APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 19, 2001
(4/9/2001 - approved as written)

At 3:18 p.m. on March 19, 2001, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)
   B. SENATOR REPLACEMENT. Weitz noted that Ken Muir has volunteered to replace Jeff Bortz for the remainder of this Senate year. A replacement for the remaining term (2002) will be elected during the at-large elections. Weitz welcomed Muir.
   C. CHANCELLOR’S ADVISORY MEETING REPORT. Weitz reported that a small group met with the Chancellor where the major topic of discussion was concern about the lack of diversity at Appalachian. The Chancellor would like to do another push for diversity on campus and is forming another committee to study and make recommendations to improve diversity and has asked for the names of four or five senators to serve on the committee. Weitz asked for volunteers and the following volunteered: Steve Simon, Patricia Allen, Joan Woodworth, and Ken Muir.
   D. COUNCIL OF CHAIRS MEETING. Weitz reported that at the March 1 Council of Chairs meeting, they spent a lot of time talking about extension classes. There was also an interesting report from the Graduate School on professional certificates (non-degree programs that address the needs of working people to be trained or retrained in other areas and then are certified after completing the period of training). There are about a dozen of these program on campus and it was brought to everyone’s attention that these programs do not go through AP&P— the Graduate School just decides what they are. Weitz noted that she has asked Gates and the Academic Policy Committee to look into this.
   Weitz reported that there was also discussion on the use of human subjects in research. It was very unclear as to what Appalachian’s policy is and who must adhere to that. Bob Johnson is supposed to come up with materials on this issue to disseminate to all faculty to help make this issue clearer.
   There was also discussion about the Senate’s previous motion regarding department chairs not serving on DPCs as the chair of the Committee. The results of this discussion will be taken up by Gates and the Academic Policy Committee.
   E. MEETING WITH SGA PRESIDENT. Weitz reported that she met with Ryan Bolick, SGA President, on several issues. Bolick asked that Weitz announce that the Faculty/Staff appreciation breakfast sponsored by SGA will be April 10, 7:00-10:00 a.m. in the Student Union. Weitz encouraged senators (and their colleagues) to attend.
II. GUEST SPEAKERS

A. PAT REIGHARD. Pat Reighard, chair of District 3 of the State Employees Association of North Carolina (SEANC), spoke to the Senate regarding SEANC and how it has been instrumental in lobbying the state legislature for faculty/staff raises. Reighard encouraged senators to join SEANC, the largest non-union public employees association in the nation with a little over 60,000 members. SEANC’s mission is to protect and enhance the rights and benefits of current, retired, and future state employees. Their issues include health care, retirement, and job security. Reighard distributed to senators a brochure with various information on SEANC and noted that there are many benefits that come with being a member. There are district meetings held monthly and invited senators to attend. Reighard asked senators to spread the word about SEANC noting that some faculty members may not be aware of it. Weitz added that this organization is for all state employees and is possibly one that can accomplish better health benefits for all.

B. ANN VILES. Ann Viles from the Library was asked to attend out of discussion the Senate had at its last meeting regarding the new library complex and to answer questions from senators including whether or not the new library will be able to house the collections for the next 20-30 years. Viles responded that there is no way to answer that question with certainty, but that the Committee is looking at past growth patterns as well as the size and composition of the current collection to try to project how much space will be needed for books and other materials. A task force report in 1996 projected that the library would need an additional 91,000 assignable square feet (ASF) through 2022. The Eva Klein & Associates report in 1999 indicated that the library’s Total Actual ASF was 67,599 less than the standard recommended for an institution of our size. This variance was projected to be 99,444 ASF in 2008.

When asked how big the new library would be, Viles replied that the UNC Board of Governors budget request for 1999-2001 requested funding for construction of a 231,000-square-foot library. The size of our present facility is 105,000 square feet.

Viles noted that an architect and building committee are just now being appointed. (Weitz added that Woodworth will be the Senate representative on the building committee.) Viles also noted that visits have been made to libraries built within the last five years to see how they were designed and what they took into account. Koch asked if there will be research cubicles for faculty and Viles responded that they are being considered.

Gates noted there has been talk that part of the collection may be housed remotely at some distant location and was asked if that being considered. Viles responded no, and that she and others at the Library appreciated and supported the Senate’s February resolution to house the collection in the new library.

III. MINUTES

Simon moved and Allen seconded to approve the February 12 minutes as written.

VOTE # 1 17 yes 0 no 2 abstain  The motion passed.

Weitz requested that the order of the agenda be switched—instead of the Ad-hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluations going second, Weitz suggested that the Welfare and Morale Committee go second. She then asked for any objections. There were none.
A vote was taken on Weitz’s recommendation that Muir replace Bortz for the remaining Senate year.

VOTE # 2  18 yes  0 no  1 abstain  The recommendation was passed.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE

Motion FS00-01/03-01 - Approve the February 2001 Draft of The Academic Integrity Code.

Rationale: The February 2001 draft of The Academic Integrity Code amends the current Academic Integrity Code. The amendments have the approval of Academic Integrity Committee, a subcommittee of Student Government Association, University Administration, University Attorney, and Welfare of Students Committee of Faculty Senate. The changes provide a remedy to the power inequity in one-on-one faculty-student negotiation. The goal is to prevent an unlawful resolution to a charge of violating the academic integrity code.

Rardin noted about the current draft that the draft puts a time limit on the process; that the draft has administrative support meaning that if faculty members follow the guidelines, the administration will support them in their decision; and that the draft adds an educational component to the process--one of the sanctions is to require the student to go through an education process.

Allen recommended that the term AIB be defined before using it in the document.

Ward noted that the issue of whether a failing course grade assigned under a first-offense consent resolution takes the form of an XF needs to be determined. The students in attendance as well as senators agreed that an F is an F and the transcript does not need to show an XF.

Rardin noted that there may be an interpretation of the current Code that would lead one to believe that the faculty and student can work out an agreement on their own with some sort of non-sanctioned sanction. That is not what the current Code is intended to do. If faculty are working out personal agreements with students with no paper trail, then they are in violation of the current Code.

Weitz asked if the new Code is adopted, when would it be implemented and what the process would be to amend it and who would be involved (since it is a new document and may need revisions). A student representative replied that it would be implemented in Fall 2001 and that amendments could be proposed by any body, but that Faculty Senate would have to approve.

Truett noted that one of the major things that faculty do is evaluate student work and that she felt uncomfortable with both the current and proposed Code because faculty are giving up their authority and responsibility to evaluate and grade students.

Allen called for the question and Dobson seconded.

VOTE # 3  20 yes  0 no  1 abstain  The question was approved.

A vote was taken on the motion as written (to approve the February 2001 draft of The Academic Integrity Code).

VOTE # 4  15 yes  2 no  4 abstain  The motion passed.
B. WELFARE AND MORALE

1. Resolution FS00-01/03-04 - Opposition to the Governor’s Directive to Place Funds Designated for the State Retirement Plan into an Emergency Reserve Account. Arnold noted that the resolution was a joint one with the Academic Policy Committee. Koch asked if the money being diverted is a temporary loan from the fund or is it a permanent taking of money out of the fund. Dobson noted that it is not that money is being taken out of the fund, but that they are holding off putting money into the fund. It is unclear as to whether what, if any, money they use will be replaced at a later date.

A vote was taken on the resolution as written (attachment #1).

VOTE # 5 21 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

2. Committee report. Arnold reminded that Senate that they passed a motion (FS00-01/05-01) last May regarding proposed changes to the Post-tenure Review Procedures. Dr. Durham added that he and Dr. Parker spoke about the issue this morning and that the Senate’s resolution is being seriously considered.

C. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

1. Motion FS00-01/03-02 - Faculty Handbook 4.5.3.5 - Appointment with Permanent Tenure. Gates reported that this motion is one that the Committee hoped to broach with the Council of Chairs at their last meeting before they got involved in other matters, but due to various circumstances, were unable to. Gates reported that the Committee had worked on this motion back in the fall but had never brought it before the Senate because they wanted to bring it before the Council of Chairs first, but that has not worked out. The rationale of the motion is to hopefully increase the breadth and depth of the candidate pool for chair positions. After discussion on the rationale of the motion, McKinney called for the question and Rardin seconded.

VOTE # 6 21 yes 0 no 0 abstain The question was approved.

A vote was taken on Motion FS00-01/03-02 as written (attachment #2).

VOTE # 7 19 yes 0 no 2 abstain The motion passed.

2. Motion FS00-01/03-03 - Establish an ad-hoc Committee to Study the Structure, Policies and Practices of DPCs at Appalachian. Gates reported that this motion grew out of the previously described Council of Chairs meeting in which they did not agree with what the Senate was trying to accomplish with its motion to remove the department chairs as chairs of the DPC. The Council of Chairs was receptive to the idea that if indeed there is a good reason for not having department chairs as DPC chairs, then a motion needed to be created as such. Both the Senate and the Council of Chairs will work together to study the issue. Koch asked if the Senate should rescind its previous motion. Weitz and Gates responded probably so. Rardin asked the parliamentarian to research whether the motion can be rescinded in this calendar year simply because the Council of Chairs did not like it.

Dobson suggested an amendment of April 2002 as a deadline for the study to be done and
reported back to the Senate. Woodworth suggested an amended date of December 2001 as a deadline for the ad-hoc committee to make a progress report to the Senate. The Academic Policy Committee accepted the amendments.

After some discussion about the ad-hoc committee's composition, a vote was taken on the recommendation to have four Faculty Senators and three department chairs serve on the committee.

VOTE # 8  5 yes  13 no  0 abstain  The recommendation failed.

A vote was taken on the motion as amended (attachment #3).

VOTE # 9  15 yes  1 no  2 abstain  The motion passed.

D. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATION

Committee Report. Butts reported that the final report before the Senate was not substantially different from the previous draft. There are some minor editorial changes in the wording that will hopefully make the form clearer.

Weitz reported that she received an email from Tim Huelsman who took issue with the evaluation form reported in the February Senate minutes. He noted that he did not disagree with adding a category of not observable, but rather it should not be part of the continuum--it should be a separate category completely. Butts responded that that could be obtained by eliminating the numbers (even though on the opscan sheet there still will be columns). Weitz suggested that this method be done so that this it could not be perceived, even in a subconscious way, as part of a continuum.

Weitz asked for a wording change in #5 of the procedures so that it reads, ...the Reading Committee will, if such documents exist, examine the summaries of the two most recent evaluations...

Moore asked for the following changes: Question #1 should state that ...office is managed...; Question #5 should have the word serious deleted; and Question #10 should read, dean is receptive...

Koch asked that the Senate address the issue of whether it is appropriate for the Faculty Senate (as a representative body of the faculty) to be engaged in gathering information which may or may not be used by anybody, but is doing so in secret in the name of the faculty and then not sharing it back with the faculty. Otherwise the Senate is wasting its time fine tuning a document that ultimately the Senate cannot use. Durham added that he was under the opinion that sharing the results with faculty would be against the law. Weitz suggested adding wording that strongly suggests that the dean shares the results with the faculty so that the expectation is there. Rardin asked that if the results are not used in a constructive manner, then is it not just institutionalized gossip? Koch suggested that between now and the next Senate meeting the Senate should get a legal opinion as to whether or not it is legal to release the results if this is not used in a formal performance review.

E. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Committee report. Moore reported that the Committee on Committees recommended candidates to the Senate Elections officer for the Faculty Grievance Hearing and Mediation Committees and Faculty Assembly.
Weitz announced the appointment of Bill Dobson as the Senate's representative on the Instructional Technology Advisory Committee.

At this point the Senate meeting was brought to an end due to a lack of a quorum.

Respectfully submitted,
   Mike Moore, Secretary

---

**FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET**  
**March 19, 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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</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>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, RICHARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT, KEVIN</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBSON, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, DEBRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX, JERRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVETT, SANDIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMROZY, UTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDREW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG, BETTY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MICHAEL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harvey Durham, ex officio

VOTE 1: Approve February 12 minutes as written
VOTE 2: Recommendation of Muir to replace Butts
VOTE 3: Call for the question
VOTE 4: Motion FS00-01/03-01
VOTE 5: Resolution FS00-01/03-04
VOTE 6: Call for the question
VOTE 7: Motion FS00-01/03-02
VOTE 8: Recommendation on membership of the ad-hoc committee to study DPCs
VOTE 9: Motion FS00-01/03-03

VISITORS: Linda Bennett, Arts and Sciences; LesLeigh Downs, Academic Integrity Committee; Ryan Eller, Academic Integrity Committee; Crystal Frick, Academic Integrity Committee; Jacqueline Gjurgevich, Academic Integrity Committee; Amanda Privette, Academic Integrity Committee; Clinton Parker, Academic Affairs; Pat Reighard, Fine and Applied Arts; Patrick Sullivan, Academic Integrity Committee; Ann Viles, Library; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs

attachment #1

Resolution FS00-01/03-04 - Opposition to the Governor's Directive to Place Funds Designated for the State Retirement Plan into an Emergency Reserve Account

The Faculty Senate opposes the Governor’s directive to place funds designated for the State Retirement Plan into an emergency reserve account to address projected budget deficits. We strongly urge the Governor and the State Legislature to fund the State Retirement Plan appropriately.

The Faculty Senate opposes the Governor’s directive to divert funds from the State Employee Health Plan into an emergency reserve account to address projected budget deficits. We also protest in strongest terms any plans either to increase coverage premiums or to reduce plan
benefits by imposing higher deductibles, higher out-of-pocket expenses, the establishment of drug deductibles, or an increase in co-payment for prescription drugs.

The Faculty Senate feels that such changes to either the State Retirement Plan or the State Employee Health Plan would represent a failure on the part of the State to treat its employees with proper consideration or respect and could be considered an abdication of its basic obligations.

attachment #2

Motion FS00-01/03-02 - Faculty Handbook 4.5.3.5 - Appointment with Permanent Tenure

When a search committee conducting a search for a department chair has identified and voted to recommend one or more outside candidates to the Provost, search committee members may attach an additional recommendation to one or more of those names that an offer be made to the candidate for appointment with permanent tenure.

RATIONALE: The possibility of appointment with tenure is likely to increase the breadth and depth of the candidate pool by attracting highly qualified candidates who may otherwise be reluctant to resign senior tenured faculty positions at other colleges and universities.

Appointment with tenure will also eliminate the procedural duplication involved in the typical Spring semester search process and hiring decision followed by an appearance before the DPC for a tenure decision in the Fall semester.

attachment #3

Motion FS00-01/03-03 - Establish an Ad-hoc Committee to Study the Structure, Policies and Practices of DPCs at Appalachian

That the Faculty Senate, in conjunction with the Council of Chairs, establish an ad hoc committee to study the structure, policies and practices of DPCs across the University and recommend possible adjustments to improve their functioning within their departments. The ad-hoc Committee will submit a committee report at the December 2001 Faculty Senate meeting and a final report at the April 2002 Faculty Senate meeting.

Members of the ad hoc committee will be the Chair of the Council of Chairs, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee. Other members will be two additional department Chairs and one additional Faculty Senator agreed upon by the Chair of the Council of Chairs and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
RATIONALE: Formation of the committee will give the University an opportunity to:
1. Create uniform policy on the five primary functions of the DPC:
   a) annual review of part-time and adjunct instructors
   b) reappointment of untenured tenure-track faculty
   c) promotion recommendations for tenured and untenured faculty
   d) tenure recommendations
   e) faculty searches
2. Clarify the role of the department Chair on the DPC by providing for:
   a) efficient administrative handling of DPC meeting schedules and details of faculty candidate visits;
   b) a means of conveying relevant information to the DPC for consideration in their deliberations;
   c) shielding of the DPC from the influence of the Chair, either overt or covert, in favor of or against the matter under consideration, and
   d) a separation of the roles of the Chair, making the recommendation and supporting reasoning from the Chair to the Dean truly independent