At 3:20 p.m. on January 10, 2000, Chairperson Anderson convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. VISITORS. Anderson welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors' names.)
   B. MELISSA BARTH/LINDA ROBINSON. Melissa Barth, Director of the Equity Office, reported on the results of a survey done by the Equity Office in the spring of 1998. Barth noted that the return rate was 35%--a rate she felt was gratifying. Of the professors (37%), associate professors (17.7%), assistant professors (25.1%), lecturers (6.4%), instructors (5.4%), and adjuncts (8.4%), the gender of respondents was 44.4% female and 55.6% male. Of the 85.2% who responded that they have read information material about the Equity Office, 74.6% said they were aware that the Equity Office is a safe place to bring sexual harassment and gender discrimination issues. 90.7% said they were aware that the Equity Office is a place to bring race or ethnicity discrimination issues and 84.6% said they were aware that the Equity Office is a place to bring discrimination issues involving age or disability. The survey also showed that 55.7% of the respondents were aware that the Equity Office assists in workplace concerns such as merit pay, tenure and promotion, and problems with chairs and DPCs and that 70.8% said they were aware that the Equity Office investigates the concerns of faculty who are accused of harassment or other relevant workplace misconduct. (The rest of the results can be found on the Equity Office web page Linda Robinson is working on.) Barth said that another survey will be done either this spring or next fall.

Barth was asked whether an external consultant had been contracted to study salary equity at Appalachian, to which she replied that her office had not been able to retain one. Barth said that Bobby Sharp's office has been analyzing salaries annually since 1987 employing various factors, including those recommended by AAUP, such as rank and time in service. Barth reported that her office evaluates salaries annually and reports the findings to deans and the Provost.

Barth was asked how the Equity Office ensures fairness in its investigations of faculty. She said that her office is very concerned with assembling unbiased information and to make sure that everyone with a vested interest in a concern is fully heard. She emphasized the importance of confidentiality in this process and being sure that no imputation of guilt or innocence be a part of any investigation.

Barth was asked whether an accused person had an opportunity to know the details of specific charges being made. She replied that they do; however, that had not been the case in the past. She said that when a person makes a charge it must be put into writing or on tape (to be transcribed). After sharing this information with an appropriate supervisor, an accused person can see the full complaint while the Equity Office oversees the investigation of the charges and any responses to them. Barth emphasized that it is not the job of anyone involved in an investigation to determine the truth or falsity of charges or to characterize information in any way. She said this responsibility belonged with the proper administrators who are given the results of any investigation.
Barth was asked what happens in the case of a false accusation. She replied that she does not think this has ever happened, but those making any charges are fully informed of the consequences of making false accusations. If such a person were an employee of the state, he or she would be fined or fired. If such a person were a student he or she would be expelled.

Barth was asked what was the operating budget for the Equity Office and whether any salary monies came from the faculty line. She replied that she and Linda Robinson are paid from EPA administrative funds and that two faculty are there on 1/4 time releases. She thought that the office's general operating budget was about $20,000, but emphasized that the Office has been furnished with surplus furniture from the Warehouse. She said there was little spent on travel, saying "I haven't traveled anywhere for 2 years."

Barth concluded by welcoming questions at any time and she also welcomed suggestions from anyone. She noted that she hoped to return to teaching a class or two a year sometime soon.

Linda Robinson spoke about the OPEN DOOR stickers. By displaying the OPEN DOOR sticker, a person makes the statement that they are personally committed to accept and appreciate ALL people regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, and ability. When a person makes the statement that they have an OPEN DOOR, others should feel that this person offers a safe place to be listened to and valued in a non-judgmental way. Robinson distributed a package of materials, including an OPEN DOOR sticker, to all senators.

II. MINUTES

Anderson requested from Weitz to clarify if section III.A.1., last sentence, was accurate. Weitz said it was. Durham noted that the date in the first paragraph of the minutes was inaccurate. A motion was made and seconded to approve the December 6 minutes as modified.

VOTE # 1 21 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

III. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

1. FS9900-01-01 (motion regarding workload equivalents). Bortz, who was not present at the meeting, had emailed Anderson and requested that FS9900-01-01 be postponed until next month. Anderson asked if anyone from the Academic Policy Committee would like to speak to this. Butts noted that it was the Committee's intent to get this in the Faculty Handbook. Anderson noted that it was a concern whether all departments were following the proposal, which was passed by the Senate in 1992 and approved by the Chancellor in 1994. Discussion followed. Dr. Durham said that the motion was passed by the Senate in 1992 as a recommended procedure and not policy. It was then decided that it would be researched whether or not the document went before the Board of Trustees. The Senate's proposal asked for modifications to the appropriate section of the Handbook. As such, the Board of Trustees should have reviewed (and approved or rejected) the document as an amendment to Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook. Anderson will report on this question at the next meeting so that the Senate can decide how to proceed. Gates moved to table the motion (attachment #1) and Abbott seconded.

VOTE # 2 22 yes 1 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

The Senate took a break at 4:45 and reconvened at 4:55.
B. AGENDA COMMITTEE
Letter to the General Administration. Anderson presented the proposed letter to the General Administration regarding the contingencies that were established on which faculty received additional merit for teaching excellence. Koch added that in talking to chairpersons, most were not happy with the guidelines. After some discussion and a few amendments, a vote was taken on the letter (attachment #2).

VOTE # 3  18 yes  3 no  2 abstain  The motion passed.

C. CHANCELLOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Spring meeting dates. Anderson noted that the meeting dates for the Chancellor Advisory Committee were Monday, March 6 and April 3 at 2:00 p.m. and to let Michelle know which dates senators could attend.

D. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
No report.

E. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
No report.

F. WELFARE AND MORALE
No report.

G. BUDGET COMMITTEE
No report.

H. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
No report

IV. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. FS9900-01-02 Resolution regarding use of tuition increases for faculty salaries. A question was asked whether tuition had ever been increased before to pay for faculty salaries. Durham noted that two years ago, UNC-CH and NC State increased tuition with UNC-CH choosing to use the increase for faculty raises- State did not. Anderson said that the General Administration has already submitted its request to the Board of Governors - a request that includes tuition increases for faculty salaries for UNC-CH and NCSU. Butts said that the resolution was an important statement of principle that should be expressed. Butts moved to put the resolution on the table and Campbell seconded. There was discussion on whether Chancellor Borkowski intends to use the tuition increase for faculty salaries. Rardin called for the question.

VOTE # 4  21 yes  2 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

A vote was taken on the resolution as written.

VOTE # 5  8 yes  13 no  2 abstain  The motion failed.

B. FACULTY CONCERNS
1. Privacy rights. Dobson noted that last April, the Faculty Senate approved several
policies regarding privacy rights. Durham responded that he would check with Dayton Cole on the status of these.

2. **Use of social security numbers.** Moore asked the Welfare and Morale Committee to look into requesting that BlueCross BlueShield stop using social security numbers as BCBS identification numbers.

3. **Faculty meeting.** Moore asked senators if they had received feedback from faculty regarding the General Faculty meeting on January 6. Many said they had and that it was positive feedback in regard to the fact that Dr. Durham and other administrators stayed for questions and answers.

Craft made a motion to adjourn that was seconded by Moore.

VOTE # 6

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>abstain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Moore, Secretary

FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
JANUARY 10, 2000

VOTING SYMBOLS: Y=yes N=no A=abstain

NAME OF SENATOR 1 2 3 4 5 6
Abbott, Richard y y y y n y
Anderson, Stella y n y y n y
Arnold, Edwin y y y y y y
Barber, Bill y y n y y y
Barrett, Kevin y y y y n y
Bortz, Jeff excused absence
Boyd, John y y y y n y
Butts, Jeff y y y y y y
Campbell, Kathleen y y y y y
Craft, John y y y y n y
Craib, Mitchell y y y y n y
Dobson, Bill y y a y y y
Edwards, Debra excused absence
Gates, Paul y y a y y y
Giskin, Howard y y y y n
Gravett, Sandie excused absence
Jamrozy, Ute y y y y a y
Koch, Andrew y y y n y
Long, Betty y y y n y
McKinney, Harold y y y n a y
Moore, Michael y y y n y y
Muir, Ken   y y n y n y
Rardin, Patrick y y y y n y
Taylor, Robin  y y y y n y
Truett, Carol y y n y y y
Weitz, Gayle y y y y n

VOTE  1: Approve December minutes as amended
VOTE  2: Motion to table FS9900-01-01 regarding workload equivalents
VOTE  3: Vote on the letter to the General Administration regarding contingencies established on which faculty received additional merit for teaching excellence
VOTE  4: Call for question on FS9900-01-02
VOTE  5: FS9900-01-02 (resolution regarding use of tuition increases for faculty salaries)
VOTE  6: Adjournment

Visitors: Robbin Derry, Philosophy and Religion; Clinton Parker, Academic Affairs; William Purcell, Public Affairs; Bobby Sharp, Institutional Research; and Bill Ward, Academic Affairs.

attachment #1
Faculty Senate
January 10, 2000

FS9900-01-01 - MOTION CONCERNING WORKLOAD EQUIVALENTS
New workload equivalents were adopted by the University in August 1994, but those new equivalents have never been incorporated into the Faculty Handbook. The following language should be substituted for section 5.1.2.B. of the Handbook (p33):

1. Lecture Courses
   The class load equivalent of lecture courses is determined by the weekly hours of lecture in the course. For lecture/laboratory courses such as science courses or other courses with a similar structure that are listed as four credit hour courses in which the course consists of a three hour lecture and two or three hour each lab each week the class load equivalent for the lecture portion will count as three class load hours with the laboratory class load equivalence to be considered separately. (Credit will be given only if the faculty is directly involved in laboratory instruction.)

2. Large Sections
   The class load equivalent for a three credit hour lecture course with beginning enrollments exceeding 45 students will be adjusted by adding 1 hour to the class load. In the extraordinary event that a lecture course exceeds 90 students there will be a total adjustment of an additional 2 hours to the class load. (A two hour/week course would be considered a class load of 2 2/3 hours if the enrollment is 45+ and 3 1/3 if the enrollment is 90+.)

3. Upper Level and Graduate Courses
   No adjustment in class load hours will be given because a course is numbered 4500 or above.
4. Laboratory, Studio, or Activity Courses
Laboratory, studio, or activity courses with fixed meeting times, and that demand class preparation and supervision and evaluation of students, will be given class load hours equivalent to the scheduled meeting time of the laboratory, usually two or three hours per week. The class load equivalence of an open or unstructured studio, activity or laboratory course should be determined in consultation with the department chair keeping in mind the standard class load measure of instructor work or involvement comparable to a three credit hour lecture course with 25-30 students.

5. Music
The class load equivalence for person teaching three hours of individual music lessons normally will be two class load hours.

6. Student Teaching
The supervision of 18 student teachers (with a suggested minimum of 5-7 visits per student per semester) will be considered the equivalent of a full semester teaching load. The supervision of 4 to 5 student teachers will have a class load equivalence of a three hour lecture course. The normal class load equivalence for student teacher visitations (usually two per student per semester) by instructors in the student's major area will be one credit hour for every four students supervised.

7. Internship Supervision
The supervision of up to 10 internship students will have a class load equivalence of up to three credit hours. The precise equivalence may be negotiated by the internship supervisor and the department chair or dean.

Supervision of a student writing a thesis should be given, at a minimum, a class load equivalent of 1 hour.

The class load equivalence for supervision of independent or individual study should be determined in consultation with the department chair keeping in mind the standard class load measure of instructor work or involvement comparable to a three credit hour lecture course with 25-30 students.

9. Course with W or S Designations
Courses with the W designation should be considered as normal size if the enrollment is 25 students. An adjustment of 1 class load hour should be given if the enrollment exceeds 30. The optimal enrollment for courses with the S designation is 20 students.

attachment #2

January 11, 2000

President Molly Corbett Broad
UNC General Administration
Post Office Box 2688
Chapel Hill, NC 27515

Dear President Broad,
The Faculty Senate at Appalachian State University would like to share its view with the General Administration regarding the money targeted for teaching excellence during the 1999-2000 academic year. We have had several months since this practice was implemented to observe the results and reflect on the impact of this strategy at Appalachian. The sense of faculty across the campus is that the impact of targeting money for a minority of faculty has produced an overall negative impact on the campus. Such a practice has produced a damaging effect on overall campus morale. This is especially true for the many excellent teachers who were left out of the equation because the reward was limited to one third of the faculty.

In addition to the immediate impact on morale, this practice will also generate some ongoing effects, as it produces disparities in pay that will have to be addressed in the future. This occurred because the targeting of teaching money to such a small group of faculty upsets the merit structure that the various departments have in place to reward teaching, research, and service. Merit structures internal to the university are designed to reflect recognition for the variety of strengths that individuals bring to the university. Teaching excellence is already a component in the mix of factors for merit pay in departments at Appalachian. Targeting money for teaching excellence to a limited number of people upsets this balance. The perception is that the one third designation was arbitrary. The reality is that the policy has produced a situation in which a limited number of faculty have experienced substantial pay raises, while other meritorious faculty have been left behind. These are pay disparities that, in the interest of fairness, Appalachian will have to correct over time.

We applaud your interest in promoting quality teaching. However, we would submit that the campuses themselves are in a better position to decide how Teaching Excellence should be recognized and rewarded. The Faculty Senate at Appalachian respectfully requests that in the future such decisions be left to the individual campuses.

Sincerely,
Stella Anderson, Chairperson
Faculty Senate

cc: Mr. Brent Kincaid, Chairman, Board of Trustees
    Chancellor Francis Borkowski
    Dr. Harvey Durham, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs