APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 12, 2001
(3/19/2001 - approved as written)

At 3:20 p.m. on February 12, 2001, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. COLLEGE ELECTIONS. Koch reported that all ballots for the college elections have been mailed to faculty.
   B. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors' names.)

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   No guest speakers.

III. MINUTES
   Gates moved and Simon seconded to approve the January 8 minutes as written.

   VOTE # 1  19 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
   A. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
      Rardin reported that he and Koch attended a meeting last Thursday with the parties involved with the proposed new Academic Integrity Code and ironed out all the wrinkles. Rardin asked that senators look over the proposed Academic Integrity Code and refer to the attached current Academic Integrity Code which is subject to being replaced by the new proposal. Rardin asked that senators come to the March 19 meeting prepared to vote on the new proposal.
      Moore asked for a summary of the ways in which the University, Student Government, etc. is going to promote academic integrity. How will incoming and current students be made aware of this process as well as continuing and new faculty. Jackie Gjurcevich, a student on the proposed Academic Integrity Code committee, responded that the Committee has already begun to make posters and prepare workshops to reach students. One of the roles of the faculty members on the Academic Integrity Board is to help educate faculty via memos and departmental workshops. As a Committee, they are focusing on students and making sure that they understand the changes if the proposal goes through. Ward added that if the proposal goes through, the Board would start a campaign to help faculty.
Email addresses of Jackie Gjurgevich and Amanda Privette will be sent to senators in case senators have any concerns or comments.

**B. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE**

1. **Motion FS00-01/02-02 - Faculty Handbook change to 4.8.2(a): Composition of Departmental Personnel Committees.** Gates reported that the Committee was requested to draft the motion, which would separate the department chairperson from holding the position of chairperson of a DPC and/or search committee. The motion would put another layer of objectivity in a personnel decision and makes the decision of the department chair more meaningful because the department chair at that point has not sat in on the DPCs deliberations and would not just then pass it on through but would actually make an additional determination in his/her role as department chair only.

Discussion followed on what the responsibilities of the proposed chair of the DPC would be because some senators sensed an increased workload if one were chair of the DPC. It was decided that the responsibilities of the DPC chair would be much like that of the chair of search committees.

Bortz noted that the problem with the DPCs is the election process and offered an amendment that only tenured faculty serve on DPCs. Truett seconded. Gates replied that this amendment is a substantive change and that this issue has already been discussed and voted down by the Senate so with that in mind, the Academic Policy Committee would decline the amendment. After some discussion, it was decided that this issue would be taken up by the Committee and brought back to the Senate.

Discussion followed as to whether the department chair should also be chair of the DPC as this might lead to double-dipping by department chairs. The department chair serving as an ex-officio on the DPC does not eliminate his/her role at all. The department chair ultimately takes recommendations from the DPC and acts upon them. The discussion then leaned towards department chairs not serving on DPCs. Is what a department chair says hearsay in an authoritative nature? Atkinson moved and Moore seconded that an amendment be made to FS00-01/02-02 to remove the department chair from the DPC. After further discussion Dobson called for the question.

**VOTE # 2**

19 yes  2 no  1 abstain  The question was approved.

A vote was taken on the amendment to remove the department chair from the DPC.

**VOTE # 3**

5 yes  16 no  1 abstain  The motion failed.

A vote was taken on **Motion FS00-01/02-02** as written.

**VOTE # 4**

16 yes  3 no  3 abstain  The motion passed.

2. **Committee report.** Gates reported on the implementation of the **Faculty Handbook** section (4.14.2) on the periodic reopening of department chair positions. A memo by Dr. Durham was sent to deans in the fall of 1999, thus this is the effective date of the policy. For chairs who have been in the position one or two years, reviews begin five years after the effective date of the policy. For chairs who have been in their position three to five years, reviews begin three years after the effective date of the policy. For chairs who have been in the
position six or more years, reviews begin two years after the effective date of the policy, which will be fall of this year. Four chairs have elected to step down this year: Dennis Grady (Political Science/Criminal Justice); Dan Hurley (English); Sue Keefe (Anthropology); and Mike Wade (History). The process is currently underway to fill those positions. The other chairs whose reviews are due this fall are: Randy Edwards (Accounting); Mary Reichel (Library); Unal Boya (Marketing); Lee Baruth (Human Development/Psychological Counseling); Sammie Garner (Family and Consumer Sciences); Vaughn Christian (Health, Leisure and Exercise Science); Mark Estepp (Technology); and Susan Cole (Theatre and Dance).

Woodworth asked that the minutes reference the Faculty Handbook section where the procedures for this process are. (section 4.14.2 of the current Faculty Handbook)

C. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Research Council replacement. Moore noted that the Committee recommends Christopher Curtin (Art) to replace Margaret Yaukey on the Research Council for the spring semester 2001 only.

VOTE # 5  20 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

D. WELFARE AND MORALE

Committee report. Arnold reported on the privileges of emeriti professors. Arnold obtained the emeriti benefits information from the Human Resources Office. These benefits apply also to phased-retirees and include: free library privileges; an ASU email account and free access to email; free access to Mt. Mitchell, the pool, and the Quinn Center; discounted athletic tickets; if over age 65, tuition-free courses; a free parking permit for ungated lots; office space if teaching and it is available; and an ASU I.D. Retirees are told this information verbally--there is nothing in writing (except the HRS website)--but Human Resources is working on a brochure to give to retirees.

Arnold noted that the ASU modem pool for slip accounts is becoming obsolete and that when it fails, no effort will be made to repair it. No one knows for sure when this will happen. There are several arguments for doing this such as it is expensive to keep it up and upon surveying other UNC universities, it was found that they do not provide this free service. Arnold added that the Information Technology Advisory Committee, on which there are faculty serving, voted to do away with slip accounts when the modem pool fails. However, Appalachian has made arrangements with Wave Communications to offer discounted internet service to Appalachian faculty and staff.

Ward noted that for those phased retirees who select the title emeriti faculty up front, they give up their privilege to serve and vote on committees. Weitz added that it is not the faculty who determines whether they are emeritus--it is the DPC that makes the recommendation. Moore asked if as a phased retiree, could they elect to teach all 12 of their hours in one semester, and then still serve on committees in the other. Ward responded that he will check on this.

E. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Committee report. Abbott reported that he attended the ASU Foundation meeting on January 25 and that there was nothing to report at this time from the subcommittees. Weitz asked Durham if it would be possible for a faculty member to attend a subcommittee meeting. Durham replied that they are open meetings and to contact Sieg Herrmann to receive a notice of the meetings. Abbott added that from the 100 people that were in attendance, nine were from the non-administrative academic types. The majority were from capital industries and you could see
where the influences come to move Appalachian towards a business model. One thing the Chancellor said at the meeting was that Appalachian would have a definite physical presence in Hickory next fall. Weitz asked if there was any mention of a Centennial Park to which Abbott replied, no.

Abbott reported that he also attended a Space Committee meeting on January 26. Discussed at that meeting was the future of Varsity Gym and the new recreation center. Weitz asked if the meeting was informational or is the Space Committee the Committee that makes decisions. When Moore replied that it's informational, Weitz asked who makes the decisions. Durham responded that people apply for space through this Committee and then the Committee makes recommendations to the administration. The Committee is comprised of Clinton Parker (chair), Jane Nicholson, Clyde Robbins, John Abbott, Mike Moore and Bob Feid. The Living/Learning Center was discussed as well as capital projects. The bond money will account for capital projects for the next six-eight years. The bridge behind Broome-Kirk Gym will be torn down this summer and rebuilt.

**F. AGENDA COMMITTEE**

1. Chancellor Advisory meeting. Weitz reported on the January 26th meeting, which was attended by Marking, Jamrozy, Weitz, and Atkinson. Also in attendance were Jane Helm and Harvey Durham. The three main topics were tuition increase, credit card purchases, and the use of the Convocation Center. Weitz noted that Helm distributed a copy of the letter from the Chancellor to the Board of Governors regarding the proposed tuition increase request. The amount of money going towards faculty salaries is now to be 70%, with 30% going towards financial aid for students (for both years).

   Another concern brought before the Chancellor was why purchases cannot be made with a university credit card. There are four other UNC institutions that can do this and the state legislature said no more for whatever reason. This concern will be looked into.

   The other concern dealt with use of the Convocation Center. It appears as though academic departments who need to use the facility are not able to do so. The policies governing that building are also being looked into.

   The next Chancellor Advisory meeting will be Monday, March 5 at 3:15 in the Chancellor's Conference Room. Weitz encouraged those senators who have not already attended or submitted a question for the meeting to do so, and to email Michelle if you can attend.

2. Faculty Assembly. Weitz noted that due to a conflict, she would not be able to attend Friday's Faculty Assembly meeting and asked for a volunteer to go in her place.

3. Council of Chairs meeting. Koch attended the February 1 Council of Chairs meeting in Weitz's absence and reported that the Workload document was not distributed or discussed at the meeting. The Chair of the Council of Chairs was not present at the meeting so Koch has redistributed the workload document to the Council so that it will be discussed at the March 1 Council of Chairs meeting.

**G. BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Committee report. Gravett briefly reported that according to the NC Governor's office, there is going to be a $790 million budget shortfall this year (by June 30). Governor Easley has declared a budget emergency which means he can use funds that are typically restricted, including the contributions to pensions for state employees, which he does plan to tap into to the tune of over $150 million this year. Monies that Appalachian has been asked to return have been covered from mostly unpaid/unoccupied positions. At this time, Appalachian is not yet feeling much pressure.
Gravett also reported that in the Chronicle of Higher Education two issues ago it reported that the Education Oversight Committee of the legislature turned down the General Administration’s request for $28 million for faculty salary competitiveness. Gravett suggested that senators follow the State Employees Association of NC (SEANC) website (http://www.seanc.org) for up-to-date news on the status of state affairs in regards to state employees. Gravett also suggested faculty read the News and Observer to stay updated.

H. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATORS’ EVALUATION
Committee Report. Butts reported that the Committee has a tentative final report for the Senate’s input. The Committee still needs to meet with the deans, which will be Wednesday. The deans have seen a copy of the proposed procedures and the structural questions but now need feedback from them. Final word from the deans and from the attorneys will impact the final evaluation.

Butts noted that there is one question that needs to be addressed: who in the college/school should evaluate the dean? Is it full-time faculty? Faculty teaching six hours or more?

Dobson asked the rationale for demographic data; was it going to be analyzed using demographic data? Butts replied that it could be--that it might reflect differences within the college. It was noted that faculty have raised concerns about gender identification--is it legal? Is it relevant?

The length of the evaluation was discussed. Some expressed that it is too long and that a lot of the questions should be consolidated. It was also noted that faculty may not be able to answer all of the questions; that some of the questions only department chairs would be knowledgeable about. It was suggested that in addition to strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree, the category not observable should be added. Butts responded that Bobby Sharp had suggested the same thing, but that Tim Huelsman said the opposite. A member of the Committee noted that eleven of the questions for the evaluation came from the Faculty Handbook’s descriptions of deans responsibilities. The Committee had tried to keep the evaluation to eleven questions, but felt that the other questions were necessary.

A question was raised whether the input from chairs would be weighed the same as the faculty. Another question was if there are going to be questions related to effectiveness of teaching, then should there be questions related to research.

Koch commented that if something is not done this document will not fulfill the purpose for which it was designed and then asked for what purpose was this designed? Is this to be used as a formal personnel evaluation/performance review that will be used by the administration. Butts replied that it would be and that the Committee itself had some very long discussions on this. At the end of these discussions, the Committee felt that a public reporting and summarization might be illegal based on privacy laws. As a result of that, this document is skewed more toward a formative feedback process. The Faculty Senate chair would report back to the Senate that the process has been completed and that the Committee has met with the dean and the Provost.

It was asked that if this evaluation were not an administrative device that is kept secret, then could the results then be made public. Butts responded that this is not a process being carried out in secret and that there would be several people who know the results. Bortz noted that if this is to be used as an administrative device that the faculty cannot know the results of, then the administration needs to carry it out and not the Faculty Senate. Weitz suggested that in the procedures it strongly be recommended that a narrative version of the results be made public to the faculty by the dean.

In conclusion, it was noted that the legal issue of making the results public needs to be looked
into and reported back to the Senate and that Dr. Durham would need to decide how the results, if made public, would be used by him, if at all. Input from the deans would also be needed to see how valuable they would see the information coming from either angle (private and part of their personnel file or public and not part of their personnel file).

Senators were asked to talk to their colleagues before the next Senate meeting to see what difference it would make to them whether they know the results of the evaluations or not.

The Academic Policy Committee was asked to study the possibility of adding to the Faculty Handbook a procedure for deans similar to the one already in place for department chairpersons that states, \textit{When viewed as necessary, the dean or chairperson or the faculty, by a petition of more than 50% of the faculty of the department, may call for a meeting between the dean and the faculty members to discuss concerns pertaining to the chairperson's leadership of the department. ...

\textbf{I. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY HANDBOOK CHANGES}

\textbf{J. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON MERIT PAY}

\textbf{K. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON WORKLOAD}

\textbf{L. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON EQUITY/GRIEVANCE}

\textbf{V. OLD BUSINESS}

None.

\textbf{VI. NEW BUSINESS}

\textbf{RESOLUTION FS00-01/02-01 - APPALACHIAN'S NEW LIBRARY}. Koch reported that plans are being made for the new Library and that if Senators have opinions as to what this new building will look like, they need to make them known. Discussion followed. Abbott noted that he thought that the resolution was not strong enough and that a meeting is going to be held next month regarding the new library. Durham added that the committee appointed for planning the new library will be comprised of mostly instructional faculty in addition to library faculty and staff and people from Academic Computing Services.

It was noted that faculty should be more concerned about the decision made about the future collections the library will house as opposed to what the building will look like. Weitz suggested that Mary Reichel be invited to the March Faculty Senate meeting.

Moore was concerned as to how the committee was formed. He questioned if there are Research Council faculty and if the Graduate School had a voice in who was on the Committee. Durham responded that faculty from every department could not be included on the committee and that the work of the committee will reach out to faculty and ask for their input. Durham added that right now there are potentially 17 people who may serve on the committee.

John Abbott, who will serve on the committee as Library faculty, agreed that he would be willing to voice the concerns of the Faculty Senate to the committee.

A vote was taken on the \textit{resolution as amended} (to take quotation marks off the word \textit{book} in the last sentence of the first paragraph).
VOTE # 6  20 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The resolution passed.

Weitz reported that at the March meeting, the main items will be the Academic Integrity Code, the faculty reporting system, which is a joint venture between the Welfare and Morale and the Academic Policy Committees, and the composition of DPCs.

Koch turned the Senate's attention to page 38 of the General Bulletin regarding rental of textbooks and noted that the first sentence of that section needs to deleted due to the potential of lawsuits.

Gravett moved to adjourn and Edwards seconded.

VOTE # 7  17 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

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

Respectfully submitted,
    Mike Moore, Secretary

FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
February 12, 2001
VOTING SYMBOLS:  Y=yes  N=no  A=abstain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SENATOR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, RICHARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATKINSON, WILLIAM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL - excused absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT, KEVIN - excused absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORTZ, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN - excused absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBSON, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, DEBRA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX, JERRY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVETT, SANDIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMROZY, UTE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KOCH, ANDREW  Y Y N Y Y Y Y
LONG, BETTY     Y Y N A Y Y Y
MARKING, MARTHA Y Y N Y Y Y Y
MCKINNEY, HAROLD Y N A Y Y Y Y
MOORE, MICHAEL Y Y Y N Y Y
RARDIN, PATRICK Y Y N Y Y Y Y
SIMON, STEVE   Y N N Y Y Y Y
TRUETT, CAROL  Y Y Y A Y Y Y
WEITZ, GAYLE   Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
WOODWORTH, JOAN Y Y N Y Y Y Y
YAUKEY, MARGARET

VOTE 1: Approve January 8 minutes as written
VOTE 2: Call for the question
VOTE 3: Motion to remove department chairs from DPCs
VOTE 4: Motion FS 00-01/02-02
VOTE 5: Committee on Committees recommendation
VOTE 6: Resolution FS 00-01/02-01
VOTE 7: Adjournment

VISITORS: Jacqueline Gjurgevich, Academic Integrity Committee; Peter Petschauer, History; Amanda Privette, Academic Integrity Committee; Michael Wade, The Appalachian; Bill Ward, Academic Affair

Resolution FS00-01/02-01

Since the time of Aristotle the library has been the center of academic life. While it can be acknowledged that new technologies can enhance the quality and quantity of information available to students and faculty, they cannot replace or substitute for the books that form the core of the library’s resources.

Therefore, in our view the new library should be built with sufficient space to house all the present and expected future holdings of ASU’s book collection on campus. Further, it is our opinion that the holdings remain organized according to subject area and that the stacks remain open. We believe this provides the greatest access to the widest variety of information by both students and faculty.

Motion FS00-01/02-02 - Faculty Handbook 4.8.2(a) - Composition of Departmental Personnel Committees
As soon as practicable after the election of a Department Personnel Committee pursuant to (b), infra, committee members will elect a chair of the DPC from the elected membership. The chair will preside at all regular meetings and call special meetings when two or more committee members make written request for a meeting of the DPC.

The departmental chairperson shall attend committee meetings as an ex-officio, non-voting member, except when the personnel action being considered involves the chairperson. The departmental chairperson serves a resource function for the committee, providing information to the body as requested during their deliberations.

RATIONALE: This change will separate the departmental chair's role with the DPC from that of the departmental chair for purposes of Section 4.8.3 (a). Under that section, the departmental chair receives personnel action recommendations from the DPC, which are then forwarded (with concurring or dissenting recommendations attached) to the dean and Provost and Executive Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Removing the departmental chair from a leadership position on the DPC will create distance between the two roles, helping to minimize conflicts of interest, real or apparent, and add an additional measure of objectivity to the decision-making process.