At 3:35 p.m. on March 18, 2002, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors' names.)
B. FACULTY SENATE MOTIONS/RESOLUTIONS UPDATE. Weitz noted that the status of Faculty Senate motions/resolutions can be viewed at http://www.facsen.appstate.edu/Resolutions/Res2001-2002.html. Weitz has a meeting with Durham this week and will try to get updated information on the status of Senate motions.
C. REMAINING MEETINGS. Weitz reported that the remaining spring Faculty Senate meetings are March 18, March 25, April 8, April 15 and May 6. Weitz hoped that these meetings would adjourn by 6:00 p.m. The May 6 meeting, which will be a short one, will end this Senate and convene the next Senate. Elections for new officers will take place at that meeting also. A dinner will be held shortly after the May 6 meeting adjourns.

II. MINUTES
A motion was made and seconded to approve the first part of the February 11 minutes as written.

VOTE # 1  20 yes  0 no  1 abstain  The motion passed.

The Budget Committee asked that its report be first on the agenda.

III. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. BUDGET COMMITTEE
1. Report on 101-1310 ranking of reclaimed positions. Petschauer noted that McLaughlin did most of the work on this report. The Committee was concerned to know the progress on reducing Academic Affairs funding from 101-1310 of non-teaching positions. The report compares the data from the Budget Committee’s January 2001 report with their report of January 2002 and finds the biggest change to be that the majority of the development officers positions have been removed from 101-1310.

The Committee also compared data from Academic Affairs with the Committee’s own data. There were a few discrepancies between data. Academic Affairs included salaries from the Hubbard Center and ITS where the Budget Committee did not. The Budget Committee included salaries of advisors and freshmen seminar where Academic Affairs did not. Weitz asked if the Senate wanted to prioritize a list of areas that should next be deleted from 101-1310 funds. McLaughlin added that the Committee has not yet compared Appalachian’s practices in this area with other universities in the system. McLaughlin also added that he and Petschauer met with Durham and learned that salaries from advising, assistant deans, and other grab-bag positions have been covered by 101-1310 for historical reasons. The positions happened to have
been placed in the fund at one point for one reason or another and there they have stayed.

McLaughlin noted that he thought those grab-bag positions are the ones that need to be looked at. The Committee also asked for input from the Senate on the appropriateness of using these funds for advisors and assistant deans. Hall asked what advisors do. McLaughlin responded that there are two types of advisors: college-based advisors and enrollment services advisors, who advise first year students. In some instances advisors teach freshmen seminar or a course in a department but primarily advising is their job and they work really hard at it. Weitz added the our administration views teaching duties to include advising therefore advising and teaching are synonymous in terms of usage of that money. Weitz noted that she spoke with Nancy Spann who said that there are three or four positions in which a full-time or tenure-track faculty member has a 1/4 reassignment to General Studies for advising. McLaughlin noted that the General Administration definition of 1310 funds is very general. Weitz reiterated McLaughlin’s suggestion that the grab-bag positions be looked at first.

Discussion followed on those catch-all categories starting with Cultural Affairs. It was suggested that with the amount of money those programs generate, that salaries for those positions come from somewhere other than 101-1310. McLaughlin added that the reason the Cultural Affairs director is paid out of faculty funds is because when the position was created it was held by a faculty member on reassignment. Then the job was professionalized and the director’s salary continued to come out of the fund even though it is no longer a faculty position.

Weitz responded a question from Hall that it has been worked out with Athletics that that quarter-time they teach will be paid from 101-1310. Weitz assumed that this practice would be applied to the other categories. Moore noted that for some positions, one-quarter of their salaries might equal one-half a faculty member’s salary and become a disproportionate expense. After some discussion, Weitz noted that the reason this issue was before the Senate was because it is a way of dealing with how can we minimize workload by maximizing the positions allocated and using all the money intended for faculty toward faculty salaries. The question is not whether these programs/positions should exist, but where they should be paid from. It was suggested at looking at those positions that are furthest removed from teaching. After further discussion, the Senate came up with two tiers of recommendations for removing from 101-1310: 1) Cultural Affairs, Development, and Academic Computing; and 2) Associate and Assistant Deans. Progress on these recommendations will be made checked annually the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.

Millsaps asked what happened to the money after it returned to Academic Affairs from Athletics. McLaughlin responded that he asked Durham the same question and his reply was that the money remained in the salary pool. When Millsaps noted that this money should go towards new positions, Ward responded that we cannot create new positions but there may be a position out there which could be brought up to standard if somebody were hired into that position.

2. **Report on distribution of faculty salaries.** Petschauer reported that it has been a long, consistent pattern at Appalachian to have a huge cohort of senior faculty members. That cohort had risen to 49% in 1988 but has since declined to 39% (2000-2001). Petschauer added that no other UNC institution has a cohort rate that high. The Committee has not received all the data yet, but when they do, they will look at faculty salaries over the last 20 years in relationship to senior faculty. Weitz added that she spoke with Bobby Sharp last week regarding the statistics for the difference between male and female faculty salaries and how those have changed. This material will be ready for the next Faculty Senate meeting. Marking asked if a comparison has
been done between the different colleges/school. Weitz responded that this information is in the report distributed annually by Dr. Durham.

B. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON DPCs
   Final report/Committee recommendations. Weitz highlighted the changes being proposed (in the green document) from what is in the current (1989) Faculty Handbook. In terms of DPC composition, the basic change is that the Ad-hoc Committee is proposing that departments be able to select what the composition of the DPC will be. There are four options for this: 1) essentially the current practice; 2) representation is based on the program area; 3) DPC is all tenured and tenure-track faculty; and 4) DPC is all tenured faculty. The Ad-hoc Committee thought that some of the problems facing some departments could be resolved by having different structure options. Weitz noted that one of the major problems voiced to the Committee by untenured faculty was an insecurity of making decisions regarding promotion and tenure on personnel committees so it was thought that the alternate should be tenured faculty so that the untenured faculty, if they so desired, could leave the committee and a tenured person could fill in. In point E of the composition of DPCs proposal, the change there is that the chair of the DPC will no longer be assumed to be the department chair. The DPC will decide on the Committee chair. It still could be the department chair if the Committee so desires. The department chair would be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the DPC.

   Discussion followed on the argument of non-tenure faculty possibly being forced off the DPC. Weitz added that Appalachian is the only UNC institution that allows untenured faculty on the DPC. Koch noted that with no uniformity of how DPCs are selected, there may be issues of fairness across the campus. Weitz responded that since Appalachian has such a variety of department compositions, at this point, while it may be problematic, these options seem to be a better fit than a one-size fits all which seemed to the Committee to be more unfair.

   Arnold noted that this is a major change that should go before the faculty. Butts added that the faculty need to vote on this. Butts noted this if this is to be presented to the faculty, then option IV should be left as an option for faculty to view. Pope asked that considerations be made on how to protect non-tenured faculty on DPCs, not to eliminate them. She also added that consideration be made that the Equal Opportunity Officer not be non-tenured faculty. Moore responded that the new Faculty Handbook requires the EEOC to be nontenured.

   Yaukey suggested an email poll on five or six major issues. Weitz asked if the Senate wanted to continue discussing and making changes to the document before it is presented to the faculty as a whole. A motion was made to table voting on the recommendations until further information was provided.

   VOTE # 2 21 yes 1 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

C. FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE
   Update. Moore reported that there has been on-going discussions between senior administrators and Gretchen Bataille of the General Administration. There are two minor adjustments about which Durham still needs to inform Bataille. Weitz said that the requirements for tenure and promotion would not be changed in the new chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook, despite it being possible the President’s Office might mandate changing our guidelines to require accomplishment in all three categories.

D. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
   1. FS01-02/03-01 - Motion to Form an Ad-hoc Committee on Distance Education.
Simon reviewed the motion. Discussion followed. Yaukey asked was is in place now. Weitz responded that right now a group of non-faculty people are running the Distance Education program (Office of Extension Instruction). Koch asked why the Dean of the College of Education was on the committee. The response was that most programs come from that College. Barber asked if a Faculty Senator should serve as a liaison on the Committee. Weitz noted that this Committee would be an ad-hoc committee of the Senate and that it will make a final report to the Senate. An amendment was approved that a representative from the Office of Extension Instruction serve on the ad-hoc committee as an ex-officio, non-voting member. A vote was taken on the motion as amended.

VOTE # 3 21 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

FS01-02/03-01 - Motion to Form an Ad-hoc Committee on Distance Education
Move to establish an ad-hoc committee composed of the Dean of the College of Education, two chairs (one from a department with a distance learning program), four faculty members (two from departments with distance learning programs), and a representative from the Office of Extension Instruction (ex officio and non-voting), whose charge will be to examine distance learning programs with regard to how well they parallel on-campus programs and services, to determine whether similar approval and evaluation procedures are followed, and the positioning of distance education activities within the academic structure.

Rationale:
Distance education has grown rapidly in the last few years and is expected to grow even more rapidly in the future. Several concerns related to distance education were revealed by the SACS self-study. Distance education students deserve academic programs and services equal to those provided on the Boone campus. Distance education is an academic function requiring faculty oversight.

2. FS01-02/03-02 - Motion to Form an Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Governance.
Simon reviewed the motion noting that it has been 12 years since the Academic Policies & Procedures manual has been updated. Woodworth asked who did the last review but no one knew the answer; Ward guessed AP&P. Rardin asked why this is being done. Weitz answered that there has been evidence in the minds of faculty this year that there is a conflict of interest in having the person to whom the recommendations are made run the committee that serves as the check and balance to that decision. An amendment was approved that a representative from AP&P be an ex officio, non-voting member of the ad-hoc committee. A vote was taken on the motion as amended.

VOTE # 4 22 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

FS01-02/03-02 - Motion to Form an Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Governance
Move to establish an ad-hoc committee composed of a dean, two chairs, four faculty members, and a representative from AP&P (ex officio and non-voting), whose charge is to update the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, examining the university's academic governance structure, policies and procedures, and recommending changes, if necessary.
Rationale:
- The AP&P Manual is 12 years old.
- There appear to be curricular matters which fall outside the current AP&P structure, such as: graduate professional certificates, consortium agreements and distance learning programs, relocation of programs, international programs and establishment of schools, centers, institutes and similar academic units.
- Academic governance responsibilities for curricular issues are delegated to the faculty by the Faculty Handbook, the UNC Code and SACS accreditation standards.
- Effective shared governance requires that the AP&P committee be entirely independent of the academic level that the recommendation is forwarded to.
- Our current governance structure does not link to current university planning documents (e.g. strategic plans, unit plans, 5-year plans and the master plan.)

3. FS01-02/03-03 - Motion to Form an Ad-hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Simon reviewed the motion. Weitz clarified that the goal of this ad-hoc committee would be to see how close the changes that are going to be proposed by the Office of the President are to current department documents. Butts offered that the motion was premature—that the Faculty Senate should wait until and guidelines come down from the President’s Office and let departments then review their own guidelines for consistency. Weitz responded that it would be a morale issue that faculty would choose to raise the bar before they are told they have to do so. Also, that a review might show that departments have already raised the bar. Weitz added that she has all the promotion and tenure documents from each department. Butts said he not think that any committee has to review the documents—that one person could read through the documents and note where there may be problems. Koch added that this is an administrators job to make sure that the documents are consistent with General Administration policy. Moore expressed concern that a myth was being made into truth by repetition. The myth was that Bataille had mandated or would require Appalachian to change its tenure and promotion requirements by raising the bar. He said that in January he had forwarded senators an email quoting Bataille on this issue, and that she never said there would be such a requirement. In fact, she said that Appalachian could develop its own policies in this area and that she was only noting that such a change would in her opinion better accord with Appalachian’s stated mission. Yaukey added that this is a dean and chairs job. Barber called for the question.

VOTE # 5  22 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The question passed.

A vote was taken on the motion as written.

VOTE # 6  2 yes  19 no  1 abstain  The motion failed.

4. FS01-02/03-04 - Motion to Streamline Paperwork
Simon reviewed the motion and a vote was taken on the motion as written.

VOTE # 7  5 yes  12 no  4 abstain  The motion failed.

Simon moved and it was seconded to adjourn until the 25th of April.
VOTE # 8  19 yes   1 no   0 abstain   The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore

**FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET**
**MARCH 18, 2002**

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>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>unexcused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROCKER, DEBORAH</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX, JERRY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL, KIM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG, BETTY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUGHLIN, TOM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLSAPS, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MIKE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIR, KEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETSCHAUER, PETER</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPE, JANICE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARDIN, PATRICK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUETT, CAROL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITZ, GAYLE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHYTE, TOM  excused
WOODWORTH, JOAN  Y Y Y Y N Y Y
YAUKEY, MARGARET  Y Y Y Y Y N N Y

VISITORS:  Ian Mast, ACLU student; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs

VOTE 1:  Motion to approve the first part of the February 11 minutes as written
VOTE 2:  Motion to table a vote on the DPC Ad-hoc Committee recommendations
VOTE 3:  FS01-02/03-01 - Motion to form an ad-hoc committee on distance education
VOTE 4:  FS01-02/03-02 - Motion to form an ad-hoc committee on academic governance
VOTE 5:  Call for the question
VOTE 6:  FS01-02/03-03 - Motion to form an ad-hoc committee on promotion and tenure guidelines
VOTE 7:  FS01-02/03-04 - Motion to streamline paperwork
VOTE 8:  Adjourn

Faculty Senate
Appalachian State University

III.D.1.  - Report on 101-1310 Ranking of Reclaimed Positions
Teaching and Learning at Appalachian - Removing Non-Teaching Positions from 101 and 1310.

In January of 2001, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution that asked for the removal from 101 and 1310 that are not significantly involved with teaching at Appalachian. This resolution resulted in several efforts since then to come to grips not only the interpretation of the data available from the BD119, but also the changing nature of the positions involved. At the time, the Budget Committee (under the leadership of Dr. Sandie Gravett) submitted the following accounting of the positions involved:

Four Development Directors  $ 157,979
Ten Asst. and Assoc. Deans  $ 749,470
A number of Athletic Positions  $ 784,357
Directors, Advisors, Managers  $ 723,232
Enrollment Services (adv., tutors) $ 618,538
Grand Total $3,033,556

In the Budget Committee's efforts to accommodate this resolution, the Committee once more combed the BD119 and revisited the positions and their assignments. Here are the findings as of January, 2002:

One Part-Time Development Officer $ 16,000
Nine Asst. and Assoc. Deans  $ 751,000
Administrators, Directors, etc.  $ 638,000
Advisors $ 459,000

Grand Total $1,864,000
With 16% Benefits at $ 298,240
$2,164,000

That is, all athletic personnel has been removed from the 101 and 1310 lines and all but $16000 of the development funds has also been removed from these lines. Thus the original amount from the fall of 2000 has been reduced to approximately $2,091,236. The $227,000 is due in large part to interpretations of what is and what is not a teaching position.

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Dr. Harvey Durham had begun to address the Senate’s concern on September 6, 2001. In a memorandum of that date, he summarized specifics of his office’s interpretation of the Committee’s motion and the positions offered for transfer from 101 and 1310. We now provide a comparison of Dr. Durham’s and the Committee’s latest interpretations of the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad.Affairs</th>
<th>Budget Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cult. Affairs (3) $155,188</td>
<td>(3) $158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Progr. (2) $90,209</td>
<td>(2) $ 85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Ass. (3) $167,767</td>
<td>(3) $188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development (1) $ 97,802</td>
<td>(1) $ 16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Comput. (1) $ 73,882</td>
<td>(1) $ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Ctr (2) $168,507</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS (1) $ 68,445</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S (5) $294,440</td>
<td>(4) $227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. (2) $195,000</td>
<td>(4) $324,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. (3) $224,586</td>
<td>(2) $159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA (1) $ 78,967</td>
<td>(1) $ 82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus. (1) $67,707</td>
<td>(1) $ 70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS (1) $78,940</td>
<td>(1) $ 82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors ----</td>
<td>$364,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh.Sem. ----</td>
<td>(1) $34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals $ 1,761,440</td>
<td>$ 1,864,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, interpretative discussions will need to address the Hubbard Center, ITS, advisors and Freshmen Seminar positions. The Committee began these discussions with Dr. Durham and both he and members of the Committee reiterated its sense that positions need to be moved, and will be moved, from 101 and 1310 at a reasonable pace. A pace that now depends not only on our will to change but also funds to do so.

The Committee suggests that the Senate emphasize the agreement between its findings and that of the Office of Academic Affairs on many positions. It also suggests that this office begin the devolution of positions with the areas that seem most remote from students, that is, the principal mission of the institution.
III.D.2. - Report on Distribution of Faculty Salaries

The major detriment to attaining a level of salaries that are truly reflective of the quality and effort of Appalachian’s faculty remains the large number of senior professors working at our institution. Ever since the mid-1980s, this cohort has risen so dramatically that in 1988, almost half (49%) of our faculty were professors. The ratio has since descended to 39%, but it is still a powerful determiner of our salary situation. It has not only determined our relative competitiveness vis-a-vis comparative institutions nationally and locally (within UNC) but also the salary distribution internally.

The good news is that Appalachian is third with its average salary of $57,117 when compared to a cohort of sixteen similar institutions. Our Associate Professors rank fourth (at $55,324), our new assistant professors rank fifth (at $43,825) and our instructors rank first (at $42,242). The bad news is that Appalachian’s professors rank eleventh (with $65,644) and our Assistant Professors rank seventh (at $44,840).

Our salary disadvantage shows especially clearly in a comparison of similar comprehensive institutions within UNC. Our overall ranking is fourth out of the six institutions at $57.117. Our professors rank last (at $65,644), our associates rank fourth (at $55,324), our assistants a rank fifth (at $44,840) and our new assistants rank fourth (at $43,825). The only bright spot are our instructors, they rank second (at $42,242).

Aside from the persistent efforts President Molly Broad, Chancellor Frank Borkowski, and many others who recognize this lack of competitiveness, only two other givens will change our faculty salary picture. One is a revitalization of the governor’s and legislature's interest in salaries of all state employees, especially faculty members. Two is the continuing and gradual adjustment of the number and percentage of senior professors working at Appalachian.