursework section of this manual for information about selected topics numbering.

Semester Offering Information
Main campus undergraduate courses offered in a fall or spring term are eligible for the university’s book rental program. Selected Topics, On Demand, and Summer Sessions, only courses are not eligible.
Semester offerings (only) can be changed without an AP&P proposal. Details about that process can be found at: https://app.appstate.edu/semester-offering-changes-submitted-deans-office
Courses can be offered: Fall, Spring, Summer Sessions, On Demand, Even-numbered Years, Odd-Numbered Years. Please see the Alternate Year section of this manual for details on inclusion in course descriptions.
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Statement Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development

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

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

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

As faculty we reaffirm our responsibility to ensure that scholars are not silenced if their research findings question or do not support powerful interests. If warranted, we will provide an open forum for targeted researchers, advocate on behalf of faculty who have been silenced, and support research efforts politically targeted for defunding. We have a responsibility to prepare and empower our students to be ethical global stewards as they face inevitable ecological and global challenges of their future. We encourage the administration to publically reaffirm their commitment to the University mission of a sustainable future for all global citizens.
Faculty Senate Technology Committee April 2017 Report

Below is a summary of the Faculty Senate Technology Committee efforts in AY 2016-17.

Reports from ITS governance
● Reorganization of ITS
● David Hayler is interim CIO
● Tom Van Gilder announced as director of LTS (Learning Technology Services becoming Center for Academic Excellence)

Report from course evaluation system demonstration
ITS has made a purchase recommendation for CourseEval system made by Academic Management Systems Inc. Committee (ITS staff and faculty) evaluated 7 vendors and piloted 2 products. We are last (or nearly so) UNC institution to use a central, online system. This addresses a SACS compliance issue. The CourseEval product uses Shibboleth authentication (our primary authentication mechanism) and has Moodle (AsULearn) integration. For the most part, the system seems to be a good solution in terms of privacy, flexibility and reporting.

Status of ongoing committee initiatives
● Open Access statement development
We are drafting a Senate resolution to support open access publication but not limit or restrict faculty unnecessarily. Nearly done, will bring to Senate early next year.
● Information security from a faculty perspective
We are identifying use cases for how faculty use various technologies (e.g., Mountaineer Apps, AsULearn, etc.) and the information security implications. For example, many faculty ask, “Can I store my AsULearn grade book in my Google Drive?” There are lots of use cases and questions that arise, so will continue to work on this.
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Faculty/Student Listening Session
Fall 2016

Topic: What Can We Do to Improve the Campus/Community Climate for Underrepresented Students

1. Develop classroom policies that promote the classroom as a safe space
   a. Consider more flexible/open attendance policies for students with mental health issues or anxiety
      i. While this is not directly possible, faculty are encouraged to refer students with mental health issues to counseling AND the Dean of Students who can work to provide basic information to all of a student’s professors.
   b. Encourage attendance for campus events through offering class credit or extra credit: Students indicated that they very much appreciated faculty making announcements about upcoming events and/or offering extra credit for attendance, when appropriate.
      i. Faculty are not required, but encouraged, to keep up-to-date with campus events being offered, to consider offering extra credit for attending events that relate to course subject matter and to help keep students informed about the events.
   c. Provide a statement on syllabuses about faculty willingness to discuss issues that make students feel uncomfortable:
      i. Again, doing so would not be mandated but an example is provided below for those who wish to use it or modify it for their use.
         "Because it is important to maintain an open and fair class environment, students in this class are welcome to let the professor know if any issue related to race, gender, religion, sexual preference, or disability has been treated or discussed in a way that can potentially make a student feel uncomfortable. Students are welcome to talk to the professor after class, to visit during office hours, or simply by sending an email requesting an appointment."
   d. Include bias reporting on syllabuses
      i. The Bias reporting system is currently operational but the ability to anonymously report has been removed, as requested by the senate, and now includes more upfront information https://bias.appstate.edu/
      ii. Including information about the bias reporting system is not mandatory but an option. One example of what that might look like is:
         "Alternatively, if a student feels that a faculty member has treated them or held a discussion that makes that student feel uncomfortable, students may
also submit a confidential report of the incident using the Bias reporting system at bias.appstate.edu. However, with a confidential report, it may be more difficult for faculty to correct the situation. As such, students are encouraged to communicate directly with the faculty member or with the chair of the department in which the faculty member resides whenever possible.

e. Encourage open dialogue in the classroom – promote free speech, use current events
   i. Students at the listening session indicated that they wished more faculty would discuss current events in their classes instead of issues from many years ago. They want to discuss the water situation in Flint, MI, for example. Faculty might consider how they might adapt a more flexible curriculum in order to be able to include current topics.

2. Promote an open-door atmosphere (consider signs on faculty doors) – similar to the safety pin idea
   a. Initially, some faculty thought the Open Door stickers meant open to LGBTQIA students but the Open Door initiative on campus is much broader than this so we want to be sure that all faculty are aware of its meaning and consider identifying themselves as having an Open Door. From the Open Door website: “The Open Door program promotes the value of every person's contribution to the community – not in spite of our religion, sexuality, race, gender identity, or ability.”
   b. Re: the promotion of it: From the Open Door Manager, Yormeri Silva: “Currently, we are limited in our marketing options to both students and faculty/staff since we are not considered a "club" officially, but we are working on making the transition. Having an academic channel to reach students would be great in our efforts to reach students! Outside of email announcements, we have a Facebook and Twitter account and have been promoted by the ASU Facebook in the past. I would like to have promotional outlets in residence halls and for incoming freshmen and transfer students during open house week for the Open Door program.”

3. Develop faculty training on identity and privilege - Consider establishing a committee to decide on what is needed or could be done.

4. Ensure all University sites use preferred first name and pronouns (ASULearn, Degree Works, etc...) - Done. ASULearn, Banner and Degree Works all identify preferred first names.

5. Provide more resources for psychological services and more psychologists of diverse backgrounds (Stephanie)
   a. We have a meeting set up for next week with the Director, Chris, to talk about this. They increased the number of counselors they had previously and seem to be better able to meet demands but we want to discuss what he feels their needs are now. While we can’t mandate the hiring of psychologists that might
reflect underrepresented, we do want to be sure that Chris is aware that some of our students feel this is a need.

6. Provide scholarships for students whose funds are threatened as a result of sexual orientation/identity
   a. Scholarships for diverse students are not an option within the University but the Chancellor has agreed to help us find resources off-campus if we wish to pursue this.

7. Provide decompression/debriefing zones/areas (safe spaces) in buildings on campus or signage directing students to existing ones in nearby buildings

8. Provide more open forums between students and faculty
   a. If the faculty are interested in supporting this, we will pursue having one each semester where there is no agenda but a handful of faculty (only faculty) are present to listen.

9. Support offering a freshman orientation class (App 101, a Gen Ed course for all students to address all issues of social justice)
   a. It seems reasonable for faculty to support, and be involved in, discussions about how to make aspects of resource, wellness, community responsibility, social justice, etc. education available in current First Year Seminars, when instructors are willing to include such features in existing courses.
   b. Similarly, it seems reasonable for faculty to support, and be involved in, discussions about whether or not an “App 101” (as described above) as a stand alone course is feasible and what such a course might look like (e.g., required, optional, is there a 201 version for transfers, etc.).
   c. We therefore suggest a committee led by Student Welfare lead a discussion in 2017-18 about creating an App 101 course or modules that could be added to existing FYS courses.

10. Develop storyboards (capture videos) with the testimonies of students so students don’t have to keep repeating themselves.
    a. Looks like this has been done recently: [http://theappalachianonline.com/indepth/a-representation-of-race.html](http://theappalachianonline.com/indepth/a-representation-of-race.html)

11. Promote the availability of culturally sensitive resources (hair care and products, music/movie choices):
    a. Consider providing a space and having hairdressers skilled in cutting African American hair come to campus once a month.
i. Willie Fleming has helped the community find someone who would be appropriate. An African American woman was hired at Changes Salon and she does ethnic hair. Changes Salon is located at: 1542 Old US Hwy 421 #E, Boone, NC 28607. Appointments can be made at: 828-265-4006. There are also currently discussions underway with Mr. Damien Johnson, the owner of three barbershops and a barber school in Charlotte. We don't have a confirmation yet on whether he will be able to provide barber services here in Boone.

b. Consider working with the Schaeffer Center and/or the new Downtown Boone Appalachian Theater to offer movies that celebrate diverse characters (for example, Hidden Figures was not shown at the local Boone theater, could it have been brought in for a single day or weekend while still in theaters)

i. Willie Fleming is currently investigating how we might pursue options. Possible venues include Schaeffer Center and the App Theater downtown (currently under renovation).
Faculty Survey on the Textbook Rental System

At present, Appalachian State University uses a system of printed textbook rentals. All full-time students pay $140 per semester for access to their textbooks. Currently this fee does not cover students’ costs associated with either e-books or workbooks that students get to keep. Some faculty have raised concerns that they cannot use the academic materials of their choice (i.e. e-books) for fear of negative student responses. We are not considering abandoning a rental system, but instead evaluating how e-books might be incorporated within the existing system.

Reasons provided by faculty for considering the inclusion of e-books into the rental system include:

- Some publishers are opting to eliminate paper versions of texts and are switching to only using e-books, in many cases for several of their texts. This impedes academic freedom as some faculty may have to choose another publisher in order to find a printed textbook that can be used and which may be less than ideal.
- E-books are the future and they are more efficient and sustainable.
- Using e-books would eliminate the following:
  - Having to ship paper textbooks to campus,
  - having to forecast demand and manage inventory,
  - Students having to wait in line to get books and face potential shortages, and
  - Discontinuing books no longer needed and transporting them to be recycled.

Given these concerns, it has been suggested that we consider alternatives for including the adoption of e-books within the current system. We are unclear yet as to how this might look and whether it would require additional financial support from the University or from the students in terms of a higher fee. Before doing so, we would like to assess whether the current system is adequately meeting faculty needs and how many faculty feel like they would benefit from incorporating e-books into that system. We are therefore asking that you answer the following four questions (responses will be anonymous):

1. Is the current system of using printed textbook rentals working for you currently?
2. Please provide any additional comments, suggestions or concerns you have about whether the current system of printed textbook rentals is meeting your needs.
3. Do you presently use an e-book for any of your classes? Yes, all of them Yes, some of them No
4. Do you think you would use e-books for any of your classes if this was an option? Yes, all of them. Yes, some of them No Undecided Not Applicable
5. Please provide any additional comments, suggestions or concerns, you may have about the use of e-books.
Thank you for your participation. If you have further information to contribute, please speak with your department’s faculty senator. Additionally, if you would you like to participate/serve in a committee to discuss this issue, please email Dr. Stephanie West, Student Welfare Committee Chair, at westst@appstate.edu.

REMINDER: PLEASE DO NOT ANSWER THE QUESTIONS IN THIS SURVEY. THIS DOCUMENT IS INTENDED FOR YOUR INFORMATION ONLY. WE WILL DISCUSS THE PROCESS AT OUR APRIL MEETING.
Appendix J – Faculty Senate Meeting April 10, 2017

To: Appalachian State University Faculty Senate  
From: The Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee  
Re: Child care Survey Report  
April 10, 2017

Please find enclosed a brief report of the most significant findings from the child care survey developed by the Faculty Senate Welfare and Morale Committee.

Based on the enclosed report, the Welfare and Morale Committee concludes that a significant population of faculty and staff are affected by a lack of childcare options, and therefore recommends that the faculty, staff, and administration work together to address child care and snow day related issues.

The urgent need for child care and snow day options at Appalachian April 2017

In March 2017, the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate Welfare and Morale Committee surveyed all faculty and staff (nonstudents) on their perceptions of issues resulting from availability of child care on a regular basis and on snow days for school age children. The main outcomes are summarized below. The members of this committee agree that a significant problem exists. The default Qualtrics survey report can be found here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8b0SR8K02A_U3MxLXlWMUh2LW8/view

We emphasize that a large number of those who responded appear to have a vested interest in the topic (as parents of school age children); however, the lack of child care services for parent and guardian employees at Appalachian has a wide ranging effect on the productivity and morale of all faculty and staff in the institution, as well as on the larger community. Specifically, two thirds of respondents indicated that challenges with child care and snow day availability interfered with their job performance as ASU employees. Though not part of the survey, if a faculty or staff member cannot work because of the lack of availability of child care or snow day care, it may result that their nonaffected colleagues will compensate, making this an issue for a majority of faculty and staff.

67% agree with the statement: “child care availability in the Boone area has prevented me from accomplishing my job to the best of my ability.”

72% agree with the statement: “child care availability in the Boone area has affected my family in a negative way.”
30% agree with the statement: “child care 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.”

92% agree they had moderate or more difficulty in finding snow day care.

80% agree with the statement “snow day option availability in the Boone area has preventing me from
accomplishing my job to the best of my ability.”

76% agree with the statement “snow day option availability in the Boone area has affected my family in a negative way.”

28% agree with the statement “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.”

62% responded no to the question “was your child placed in a facility by the time of needed care?”

55% responded that the average wait time for being placed in a facility by the time of needed care exceeded two semesters.

3,279 faculty and staff (nonstudents) were invited to take the survey resulting in 541 responses. Demographical information was collected and can be found in the default Qualtrics report. It is worth noting that of the respondents who expressed need for child care since 2000, roughly half (153) took the time to write about their child care and snow day experiences in the general feedback textbox.