At 3:27 p.m. on March 15, 2004, Chair Gates convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 I. G. Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Chair Gates welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)

B. Chair Announcement – DPC Reform Survey Report
Gates reported that many untenured faculty had responded in opposition to the e-mailed DPC Reform survey. Gates noted that DPC Reform would be addressed later on the agenda under, VI. Committee Reports.

II. MINUTES – February 9, 2004

Senator Anderson asked for clarification in IV. Provost’s Budget and Resolutions Status Reports. She noted that the last sentence needed to say that “Appalachian must draw on tuition increases for faculty salaries (as compared to peer institutions) yet, Appalachian faculty are considered ‘overpaid’ (according to findings of the Washington State Study).” Senator Anderson also noted that the word “in” needed to be inserted in the 8th sentence of the same paragraph. Senator McGaughey, Gates and Moore clarified and re-worded the first sentence in section, A. Academic Policy Committee’s paragraph to read: “Senator McGaughey reported that she is representing the Senate on ITAC, and that she would like to offer a faculty response should ITAC consider a computer use privacy policy for employees that might say that no employee can expect privacy in the Appalachian network.” Senator Arnold pointed to section C., Welfare of Students Committee and suggested that the wording be “toned down” by deleting the word “stubbornly” from the second sentence of the paragraph. Senator Arnold, Moore and Gates re-worded sentence to read: “There were many, and Muir and Arnold concluded that some students seemed misinformed and had concluded essentially that if faculty were going to ask for raises from tuition then many students would prefer that faculty do their job by keeping at least 10 office hours a week.” Secretary Moore noted one minor change in section, IV. Provost’s Budget and Resolutions Status Reports. He inserted the word “in” so that the sentence would read: “Burwell explained that in a comparison of comprehensive universities tuition in UNC ranks 37th out of 46 states in tuition, and 8th out of 46 states for out-of-state.”

Senator Moore called for a point of order because the February 9th meeting had been disbanded due to a lack of quorum therefore, before proceeding with business, a vote to adjourn the last Senate meeting was in order. Gates noticed that there was a lack of quorum at the present meeting. There was a brief informal discussion - not related to the written agenda - regarding comparisons and criteria for peer institutions and many factors involved in determining faculty salaries. A couple of senators arrived and Gates announced that there was a quorum.
III. MOTIONS/RESOLUTIONS STATUS – Gates noted the motions and resolutions were up-to-date and available online.

IV. PROVOST’S BUDGET AND RESOLUTION STATUS REPORTS
Although Dr. Burwell had no new information to report regarding budget and resolution’s status, he did mention that the Office of Academic Affairs intends to “spend down everything.” He explained that each college could spend down half of their lapsed salaries. He also noted nothing would be “rolled over” into next year’s budgets. Academic Affairs was following recommendations from the OP to “spend down” the budget, according to Burwell. Senator Koch asked Burwell to explain why there was a large deficit in the 2003 academic budget and a $59,000 surplus in the athletics budget in 2001. Dr. Burwell noted that he would look into it and report back to the Senate at the next meeting.

Before continuing to VI. Committee Reports the chair proceeded to vote to adjourn the last meeting. The February 9, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned by a vote on March 15, 2004 at 3:58 p.m.

Senator Moore moved and Senator Waring seconded to adjourn the February 9, 2004 meeting.

VOTE 3. Motion to Adjourn February 9, 2004 meeting
(the 3rd & final vote of the February 9th meeting as recorded and appended in the February 9, 2004 minutes )
17 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

Chair Gates convened the March 15th meeting and proceeded to call for a vote on the February 9th minutes.

Senator Hall moved and Senator Simon seconded to approve the February 9, 2004 minutes (as amended).

VOTE 1. Motion approve the February 9, 2004 Minutes (as amended).
18 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS
Gates noted, in light of the fact that many untenured faculty had responded unfavorably to the DPC Reform Proposal survey, the ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Governance had since re-evaluated and produced a revised proposal. Koch said, “the one consistent thing that kept coming up was from untenured people who felt like they were being disenfranchised.” He noted that the newly modified proposal would allow for the inclusion of an untenured faculty member serving
on DPCs. Senator Koch reasoned that by adding one untenured faculty member to a DPC, it would alleviate untenured faculty’s concerns about losing their input on DPCs. He informed senators that he had since spoken to a lot of untenured faculty about the revised version of the proposal and that they were in favor of the addition of an untenured member. It was not part of the written agenda so he introduced the motion by reading it aloud:

**DPC Reform Resolution**

The Faculty Senate instructs that Handbook Committee to replace the current language in the Faculty Handbook on the composition of DPC’s to reflect the following structure:

1. The DPC will consist of all tenured faculty in a department plus one untenured faculty member. The untenured member of the DPC and one untenured alternate will be selected by a vote of the untenured members of the department. The term of service on the DPC for untenured members is one year.

2. The DPC may constitute subcommittees as needed in order to further departmental business.

3. The DPC and all subcommittees will operate under Robert’s Rules of Order.

Senator Koch explained the reasons for re-writing the motion about DPC reform. After re-evaluating the original motion and getting feedback from faculty about it, he realized that “a one-size fits all” approach would not work. Further, he reasoned that the new streamlined proposal allowed for greater flexibility within departments. He explained that the strategy or “idea was to enfranchise non-tenured faculty.” Senator Lambert expressed concern about the proposal’s inclusion of all tenured faculty on DPCs because her department had a large number of tenured faculty. Senator Hall was concerned about workload problems that might arise for tenured faculty if the proposal were implemented. Senator Anderson noted that departments had the option of setting up subcommittees that might help balance workloads. Senator Yaukey supported the motion and noted that it would allow for a more open process of hiring within departments. Senator Weitz also supported the motion and commented that all tenured faculty needed to be involved in the decision-making process. Senator Koch noted that the DPC proposal would generate less secrecy in the hiring process and more collegiality among faculty. Senator Staub voiced opposition to the proposal stating that it would create an “all boys club” and create more stress for faculty. Senator Weiss argued that “one person’s secrecy is another’s confidentiality” and that the motion had the potential to be hurtful and disruptive. Senators continued to debate the issue of confidentiality versus secrecy. Senator Hall brought up the issue of the lack of diversity within departments. Senator Anderson pointed out that faculty diversity was a bigger issue and it needed to be addressed in the future but it was not an issue related to the resolution at hand. Senator Rardin and Senator Cramer asked for clarification on the motion’s wording. Senator Moore pointed out that 15 state institutions did not include untenured faculty on their DPCs. Senator Gates noted that the motion was an attempt to accommodate the COC
and faculty. Senator Weitz suggested that the Faculty Handbook Committee re-write the language on DPCs. Senator Arnold asked that definitions page be included with the revised handbook language. Senator Koch reminded senators that the motion’s purpose was to charge the Faculty Handbook Committee to produce specific language regarding DPC reform. Senator Cramer clarified the exact wording of the motion and read it aloud.

**VOTE 2. Resolution DPC Reform (as revised) –**

10 YES 4 NO 5 ABSTAIN

The motion passed.

A. Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Governance (KOCH, McGarry, Weitz)

1.) FS03-04/03-01 – Motion to Propose Changes to the Faculty Constitution-

1. Preamble.

From: The faculty of Appalachian State University acknowledges the principle of faculty self-government and also recognizes its responsibility for helping the University administration direct the internal affairs of this institution.

To: The faculty of Appalachian State University acknowledges the principle of faculty self-government and recognizes its role in directing the internal affairs of this institution.

2. Article II, Section 3.

From: Those eligible to serve on and participate in election of members to departmental personnel committees are full time faculty in the ranks of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

To: Those eligible to serve on and participate in election of members to departmental personnel committees, grievance and due process committees, and the Faculty Senate are full time faculty in the ranks of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

3. Article III, Section 2.

From: The Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, as chair of the faculty, shall preside at the faculty meetings.

To: The Chair of the Faculty Senate, as chair of the faculty, shall preside at the faculty meetings.
4. Article III, Section 3.

From: The chair of the Faculty Senate shall be the vice chair of the faculty and shall assist the chair of the faculty in the performance of the duties of the chair of the faculty, including such duties as presiding at the faculty meetings in the absence of the chair of the faculty.

To: The vice-president of the Faculty Senate shall be the vice chair of the faculty and shall assist the chair of the faculty in the performance of the duties of the chair of the faculty, including such duties as presiding at the faculty meetings in the absence of the chair of the faculty.

5. Article IV, Section 2.

From: The purpose of the Faculty Senate shall be to participate in the formation, implementation, and review of the University policy and to provide means for the faculty to act effectively on matters with which it is concerned.

To: The purpose of the Faculty Senate shall be to participate in the formation, implementation, and review of the University policy and to provide means for the faculty to act effectively on university matters.

6. Article IV, Section 3.

From: The Senate shall be composed of twenty-seven faculty members elected by the faculty. The twenty-seven members shall be elected as follows:

a. Nine senators shall be elected at large.
b. The eighteen faculty seats shall be apportioned among the degree-granting colleges, schools and the Library. Each degree-granting college or school and the Library faculty shall be apportioned at least one Senate seat. (Hereafter, the degree-granting colleges, schools and the Library shall be referred to as the colleges.) For purposes of apportioning representation to the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate, a faculty member is here defined as anyone holding on the following ranks: Lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Excluded from the operational definition are emeriti faculty and adjunct faculty. For purposes of apportioning representation to the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate the following factors shall not be deemed relevant: duration of appointment, magnitude of teaching responsibilities, geographical location of the teaching activity, or leave status. Persons holding joint appointments shall be counted as faculty members in only one department.

In the actual apportionment procedure, the following rules apply: 1.) In the fall semester of each academic year (but prior to November 1) the Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning will forward to the faculty elections officer a count of the number of faculty (using the
definition of faculty outlined in the preceding paragraph) in each college. 2.) The percentage of faculty in each college is to be computed to five decimal places (e.g., .41095 or 41.095%). 3.) The number of seats to be allocated to each college is computed by multiplying the percentage found in @.) above by eighteen (e.g., .41095 x 18 = 7.40); this calculation is to be rounded to the nearest one hundredth. Each college receives the number of seats given by this calculation (fractions of a seat are ignored). If this sum totals less than eighteen, the remaining seats will be allocated using the fractions of a seat. The college with the highest fraction receives an additional seat; the college with the second highest fraction receives and additional seat. This process continues until exactly eighteen seats are allocated. The faculty elections officer shall communicate each allocation to the deans of the various colleges and their respective elections chairs by December 1.

To: The Senate shall be composed of faculty members and elected by faculty members. Members shall be elected as follows:
   a. The faculty in each academic department will elect one senator from their department.
   b. The faculty of the Library shall elect one senator from their area.
   c. The faculty of the School of Music shall elect one senator from their area.
   d. The faculty of the university shall elect six faculty at large.

7. Article IV, Section 5

From: The normally designated term of office for Faculty Senate members is three years. Terms of members will be staggered so that six vacancies occur each year among senators elected from the individual colleges. Three members at large shall be elected annually.

To: The normally designated term of office for Faculty Senate members is three years. Terms of members will be staggered so that approximately one third of the membership is elected annually.

8. Article IV, Section 6

From: Procedures for electing the members of the Senate:

   a. The procedure for electing senators from each college shall be: 1.) By August 15, the vice chair of the Faculty Senate, who is the senate elections officer, shall name an elections chair for each college, school, and Library for the entire academic year. 2.) The Senate elections officer shall request that the elections chair of each college, school, and Library provide a mechanism for the nomination of candidates for the college elections. 3.) Prior to March 1, the faculty members of each college shall vote to elect the number of Senate members allocated. All voting
shall be by secret ballot. It shall be the responsibility of the elections chair to set the date, time, and place of voting; prepare the ballots; supervise the election; provide for the tabulation of votes; notify all nominees of the election results; and report the results of the election to the senate elections officer. 4.) The senate elections officer shall announce the results of each election to the general faculty.

b. The procedure for electing members at large shall be as follows: 1.) Membership at large in the Senate shall be determined by the faculty on the basis of an annual election to be held during the spring term prior to March 31. All voting shall be by secret ballot. 2.) The senate elections officer shall set the deadline for the submission of nominations for members at large. Space for write-in votes will be provided on the ballots. 3.) It shall be the responsibility of the senate elections officer to set the date, time, and place of voting; prepare the ballots; arrange for absentee balloting; supervise the election; provide for the tabulation of the ballots; and notify all nominees of the election results prior to announcing those results to the general faculty.

To: Procedures for electing the members of the Senate:

a. In early March, the vice chair of the Faculty Senate, who is the Senate elections officer shall request nominations from the faculty in each department, school, the Library, and/or the college where a vacancy occurs.

b. In late March, the Senate elections officer shall conduct the elections. A space for write-in votes will be provided on the ballots. It shall be the responsibility of the elections officer to set the date, time, and place of voting; prepare the ballots; supervise the election; provide for the tabulation of votes; notify all nominees of the election results prior to announcing those results to the general faculty; and announce the results of the elections to the general faculty by early April.

9. Article IV, Section 9

From: The Senate shall meet as follows:

a. A regular meeting of the full Senate shall be held monthly during the academic term. Summer meetings will be scheduled as needed.

To: The Senate shall meet as follows:
a. A regular meeting of the full Senate shall be held on the first and third Monday of each month. Committee meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be held on the remaining Mondays of each month. Summer meetings will be scheduled as needed. Senators will receive one course release time to accommodate this work.

Senator Weitz explained that the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate’s structure were “largely based on faculty lack of interest and involvement in faculty governance.” She commented that communication between the Faculty Senate and faculty was important and could be improved by changing to departmental representation rather than college representation. She briefly pointed out the proposed changes in the Faculty Constitution. Senator Anderson suggested dropping Article III, sec. 2., which states that the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, as chair, shall preside at the faculty meeting. Senators Weitz, Gates, Waring and Koch discussed the pros and cons of changing the section about the faculty chair. Senator Bush asked why the athletics department had never been represented on the Faculty Senate. Senator Moore noted that only teaching faculty members were eligible for service on the Faculty Senate. Although the athletics department had no ties to academic governance, Moore explained that faculty members teaching in the HLES department who were also involved in athletics programs – such as coaching - remained eligible for service. Senator Arnold asked that the words “Lecturer” and “Instructor” be stricken from the language in Article II, Sec. 3. of the proposal. There was a brief discussion about the terms, “Lecturer” and “Instructor”. Senator Weitz accepted suggestions to change Article II, Sec. 3. in motion by striking the words, “and the Faculty Senate” as well as the words, “Lecturer” and “Instructor.” Senator Moore warned that the suggested deletions had the potential to disenfranchise full-time lecturers and instructors. Senator Weitz reasoned that by eliminating full-time Lecturers and Instructors from Article II, Sec. 3., the Faculty Handbook’s wording would stay consistent with other language that also excluded full-time Lectures and Instructors. Senator Moore suggested deleting the word “the” from “…shall preside at the faculty meetings” in Article III, Sec. 2. to read, “…shall preside at faculty meetings.” Senator Moore also asked what the word “normally” meant, as written in Article IV. Sec. 5. Senator Weitz explained the word “normally” was appropriate for defining the 3-year term of service on the Senate because there had been so many abnormal terms of service due to a variety of factors. Senator Anderson was concerned that the section that addressed release time would not be accepted by administration and suggested removing it from the motion. Senator Weitz pointed out that any proposed changes to the Faculty Constitution would ultimately have to be voted on and ratified by the faculty body. Senator Waring supported the notion of increasing the size of the Senate by adding departmental representatives. Senator Rardin questioned the rationale for increasing Senate representatives in view of the fact that there were already a number of unfilled seats on the current Senate. There was a brief discussion about the proposal to increase Senate meetings. Issues concerning the legitimacy and effectiveness of the Faculty Senate were also talked about. Moore wrapped up the discussion, noting that it seemed like it was time for change and re-structuring.

Due to a lack of quorum the meeting was disbanded at 6:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY - FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
March 15, 2004
Voting Symbols: Y = yes N = no A = abstain

ANDERSON, STELLA Y Y
ARNOLD, EDWIN Y N
BUSH, ROBERT Y Y
CRAMER, BETH Y A
DEL PLIEGO, BENITO -excused
GATES, PAUL Y Y
HALL, KIM Y A
JAMISON, TOM Y Y
KEASLER, TERRY Y A
KOCH, ANDREW Y Y
LAMBERT, MONICA Y Y
MARKING, MARTHA - EXCUSED
McCaughey, Martha Y Y
McGarry, Rick -EXCUSED
McKINNEY, HAROLD -excused
MOORE, MICHAEL Y Y
MUIR, KEN -excused
OLSON, GEORGE - excused
RARDIN, PATRICK N
SIMON, KATHLEEN Y Y
STAUB, SUSAN Y Y
WARING, DOUG Y Y
WEISS, AMY Y A
WEITZ, GAYLE Y Y
YAUKEY, MARGARET Y N

VOTE 1: Motion approve the February 9, 2004 Minutes (as amended)
VOTE 2: Motion on DPC Reform (as revised).

VISITORS: Dr. Tim Burwell, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Dr. Harry Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity