At 3:20 p.m. on April 11, 2005, Chair Moore convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 I.G. Greer Hall)

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Welcome, introduction of visitors (names follow voting sheet)
2. Chair Moore reported that the Faculty Assembly had passed the document on Shared Governance in the UNC system and will seek Board of Governors approval. He also reported that one of our representatives, Andy Koch, had initiated an effort to repeal the state statute against collective bargaining.

II. MINUTES

Under the Academics Policies Committee motion to accept the Shared Governance of the 16 UNC Campuses resolution, the word “professional” will be replaced by “professorial” and the tally for vote #7 needs to be included.

Senator Marland moved and Senator Harris seconded minutes of the March 14, 2005 be approved as corrected.

VOTE-1 Motion to approve the March 14, 2005 minutes.

YES 20 NO 0 ABSTAIN 1

The motion passed

Available online at:

http://www.facsen.appstate.edu/Minutes/mar14min.html

III. CHANCELLOR’S VISIT

1. Are there things that you want Senate to address on behalf of the university community.

   Who are our peer institutions? Would like Senate input on selecting peers.

   We have not been successful at recruiting certain faculty members and need to know why? Look at cost of housing, salaries, child-care, etc.

2. How do you see yourself working with the Senate on matters you are developing? How do you
envision getting feedback from the Senate on ideas you are developing? How can we get a chance to review and respond to your ideas before they become policy?

Through meetings with the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee, meeting with the Faculty Senate, getting updates from the Provost. Last semester there was a very successful panel with AAUP, would perhaps be beneficial to reverse that, with administrators asking questions of a faculty panel.

3. How would you address a threat to academic freedom on our campus, such as with the Ward Churchill case or a wealthy donor who objects to faculty projects? Do you see academic freedom as resting with the university or with individual faculty members?

Ward Churchill had the right to speak his mind. Every faculty member enjoys academic freedom and the University supports that.

4. How do you assess "town-gown" relations with your interest in growing the university and acquiring property? What about traffic problems? What are we doing with DOT?

Stressful, seeking resolutions. University of North Carolina system leaders and lawyers tend to say one thing and the town of Boone leaders and lawyers tend to say another thing. Need to resolve who has jurisdiction. Acquiring property is an issue because it is removed from the tax roll. Not aware of anything going on with the DOT. Need to address bike lanes on Rivers St, which are often used for parking

5. What are your ideas about developing resources in support of the creative/scholarly work of faculty? Do you envision most support coming from outside grants? What planning is being done to provide research space on campus, especially in the sciences and social sciences?

Re-assigned time and travel funds are important. Faculty are encouraged to seek outside funds, and the Graduate School and Lorin Baumhover can help; but ASU has the primary responsibility to support research. We have received a $100,000 grant from the Gordon and Mary Cain Foundation to support projects in the College of Arts and Sciences. Bond dollars have proved insufficient to meet increased renovation and construction costs.

6. What role do you see for the Liberal Arts in this University, especially in light of the University’s expansion of pre-professional programs? From where will research support in this field come?

The core of any program is the Liberal Arts. Support comes in time, technical support, and other funding.

7. What will be the influence on university resources of the development of the health and allied
services initiative? What do you see as the longer-term development of this area? Do you believe that faculty have been adequately informed about the potential requirements and changes across the university from this program?

_Students have indicated Allied Health services as a primary interest and would meet the needs of the North Carolina nursing shortage. Where the nursing program goes in the future is dependent on Raleigh and will not take resources away from other areas on campus._

8. What other institutes/centers are being planned at Appalachian? Are additional Ph.D. programs being planned or contemplated? Are you thinking of changing Appalachian’s status in the University system from comprehensive to Ph.D.-granting funding levels?

_Not thinking about reclassification of the University. Not out of the realm of possibility in the future, ideas are welcome from the Faculty: what are faculty feelings about Ph.D. programs? Four Centers are coming up for consideration: Sustainable Development, Health and Human Services, Business, and Applied Technology._

9. Why can’t there be more regular updates of the University’s ten-year plan? It is obviously a moving plan, so it needs to be shared more quickly.

_Not sure if the question is for the ten-year building plan or the ten-year enrollment plan. Recognizes the space problem, especially the need for new College of Education facilities. Nothing on the board yet but would like to see it happen. Art Rex is compiling a space inventory so we know what we have._

10. What are our latest targets for enrollment growth? How will we meet these goals with additional faculty?

_Growth estimates for off-campus students have been reduced. In 2010 we project 16,731 students on and off campus, with about 14,500 being on campus._

11. What is the prognosis for our $1.4 million from the Legislature, since there are strong state budget shortfalls?

_Two Bills are now before the State Senate. Senate Bill 1050 asking for 1.4 million dollars and Senate Bill 1065 asking for 5 million dollars planning money for new Education building. Not the usual method for requesting money. Technology fee has been increased to $100. ASU has a very low FTE funding in comparison to other UNC campuses._

12. What are you doing to encourage more productive relationships between faculty and construction projects—is the building shepherd process one you wholly support?

_Concerned that there be full cooperation between departments and Business Affairs on construction projects from the beginning. Fully supports the shepherd process._
13. What is the status of the AD search? What future role do you envision for athletics and it’s relationship to the academic program? When might we expand sports that attract high academic achievers, such as swimming? How to pay for these?

Athletic fees pay for the search. Waiting on the final recommendations of candidates, but is concerned that the new AD be committed to academic quality of athletes, and of all students. A 50 meter pool is being built and programs will most likely follow.

14. Do we intend to reassess the commitment to allow and thus encourage freshmen to have cars on campus? Doesn’t this work against developing academic appreciation among students?

Supports the Freshmen having cars, does not want to hurt the enrollment pool.

IV. Nominations from the Committee on Committees

FS04-05/04-01 Motion to approve the following two people to serve on the Faculty Grievance Assistance Committee for a term of two years each – Sandie Gravett (P&R) and Stella Anderson (Management), beginning immediately and ending in May, 2006.

VOTE-2 YES 22 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion passed

FS04-05/04-02 Motion to approve the nomination of Grace McEntee (ENG) to serve as alternate on the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee until the next faculty elections.

VOTE-3 YES 22 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion passed.

FS04-05/04-03 Motion to approve members of the Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Retirement: Terry Cole (CMU), Marvin Hoffman (PS/CJ), Susan Keefe (ANT), Harold McKinney (MUS & FS), Mike Moore (HIS & FS), Fred Webb (Emeritus), Len Johnson (HRS).

VOTE-4 YES 22 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion passed.

Academic Policies Committee (McCAUGHEY, Huelsman, Staub, Marland)

FS04-05/04-04 Resolution on Academic Freedom at Appalachian State University

WHEREAS academic freedom is necessary to advance all areas of human knowledge;
WHEREAS government control of university teaching and research is antithetical to the free exchange of ideas; and

WHEREAS numerous protections for the academic freedom of both students and faculty alike are already substantively built into the codes, missions, and visions of the University of North Carolina system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Appalachian State University Faculty Senate calls on state legislators to oppose Senate Bill 1139 because the Academic Bill of Rights proposes to remove academic expertise as the standard for decisions about teaching and research at universities. The scholarly expertise of the faculty—not the opinions of lawmakers—should continue to determine the content of teaching and research. We urge all faculty and administrators at Appalachian State University to join us in our opposition to this political intrusion on academic freedom.

Articles and comments on the Academic Bill of Rights by the AAUP can be found at: http://www.aaup.org/Issues/ABOR/aborintro2.htm


Discussion:

Senator Felkel believes the Bill does support academic freedom. ASU would decide how to apply the policy. Spoke about discrimination against Christians. Feels these issues need to be discussed. Encourages a vote of no.

Senator Marland sees the Bill as milder than many other State Bills. We could clarify and add to the language of the Bill. Write something specific to our institution.

Senator Huelsman questions who will decide what content is appropriate. The Bill is a Trojan horse, leads to intrusion in the classroom.

Senator Pier questions what is “controversial matter,” which can be many things to different people.

Senator McCaughey wonders if a professor was teaching about evolution and a student wrote about creationism, would this be acceptable? Do students have any right to determine the curriculum? This changes what academic freedom means. Students may not realize what is or is not relevant or controversial.

Senator Rardin believes the Bill implies the students need to be protected from the Faculty.
Senator Ehnenn believes checks and balances need to be made at the local level. Disagrees that “neutral viewpoint” exists, as the Bill implies. Wants the students introduced to the zone of discomfort and controversial topics.

Senator Jamison is reminded of the “Speaker Ban Law” that was so harmful to free speech in North Carolina.

VOTE-5 FS04-05/04-04 Resolution on Academic Freedom at Appalachian State University

YES 19 NO 1 ABSTAIN 2

The motion passed.

Faculty Handbook Committee (MARKING, Anderson, Gates, Moore)

FS04-05/04-05 Motion to approve “Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Leave/Course Load Reductions and the ‘Tenure Clock’” (B. Ward, B. Bauldry, M. Yaukey and E. Peterson) with deletions and bold additions by the Handbook Committee:


Any academic year during which, under this policy, a probationary faculty member is on leave for more than 25 class days of the academic calendar or receives a total teaching-load reduction of six or more than six credit hours will not count as probationary service with respect to permanent tenure unless the faculty member requests in writing to the departmental chair that it be so counted. Such request must be made within one calendar year following the end of the leave or load reduction.

2. Proposed substitute headnote to the Handbook form titled “Leave Request and Certification”:

[Note: See section 4.9.1 for the policy regarding “Leaves of Absence.” The attention of probationary faculty members is directed in particular to section 4.9.1.1(g).]

3. Proposed additional Handbook sections 3.4.2.5.4.1-3 following existing section 3.4.2.5.4:

3.4.2.5.4.1 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an assistant professor who has previously been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 4.9.1.1(g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

3.4.2.5.4.2 After reviewing recommendations on the matter from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the departmental chair, and the dean, the provost may determine that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. The faculty member must make a written
request for such consideration to the departmental chair as soon as practicable, but no later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred.

3.4.2.5.4.3 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under sections 3.4.2.5.4.2 and 4.9.1, may not exceed two academic years.

4. Proposed additional Handbook sections 3.4.2.6.4.1-3 following existing section 3.4.2.6.4:

3.4.2.6.4.1 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an associate professor who has previously been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 4.9.1.1(g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

3.4.2.6.4.2 After reviewing recommendations on the matter from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the departmental chair, and the dean, the provost may determine that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. The faculty member must make a written request for such consideration to the departmental chair as soon as practicable, but no later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred.

3.4.2.6.4.3 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under sections 3.4.2.5.4.2 and 4.9.1, may not exceed two academic years.

Rationale for approval:

An absence of 25 days is about one-third of a semester; which contemplates absence from all duties— including teaching. A course reduction of more than 6 hours more closely approximates at least half of semester teaching responsibilities those few departments where 12-hour loads are common, but well over two-thirds for members of departments with 9-hour loads common.

The goal should be to trigger the advancement of the tenure clock sooner rather than later, thus giving probationary faculty additional time to make up whatever disadvantage might have been created by their absence from campus or the classroom. For instance, it provides probationary faculty a chance to regroup, which they may need after an emergency requiring an extended absence or temporary reduction in responsibilities.

Therefore, an adjustment from "more than 6 hours" to "6 hours or more" makes sense. Since 3-hour courses are the majority, 6 hours is a significant break point, and does not require faculty to get as much as a 9-hour reduction (or even 7 or 8) to qualify for the exemption.
Discussion:

Senator Weitz asked where is the section about giving birth and stopping the clock. Would like to see the language “medical emergency or catastrophic event” changed. This is the appropriate section for women on maternity leave but the language is not there. Maternity leave is automatic, you do not need to receive permission. Would like to see a section which clarifies the maternity leave situation.

Senator Malloy believes military service should also be specifically addressed.

VOTE-6 FS04-05/04-05 Motion to approve “Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Leave/Course Load Reductions and the ‘Tenure Clock’”

YES 21 NO 0 ABSTAIN 1

The motion passed

Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee Report

1. FYI:

We obtained forms from all of our peer institutions that have evaluations of upper administrators (8 peer institutions). We discussed a preliminary administrator evaluation form. We met with the Provost to discuss this preliminary form and this issue still requires more work/discussion.

Faculty Office Hours:

FS04-05/04-06 Motion that the faculty handbook Chapter V section 5.4 be changed to read as follows:

Every faculty member is required to be available a minimum average of seven (7) office hours per week during the regular academic year, distributed so as to provide students ready access to the instructor for routine conferences. Notice of office hours must be posted, included on syllabi, and filed with the departmental office. At least two (2) hours must be strictly scheduled office times, while other conference hours could be arranged for the mutual convenience of students and the faculty member. It is expected that the hours beyond the regularly scheduled two (2) may include non-traditional modes of communication and/or may require prior student commitment (i.e. “by appointment”, “with a show of hands”, etc.). These non-traditional office hours might include, but are not limited to, electronic consultations, laboratory meetings, and/or review sessions. During the term of a summer session in which a faculty member teaches, office hour expectations are half of those during the regular academic year.

Faculty initiated exceptions to this policy may be made with the approval of the department chair

Rationale:
It provides flexibility that is not allowed with the current statement.

It allows adaptability.

ASU is a comprehensive university committed to its students. This change still allows for faculty availability to students.

It is contemporary. The 2004 SGA survey showed that a majority of respondents prefer email communication with professors.

This motion protects faculty.

Discussion:

Senator Marking asked what became of the last office hours resolution. Chair Moore said he could not find its existence in last year’s minutes.

Senator Rardin moved to strike the first sentence of the motion and the word “strictly” from the third sentence. Senator Lambert seconded.

Senator Felkel provided background information. This motion was written looking at surveys completed by students who make it clear that they prefer email to face to face contact. If the word “strictly” is stricken, that makes requirements of only 2 hours, ridiculous for a comprehensive university.

Senator Ehnenn would like it to be sent back to committee and rewritten to reflect office hours based on how many hours one teaches.

Senator Marland stated if the first sentence was removed the students would be in an uproar. Encourages Faculty to have review sessions because it counts for something. Huge improvement for what we currently have, much more flexible.

Senator Pier questions perhaps it should be based on contact hours rather than credit hours.

Senator Lambert mentions teaching off campus at extension courses really reduces the number of students showing up for office hours.

Chair Moore provided additional background on motion. This motion is based on surveys completed by Faculty and students. The Provost prefers to respond to a resolution based on these two surveys.

VOTE-7 To amend the motion by striking the first sentence and the word “strictly” from the third sentence.

YES 2 NO 17 ABSTAIN 2
The motion failed

VOTE-8 FS04-05/04-06 To accept the motion as written (see above)

YES 10 NO 8 ABSTAIN 3

The motion passed

FS04-05/04-07 The Faculty Welfare and Morale committee, in conjunction with the Academic Policy committee, moves to create the Appalachian Scholars program.

This program serves to recognize the continued excellence of faculty at Appalachian who have proudly raised the Appalachian banner for many years.

Qualifications: The Appalachian Scholars will have shown demonstrated skill in teaching and a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship, or service that contributes to the reputation of Appalachian State University. Scholars must either have twenty years of service to the university and hold the rank of full professor or ten years at Appalachian in the rank of full professor.

Election: The Appalachian Scholars will be initially created by a committee consisting of all of the Deans in the university, upon recommendation by the departmental DPCs. After establishment, the Appalachian Scholars will be selected by the current Appalachian Scholars upon the recommendation of the DPCs. The Appalachian Scholars will meet at least once per academic year to select new Scholars. Presentation of the awards will be made by the Chancellor at an appropriate occasion.

Award: Appalachian Scholars will receive a medallion to be worn with academic regalia, an engraved pen, a certificate, and a small monetary sum (or similar tokens of appreciation). Current Appalachian Scholars will be noted on departmental and university documents. In addition, each member’s name will be engraved in the wall of the Appalachian Scholars Courtyard in the center of campus. Upon retirement, Appalachian Scholars will be automatically accorded the title of Appalachian Emeritus Scholar, with all of the rights and privileges granted to an emeritus faculty.

Rationale:

It recognizes long-term devotion to scholarship, service, and teaching in the name of Appalachian State University,

Senator Ehnnenn moved to strike the second sentence under election and to strike “initially” from the first sentence. Senator Rardin seconded.

VOTE-9 To amend the motion.

YES 20 NO 1 ABSTAIN 0
The motion passed

VOTE-10 **FS04-05/04-07** To accept motion as amended.

YES 21 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion passed

**WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE REPORT**

Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the Chancellor form an ad hoc committee to study and to make recommendations for the improvement of civility, intellectual discourse, and the understanding of academic freedom at Appalachian. The committee will be composed of representatives from Student Development, Student Government Association (appointed by SGA), Hubbard Center, Judicial Affairs, the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Faculty Senate), and The American Association of University Professors. The committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Chancellor by the end of the 05/06 academic year.

Rationale: Some faculty members have asked the Faculty Senate to address the matter (See appendix A), the office of Student Development has implicitly recognized the need to address the matter by sponsoring a workshop on Civility and Academic Freedom (See appendix B), there is a misconception circulating in the Appalachian community that academic freedom does not extend to individual faculty members (See paragraph 2 of Appendix C, paragraph b of Appendix D, and Appendix E.), and by its charge the Welfare of Students Committee is limited in its ability to address the matter.

Motion withdrawn.

**V. ADJOURN THE MEETING**

There being no other business, it was moved by Senator Rardin and seconded by Senator Malloy that the meeting adjourn.

VOTE-11 To adjourn the meeting.

YES 21 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion passed.

**The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Cramer

Faculty Senate Secretary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senators</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>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer, Beth</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehnenn, Jill</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felkel, Brian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</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>Harris, Tim</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huelsman, Tim</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>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamison, Tom</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Bill</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaenzig, Rebecca</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert, Monica</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malloy, Mark</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marland, Eric</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking, Martha</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>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaughey, Martha</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>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Michael</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>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, George</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>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier, Chuck</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Colin</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rardin, Patrick</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherlen, Allan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Kathleen</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Steve</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>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strazichich, Mark</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staub, Susan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waring,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTE- 1 Motion to approve the March 14, 2005 minutes as corrected.

VOTE- 2 Motion to approve Sandie Gravett and Stella Anderson for service on the Faculty Grievance Assistance Committee

VOTE- 3 Motion to approve Grace McEntee to serve as alternate on the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee

VOTE- 4 Motion to approve members of the Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Retirement

VOTE- 5 Resolution on Academic Freedom at Appalachian State University

VOTE- 6 Proposed additional Faculty Handbook sections

VOTE- 7 Amend the Office Hours motion

VOTE- 8 Office Hours

VOTE- 9 Amend the Appalachian Scholars motion

VOTE-10 Appalachian Scholars motion

VOTE-11 Adjourn

Visitors: Bill Bauldry, Lorin Baumhover, Tim Burwell, Dave Haney, Jeff McBride, Peter Petschauer, Bill Ward, Harry Williams

Committee Reports:

Agenda Committee

No Report

Academic Policies Committee

Resolution on Academic Freedom at Appalachian State University
WHEREAS academic freedom is necessary to advance all areas of human knowledge;

WHEREAS government control of university teaching and research is antithetical to the free exchange of ideas; and

WHEREAS numerous protections for the academic freedom of both students and faculty alike are already substantively built into the codes, missions, and visions of the University of North Carolina system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
The Appalachian State University Faculty Senate calls on state legislators to oppose Senate Bill 1139 because the Academic Bill of Rights proposes to remove academic expertise as the standard for decisions about teaching and research at universities. The scholarly expertise of the faculty—not the opinions of lawmakers—should continue to determine the content of teaching and research. We urge all faculty and administrators at Appalachian State University to join us in our opposition to this political intrusion on academic freedom.

Articles and comments on the Academic Bill of Rights by the AAUP can be found at:
<> http://www.aaup.org/Issues/ABOR/aborintro2.htm

NC Senate Bill 1139 Academic Bill of Rights:

Budget Committee

No report

Committee on Committees Report

Faculty Handbook Committee Report

Motion to approve “Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Leave/Course Load Reductions and the ‘Tenure Clock’” (B. Ward, B. Bauldry, M. Yaukey and E. Peterson) with deletions and bold additions:


Any academic year during which, under this policy, a probationary faculty member is on leave for more than 25 class days of the academic calendar or receives a total teaching-load reduction of six or more than six credit hours will not count as probationary service with respect to permanent tenure unless the faculty member requests in writing to the departmental chair that it be so counted. Such request must be made within one calendar year following the end of the leave or load reduction.
2. Proposed substitute headnote to the Handbook form titled “Leave Request and Certification”:

[Note: See section 4.9.1 for the policy regarding “Leaves of Absence.” The attention of probationary faculty members is directed in particular to section 4.9.1.1(g).]

3. Proposed additional Handbook sections 3.4.2.5.4.1-3 following existing section 3.4.2.5.4:

3.4.2.5.4.1 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an assistant professor who has previously been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 4.9.1.1(g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

3.4.2.5.4.2 After reviewing recommendations on the matter from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the departmental chair, and the dean, the provost may determine that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. The faculty member must make a written request for such consideration to the departmental chair as soon as practicable, but no later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred.

3.4.2.5.4.3 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under sections 3.4.2.5.4.2 and 4.9.1, may not exceed two academic years.

4. Proposed additional Handbook sections 3.4.2.6.4.1-3 following existing section 3.4.2.6.4:

3.4.2.6.4.1 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an associate professor who has previously been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 4.9.1.1(g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

3.4.2.6.4.2 After reviewing recommendations on the matter from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the departmental chair, and the dean, the provost may determine that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. The faculty member must make a written request for such consideration to the departmental chair as soon as practicable, but no later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred.

3.4.2.6.4.3 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under sections 3.4.2.5.4.2 and 4.9.1, may not exceed two academic years.

Rationale for approval:
An absence of 25 days is about one-third of a semester; which contemplates absence from all duties—including teaching. A course reduction of more than 6 hours more closely approximates at least half of semester teaching responsibilities those few departments where 12-hour loads are common, but well over two-thirds for members of departments with 9-hour loads common.

The goal should be to trigger the advancement of the tenure clock sooner rather than later, thus giving probationary faculty additional time to make up whatever disadvantage might have been created by their absence from campus or the classroom. For instance, it provides probationary faculty a chance to regroup, which they may need after an emergency requiring an extended absence or temporary reduction in responsibilities

Therefore, an adjustment from "more than 6 hours" to "6 hours or more" makes sense. Since 3-hour courses are the majority, 6 hours is a significant break point, and does not require faculty to get as much as a 9-hour reduction (or even 7 or 8) to qualify for the exemption.

Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee Report

1. FYI:

We obtained forms from all of our peer institutions that have evaluations of upper administrators (8 peer institutions). We discussed a preliminary administrator evaluation form. We met with the Provost to discuss this preliminary form and this issue still requires more work/discussion.

2. Motion regarding office hours:

Motion: That the faculty handbook Chapter V section 5.4 be changed to read as follows:

Every faculty member is required to be available a minimum average of seven (7) office hours per week during the regular academic year, distributed so as to provide students ready access to the instructor for routine conferences. Notice of office hours must be posted, included on syllabi, and filed with the departmental office. At least two (2) hours must be strictly scheduled office times, while other conference hours could be arranged for the mutual convenience of students and the faculty member. It is expected that the hours beyond the regularly scheduled two (2) may include non-traditional modes of communication and/or may require prior student commitment (i.e. “by appointment”, “with a show of hands”, etc.). These non-traditional office hours might include, but are not limited to, electronic consultations, laboratory meetings, and/or review sessions. During the term of a summer session in which a faculty member teaches, office hour expectations are half of those during the regular academic year.

Faculty initiated exceptions to this policy may be made with the approval of the department chair

Rationale:

It provides flexibility that is not allowed with the current statement.
It allows adaptability.

ASU is a comprehensive university committed to its students. This change still allows for faculty availability to students.

It is contemporary. The 2004 SGA survey showed that a majority of respondents prefer email communication with professors.

This motion protects faculty.

3. Motion regarding Appalachian Scholars:

The Faculty Welfare and Morale committee, in conjunction with the Academic Policy committee, moves to create the Appalachian Scholars program.

This program serves to recognize the continued excellence of faculty at Appalachian who have proudly raised the Appalachian banner for many years.

**Qualifications:** The Appalachian Scholars will have shown demonstrated skill in teaching and a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship, or service that contributes to the reputation of Appalachian State University. Scholars must either have twenty years of service to the university and hold the rank of full professor or ten years at Appalachian in the rank of full professor.

**Election:** The Appalachian Scholars will be initially created by a committee consisting of all of the Deans in the university, upon recommendation by the departmental DPCs. After establishment, the Appalachian Scholars will be selected by the current Appalachian Scholars upon the recommendation of the DPCs. The Appalachian Scholars will meet at least once per academic year to select new Scholars. Presentation of the awards will be made by the Chancellor at an appropriate occasion.

**Award:** Appalachian Scholars will receive a medallion to be worn with academic regalia, an engraved pen, a certificate, and a small monetary sum (or similar tokens of appreciation). Current Appalachian Scholars will be noted on departmental and university documents. In addition, each member’s name will be engraved in the wall of the Appalachian Scholars Courtyard in the center of campus. Upon retirement, Appalachian Scholars will be automatically accorded the title of Appalachian Emeritus Scholar, with all of the rights and privileges granted to an emeritus faculty.

**Rationale:**

It recognizes long-term devotion to scholarship, service, and teaching in the name of Appalachian State University,

**Welfare of Students Committee Report**
Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the Chancellor form an ad hoc committee to study and to make recommendations for the improvement of civility, intellectual discourse, and the understanding of academic freedom at Appalachian. The committee will be composed of representatives from Student Development, Student Government Association (appointed by SGA), Hubbard Center, Judicial Affairs, the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Faculty Senate), and The American Association of University Professors. The committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Chancellor by the end of the 05/06 academic year.

Rationale: Some faculty members have asked the Faculty Senate to address the matter (See appendix A), the office of Student Development has implicitly recognized the need to address the matter by sponsoring a workshop on Civility and Academic Freedom (See appendix B), there is a misconception circulating in the Appalachian community that academic freedom does not extend to individual faculty members (See paragraph 2 of Appendix C, paragraph b of Appendix D, and Appendix E.), and by its charge the Welfare of Students Committee is limited in its ability to address the matter.

Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Elections Report (Staub)

Here are the results of the at-large Senate election. Thanks to all who were willing to run.

Virginia Branch (LIB) 21 votes
Beth Davison (SOC) 24 votes
Scott Ludwig (Print Making and Drawing) 14 votes
Katie Mawhinney (Math) 39 votes
Mike Moore (HIS) 49 votes
Tammy Wahpeconiah (ENG) 24 votes
Doug Waring (PSY) 27 votes
Write-ins: Banks Talley 2 votes; Dave Domermuth 1 vote

*Mike Moore is elected. *

Reported by Susan Staub, Vice-Chair, Faculty Senate

Annual Reports of Senate Committees 2004-05:

Academic Policies Committee
Committee Members: Martha McCaughey (Chair); Tim Hueslman; Eric Marland; Rick McGarry (fall only); and Susan Staub (spring only).

This year the Academic Policies Committee (APC) tackled several major issues:

The feasibility of College-level Review, Tenure, and Promotion Committees. The committee researched and reviewed ASU Peer Institutions’ policies on RTP and presented pros and cons to switching to a system of College-level RTP committees. Discussions were held in reaction to a specific motion on the establishment of College-level RTP committees, but this motion was tabled or referred back to committee.

The APC reviewed the Council of Chairs’ proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook having to do with the nature of faculty appointment and reappointment. The APC recommended the proposed changes and the Faculty Senate supported this with two amendments.

The document by the North Carolina State Faculty Assembly which recommended the adoption of a set of minimum standards of shared governance at NC universities was reviewed and approved by APC, which suggested minor changes. The Faculty Senate supported this.

The APC partnered with the Welfare and Morale Committee to craft a proposal for recognizing Appalachian Scholars, those who have served the University for a long period of time and who have shown excellence in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. This was discussed at a Senate meeting, and a motion will be presented to Senate in April.

**Agenda Committee Annual Report 2004-05**

Prepared agendas for every Senate meeting.

Prepared two motions for Senate, both of which were passed.

I. Motion: Faculty Senate approves the policy document titled: “Policies for Establishing and Reviewing Centers and Institutes at Appalachian State University.

Passed by Senate March 14, 2005

II. Resolution Regarding W.C. Strickland
Whereas Dr. William Claudius Strickland joined the faculty of Appalachian State University in 1966 as Professor and Chairman of the Department of Philosophy and Religion and continued as Chairman until he resigned that position in 1970; and

Whereas he became the first Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1968 and continued in that position until resigning it in 1984; and

Whereas as a man of sensitivity, vision and ability, his personal honesty and integrity were reflected in his strong and positive leadership of the very complex College of Arts and Sciences for sixteen years; and

Whereas he continued as Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religion until his retirement from Appalachian State University in 1988 at which time the title of Professor Emeritus was conferred upon him by the Board of Trustees; and

Whereas he was always the consummate professional in his interactions with students, faculty, staff and administrators; and

Whereas he was a well organized, industrious and dedicated academic leader devoted to the joy of teaching, the importance of learning and the responsibility of overcoming ignorance; and

Whereas he strongly emphasized the value of a liberal education and served and honored scholarship particularly as it related to his study of the works of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy; and

Whereas he was known as an intelligent, understanding, hard-working professional and an amiable and admirable individual; and

Whereas he possessed an inimitable sense of humor and well-known skill as a teller of stories and anecdotes and has left a legacy as leader, teacher, scholar and friend whose memory will enrich and nourish our lives for years to come;

Therefore be it resolved that, in recognition of his long and devoted service to Appalachian State University and his contributions to society's well-being, Room 224 in I. G. Greer Hall will henceforth be known as the William Claudius Strickland Conference Room.

Passed by Senate February 14, 2005

Budget Committee Annual Report 2004-05

Members: Monica Lambert, Chair, Kathy Simon, Chuck Pier, Mark Strazicich

Action items for the committee:

1. Recommend creating a seat for a faculty member on the Appalachian Foundation Board.
2. Assess competitiveness of faculty salaries with peer institutions.

Assess use of tuition fees collected from students 2004-5 according to the memo from Jeffrey Davies on 3/24/04.

3. Assess progress and plans for moving non-teaching support positions, such as Cultural Affairs and Advising, out of academic salaries. Many have been moved to 101-1110; but it is unclear how or when doing so will free up money (from where?) to fill faculty lines.

4. Monitor salaries, salary comparisons with peer institutions, progress toward goals, etc.

Actions taken:

To address items 2-4 the Budget Committee met with Tim Burwell on Sept. 27, 2004 to discuss the following agenda:

1. Assess competitiveness of faculty salaries with peer institutions.

2. Assess use of tuition fees collected from students 2004-5 according to the memo from Jeffrey Davies on 3/24/04.

3. Assess progress and plans for moving non-teaching support positions, such as Cultural Affairs and Advising, out of academic salaries. Many have been moved to 101-1110; but it is unclear how or when doing so will free up money (from where?) to fill faculty lines.

4. Monitor salaries, salary comparisons with peer institutions, progress toward goals, etc.

As a result of the meeting the Budget Committee invited Tim Burwell to present the new information he had on salaries to the Faculty Senate due to the in depth information and handouts he gave us it would be better for him to present the information.

We met with Jerry Hutchens on October the 18th to discuss item 1. He informed the committee that anyone can sit in on the Appalachian Foundation Board meetings. They are held quarterly with the winter meeting in Charlotte. If we would like to have a voting member on the Appalachian Foundation Board they would have to rewrite the bylaws. He is willing to bring this to the board if that is what the faculty senate wants. The person selected would have to be an active participant with a commitment to meet 2-3 times per month and during the summer. He also explained what the Foundation does for Appalachian State University.

As a result of this meeting the committee made the following motion to the Faculty Senate in March:

Rationale:

According to its Web page, "Created in 1970, the Appalachian State University Foundation is a support organization of the university that receives and invests private funds to help further the
institution’s academic mission."... "The Appalachian State University Foundation exists solely to help create the best possible learning environment for Appalachian State University students. During the past decade, the Foundation has provided more than $60 million in scholarship and academic program support. It operates as a non-profit Internal Revenue Code Sec. 501(c)(3) organization."

Although the Appalachian State University Foundation meetings are conducted in the open (except for legal matters) and faculty members may sit in on them, the Faculty Senate would like to see the appointment of a member of the university faculty as a voting member on the Foundation Board. This would allow faculty input on decisions made by Board members. It would be understood that the person considered for this position must be willing to participate in Board member duties. In addition to the regularly scheduled Board meetings, such a commitment includes participation in committee meetings as often as 2-3 times per month and during the summer. The individual appointed need not be a member of the Faculty Senate to qualify for the appointment.

Motion:

Whereas it is useful and appropriate to employ faculty expertise in the work of the Appalachian State University Foundation Board, be it resolved that there will be appointed to the Appalachian State University Foundation Board of Directors a Faculty representative nominated by the Faculty Senate to serve a four-year term, beginning no later than August 15, 2005, and to which the faculty representative may be eligible for re-appointment for one additional term.

The faculty representative will be recommended to the Faculty Senate by its Committee on Committees which will solicit faculty applications that demonstrate skills that will benefit the activities of the Foundation Board. As per its authority, the Foundation Board will make the final decision on the appointment of this member.

The motion passed at the March 2005 senate meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica Lambert, Chair, Budget Committee

**Campus Planning Committee Activity: Spring, 2005**

The Campus Planning Committee was asked by Senate to meet and discuss with the new Provost [Dr. Stan Aeschleman] his understanding of the Senate resolution [regarding the role of the
faculty in campus planning. A resolution asking the Office of Academic Affairs to actively involve faculty in campus planning was passed April 10, 2003.

The committee met with Vice Chancellor Aeschleman on March 21, 2005. Discussion focused on the faculty role in planning, the responsibilities and duties of a project “shepherd” and the newly appointed Space Manager. In addition, the concerns of faculty in History and Political Science/Criminal justice relative to space allocation in soon to be renovated Belk Library were presented and discussed. The need for full scale communications between Business Affairs, Academic Affairs and the faculty was emphasized by the committee. The Vice Chancellor appeared to share in the concerns raised by the committee on behalf of the Senate. It appears that the Vice Chancellor will work to insure there is adequate communication between the faculty and Business Affairs. Since meeting with the Provost, some funds have been found to assist in the renovations of Belk Library.

Earlier discussions between Campus Planning Committee Chair Tom Jamison and previous Chairperson Margaret Yaukey, resulted in the conclusion that the Campus Planning Committee should develop and present a “mechanism” for enhancing communications between the Town of Boone and the University. Since this meeting, a committee has been formed [without knowledge of the Campus Planning] which appears to be an effort to “bridge the gap”. It is imperative that the Campus Planning Committee investigate the purpose and goals of this new entity as it relates to the general faculty welfare.

In response to faculty concerns relative to the Library closing for 4 to 6 weeks for moving [early May to mid-June], the committee arranged for Mary Reiche, University Librarian, to address the Senate in February. At the February meeting, she reported that the staff planned to make the move as convenient as possible. She went on to inform the Senate that ABC Express would be operative as well as technical services at the Student Union.

The CPC plan to meet with Jane Helm, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs for this spring may be delayed until fall, ’06. The purpose of this meeting will focus on communications and getting a full understanding of how she views the role of the CPC on the campus and the committee’s expectation that Business Affairs will work with the faculty in a manner that is pro-active and reflects meaningful cooperation.

Chris Curtain [Art Department] appointed to complete Kathy Simon’s term on committee.

Submitted April 11, 2005, Thomas Jamison, Chair.
Faculty Handbook Committee Annual Report 2004-05

Committee Members (Michael Moore, Paul Gates, Stella Anderson (fall), Gayle Weitz (spring), Martha Marking, Chair)

Committee work this year included:

-The Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee Procedure Manual has been revised by a sub-committee of Mike Moore and Martha Marking. It is currently available on-line.

-Assistant chair responsibilities were compiled from one survey and the outcome of Ken Muir’s survey through the Hubbard Center last year. Recommendations regarding reassigned time, appointment/reappointment and salary compensation for these duties were sent to the Council of Chairs prior to inclusion in the Faculty Handbook.

-Periodic reopening of the department chair positions (4.5.4.4.5) was considered. The sub-committee included Tom Rhyne, Dave Haney, Michael Moore and Martha Marking. Recommendations were put forth that included requiring the dean to consult with appropriate departmental staff before making a decision on the chair reopening, removing staff from the faculty meeting to discuss such issues and clarified that the vote taken was a faculty recommendation to the dean.

-The Council of Chairs charter was revisited and revised by both the Council of Chairs and Senate independently and together. The charter will be included in Chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook upon its completion.

-Communication has occurred with Dave Haney about other matters of common interest between the Council of Chairs and Faculty Senate.

-The Technology Transfer Committee submitted changes in 3.4.2.6.2 (Promotion and Tenure criteria) of the Faculty Handbook. The motion brought forth failed.

-Proposed changes regarding sections 4.9.1.1, 3.4.2.6.4 and 3.4.2.5.4 (Leave/Course-Load Reductions and the aTenure ClockÔ) of the handbook were reviewed and discussed.

Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee Annual Report 2004-05

Welfare and Morale Committee Business Summary:
1. Investigated on-line access to the ASU Faculty Handbook

Status: Access improved.

2. Investigated helping the Hubbard Center with the New Faculty Orientation and increasing Faculty Senates role in this event.

Status: Four senators have been meeting with Kate Brinko this year. Faculty Senate’s role should increase at this year’s orientation.

3. Investigated various parking options. A motion regarding a reduced-rate evening permit was passed.

Status: Motion pending.

4. Investigated faculty office hours.

Status: A motion will be made at the April Senate meeting.

5. Investigated the creation of the Appalachian Scholars. The purpose of this program would be to recognize long-term devotion to scholarship, service, and teaching in the name of Appalachian State University. This was done in conjunction with the Academic Policy committee.

Status: A motion will be made at the April Senate meeting.

6. Investigated a form to be used in evaluating upper administrators in Academic Affairs and also investigated which administrators should be evaluated. This was in response to a motion that was passed by the 2002/2003 Senate and was approved.

---

**Welfare of Students Committee Annual Report 2004-05**

Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the Chancellor form an ad hoc committee to study and to make recommendations for the improvement of civility, intellectual discourse, and the understanding of academic freedom at Appalachian. The committee will be composed of representatives from Student Development, Student Government Association (appointed by SGA), Hubbard Center, Judicial Affairs, the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Faculty Senate), and The American Association of University Professors. The committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Chancellor by the end of the 05/06 academic year.

Rationale: Some faculty members have asked the Faculty Senate to address the matter (See appendix A), the office of Student Development has implicitly recognized the need to address
the matter by sponsoring a workshop on Civility and Academic Freedom (See appendix B), there is a misconception circulating in the Appalachian community that academic freedom does not extend to individual faculty members (See paragraph 2 of Appendix C, paragraph b of Appendix D, and Appendix E.), and by its charge the Welfare of Students Committee is limited in its ability to address the matter.

The agenda for the Welfare of Students Committee this academic year included the following:

Report on the REI fee to student. A report without recommendations was submitted at the February Faculty Senate meeting.

Report on the Textbook Rental System. A report with recommendations was submitted at the December Faculty Senate meeting. Both Recommendations passed the senate: Motion 1- FS04-05/12-01 Motion 2-FS04-05/12-02.

Report on Career Demo—Office of Electronic Student Services. The committee did not report on this matter.

Report on Free Speech on Sanford Mall. The committee is working with the Student Government Association on this matter. No report has been submitted.

Report on Student representation of curriculum committees. The committee did not address this matter.

Report on status of Senator Rardin's motion from the floor of the March 03 meeting on course repeats and late drops (as amended & revised)-
 Whereas the Faculty Senate believes that the current policy on course repeats and late drops is too liberal, the Faculty Senate requests AP&P to re-visit the current policy on course repeats and late drops. The matter was addressed at the November Meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Report on Deans’ concern about grade inflation. The committee did not address this matter.

Report on the climate of civility and intellectual engagement in the classroom. A report is submitted at this time (see the above motion).

Appendix A

Faculty Letter

Memo to: Dr. Michael Moore, Member A.S.U. Faculty Senate

From: Dr. David L. White, Interim Chair Department of Geology

Date: 3 December 2003
Re: A.S.U. Student Behavior

For the first time in two years, I have had to teach a section of HIS 1101-1102, World Civilizations. In addition, I have been sitting in on an introductory geology course. In both of these contexts, and from my experiences just crossing the campus, I am appalled at the boorish, rude, and self-centered behavior of our students. Although I quickly put an end to it in my class, students felt no wrong in getting up in the middle of class and walking out. A few days ago, in the geology class, two students walked out as the professor was concluding his lecture. I have been run into on two different occasions by students cutting in front of me on University sidewalks. Likewise, facial expressions on students have made it obvious that they were displeased that they had to be in class. I have also found that students do not complete their reading, are performing poorly in my class as a result, and yet expect grades of A or B. Given that students study an average of one hour a day based on the latest data collected by ASU, it is no wonder that they are performing poorly. However, other faculty must not be demanding much from them as average grades at ASU are high. I did bring these items up in my class where, during the discussion, I was informed that one faculty member allowed students to answer their cell phones in class and that he, himself, answered his in the middle of his lecture. Another student said that her instructor failed to come to class even though she was present in the building. These students agreed that there are many faculty at ASU for whom they have no respect, nor would I, nor do I.

Consequently, I would like to ask the Faculty Senate to investigate, discuss and suggest solutions to the problems of students’ rude behavior, their lack of intellectual engagement, and the problem of faculty who enable such behavior. I believe that it is time that Appalachian State faculty act to re-establish academics as the primary focus for students’ presence on this campus—not the games, clubs, and social events that are pushed by other entities on this campus.

Appendix B

Workshop Announcement

“Exploring the Contours of Civility and Academic Freedom on Campus”
with Gary Pavela, J. D.

Are you concerned about student behavior, civility, intellectual discourse, and academic freedom at Appalachian? Please join us for a morning discussion and workshop with one of the nation’s leading scholar-practitioners on these topics.

Friday, May 6, 2005 9 a.m.-12 noon (continental breakfast 8:30 a.m.) Price Lake Room, Plemmons Student Union

Gary Pavella is the Director of Judicial Affairs at the University of Maryland-College Park and Editor of Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education. He is a nationally recognized scholar in the increasingly critical area of civility, campus life, and the law. He holds an M.A. in intellectual history from Wesleyan University and a law degree from the University of
Illinois. Gary Pavella serves as a member of the Advisory Board of the Kenan Center for Ethics at Duke University and is a past president of the National Center for Academic Integrity, a consortium of 200 universities that collaborate on academic integrity policies and procedures.

Appendix C

Quick Facts on Refuting Faculty Arguments

(from www.textbooks.appstate.edu)

1. It is possible to maintain a “rigorous and intellectually diverse scholarly environment” while still providing a Textbook Rental System. However, Faculty Senate is not willing to compromise.

2. Academic freedom is a liberty provided by the Government to an Institution, not individual faculty members. Moreover, as defined in section 3.2.3 of the Faculty Handbook, “faculty and students of this institution shall share in the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which academic freedom flourishes and in which the rights of each member of the academic community are respected.”

3. Faculty arguments suggest that textbooks become outdated during their three year tenure, yet they feel it is necessary for students to collect these “outdated” texts for our personal libraries.

4. A rental system, like the University Library, in no way promotes consumptive entitlement. Rather, it provides students with an affordable means of expanding their intellectual curiosity.

Appendix D

1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments

(excerpt)

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.
The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

Appendix E

Academic Freedom Of Individual Professors And Higher Education Institutions: The Current Legal Landscape
Donna R. Euben, Staff Counsel
May 2002

(excerpt)
Various constituencies make claims to academic freedom and freedom of speech in the academic community. Consequently, even professors, lawyers and judges "are not always clear whose academic freedom is at stake." Robert M. O'Neil, "Academic Freedom and the Constitution," 11 J.C. & U.L. 275, 281 (1984). Legitimate invocations of academic freedom can often be difficult to discern and articulate. Nevertheless, there is a substantial body of law to guide us. What follows is a brief overview of the principles and law shaping faculty and institutional claims to academic freedom, followed by a discussion of current and future challenges.

Assertions of academic freedom under the First Amendment tend to arise in one of the following three ways: "claims of professors against faculty colleagues, administrators, or trustees; claims of professors against the State; and claims of universities against the state." David M. Rabban, "A Functional Analysis of 'Individual' and 'Institutional' Academic Freedom Under the First Amendment," 53 LAW & CONTEMP. PROBS. 227, 231 (Summer 1990) (hereafter "A Functional Analysis"). Occasionally these claims may conflict.

As two commentators explain:

Constitutional principles of academic freedom have developed in two stages, each occupying a distinct time period and including distinct types of cases. The earlier cases of the 1950s and 1960s focused on faculty and institutional freedom from external (political) intrusion. These cases pitted the faculty and institution against the State. Since the early 1970s, however, academic freedom cases have focused primarily on faculty freedom from institutional intrusion. In these latter cases, faculty academic freedom has collided with institutional academic freedom.

Respectfully submitted:

Patrick Rardin

Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Elections Annual Report 2004-05

Submitted by Susan Staub

Activities: We held the election for open Senate seats and the Faculty Assembly in February. All seats were contested except the Library seat. The results are as follows:

At Large (2 seats)
Harold McKinney and Monica Lambert are elected.

Harold Mckinney135
Monica Lambert104
Doug Waring83


College of Arts and Sciences (2 seats)
Chip Arnold and Jeff Butts are elected.
Chip Arnold (ENG) 51 votes Jeff Butts (BIO) 41 votes
Katherine Mawhinney (MAT) 28 votes
Diane Sides (FLL) 28 votes

Writes ins: Richard Abbott, Cinthia Pratt, Tom Rhyne

**College of Business (1 seat)**
Mark Strazicich is elected.

Mark Strazicich18 votes
Richard Pouder17 votes

**College of Education (1 seat)**
Nancy Mamlin is elected.

Nancy Mamlin17 votes
Claire Mamola14 votes
Steve White9 votes

**College of Fine and Applied Arts (3 seats)**
Jeff McBride, Martha Marking, and Mark Malloy are elected.

Jeff McBride 38 votes
Martha Marking 36 votes
Mark Malloy30 votes
David Domermuth26 votes
Banks Talley25 votes

Write-ins: Susan Bogardus, Mike Kernodle

**Library (1 seat)**
Allan Scherlen is elected.

Allan Scherlen16 votes

**College of Music (1 seat)**
Bill Jones is elected.

Bill Jones22 votes
William Gora5 votes

**Faculty Assembly (1 delegate and 1 alternate)**
Sandie Gravett is elected delegate, Tom Jamison alternate.

Sandie Gravett124 votes
Tom Jamison 78 votes
Write-ins: Rodney Duke, Tom Rhyne

Because of irregularities with one of the at-large seats, the Senate voted to hold another election for that seat. The election closed on April 7. The results are as follows:

Virginia Branch (LIB) 21 votes
Beth Davison (SOC) 24 votes
Scott Ludwig (Print Making and Drawing) 14 votes
Katie Mawhinney (Math) 39 votes
Mike Moore (HIS) 49 votes
Tammy Wahpeconiah (ENG) 24 votes
Doug Waring (PSY) 27 votes
Write-ins: Banks Talley 2 votes; Dave Domermuth 1 vote

Mike Moore is elected.

Grace McEntee was appointed to a one year term as an alternate on the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee.

The Faculty Due Process Committee and the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee were charged.

The Committee on Committees is gathering nominations for the other elected university committees and the appointed committees. Those elections and appointments will take place at the beginning of the fall semester.

Issues: The “Senate Guidebook” needs to be updated to indicate more clearly the elections for which the Senate is responsible and who in the Senate is responsible for gathering nominations for individual committees. The guidebook indicates that some nominations are the responsibility of the committee on committees, others the vice-chair or chair. The Senate also has an ad hoc University Elections Committee whose members “serve as elections representatives for this year's senate elections.” The individual responsibilities need to be more clearly delineated. The “Senate Guidebook” has not been updated since 1992 and does not seem to reflect current practice.

The current election procedure does not seem to follow the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
Neither the “Senate Guidebook” nor the Senate web site lists the University Research Council as one of the committees for which the Senate is responsible though the by laws for the URC state that the “Council consists of voting members elected through the University Senate election procedures.” Information on the election of URC members should be added to both the guidebook and the web site.

On a related matter. It seems important that the Senate consider changing the URC from an elected to an appointed membership. As it now stands, the membership is not representative. The college this most affects is the College of Arts and Sciences, which currently has two representatives from Geology and one from Psychology, but no one from the humanities.