The April 13 Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Neufeld, 3:15 PM in the University Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. VISITORS.

Neufeld welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors' names.)

B. ELECTION RESULTS.

The results of the at-large elections are: FACULTY SENATE - Debra Edwards and Mike Moore were elected for a three-year term and Patricia Gaynor was elected for a one-year term; FACULTY GRIEVANCE HEARING COMMITTEE - Bill Bauldry was elected to the Professor Seat and Polly Trnavsky was elected to the Associate Professor Seat; FACULTY GRIEVANCE MEDIATION COMMITTEE - Mike Evans was elected to the Professor Seat; FACULTY ASSEMBLY - Jimmy Smith was elected to the Delegate Seat and Mark Venable was elected to the Alternate Delegate Seat. These results were distributed by email.

C. RECOGNITION OF SENATORS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING.

Chair Neufeld thanked all the senators for their work in this past year and before. The senators stepping down are Robert Cherry, Paul Gaskill, Dee Parks, Mike Perry, Sandra Robertson, Jim Toub, Fred Wallace, Roger Winsor, and Sara Zimmerman.

D. MCGARRY TO REPLACE GISKIN. Giskin will be spending the '98-'99 year in Costa Rica. In his absence, Rick McGarry will serve on the Senate.

E. REDUCING THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS MONEY SPENT ON NON-TEACHING COACHES.

So far the money that comes out of Academic Affairs and supports non-teaching coaches has been reduced from over $1 million to $659,000. Neufeld met with Provost Durham and Chancellor Borkowski recently to talk about how that can be further reduced. Chancellor Borkowski plans to discuss this issue at the Chancellor's Retreat in May.

F. COORDINATION BETWEEN FACULTY SENATE AND THE EQUITY OFFICE.

Neufeld met with Melissa Barth and Harvey Durham recently regarding faculty perception of the Equity Office. At the meeting it was decided that the Equity Office will submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate, and that one member of the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee will attend the Equity Office's board meetings. In addition, a list of the Board of Directors of the
Equity Office will be submitted to the Senate each year. To gather more information on faculty perception, a survey was recently distributed by the Equity Office to all faculty.

G. INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE.

The University system is conducting a study of technical resources at all system schools. This is a major effort that will be used to assess the needs of each campus.

H. HOODING OF MASTERS STUDENTS.

The Chancellor has approved the continuation of hooding masters students at the December graduation ceremonies.

II. MINUTES

Moore noted that the section on Faculty Handbook changes needs to be clarified. Gates moved to approve the March minutes with this correction, and Moore seconded.

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

III. GUEST SPEAKER

A. JAMES IVORY, CHAIR OF FACULTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.

See attachment #1 for the text of Dr. Ivory's address.

WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE.

Because the resolution brought by this committee best fit into the agenda at this point, and because Dr. Ivory was still present to answer questions, the Committee's report was moved up on the agenda. The Committee put forth this resolution: Resolution in Support of the Actions Taken by the Appalachian Student Body in Adopting An Academic Integrity Pledge - That the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate express support for actions recently taken by the ASU student body in adopting an academic integrity pledge, which will be signed by all future applicants to enrollment at this university, and which will be reaffirmed at the close of all major academic work. A long discussion ensued, much of which concerned the implications of the Code on faculty, i.e., who should institute the policy, enforcement, mechanisms to be employed, etc. A vote was finally taken to express support for the concept of an honor code, and the details of implementations left to another time.

VOTE 2 15 yes 6 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

An amendment to the resolution was suggested. The revised resolution is: Resolution in Support of the Actions Taken by the Appalachian Student Body in Adopting An Academic Integrity Pledge - That the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate expresses its
appreciation and support for actions recently taken by the ASU student body in adopting an academic integrity pledge.

A vote was taken on amending the resolution.

VOTE 3  22  yes  0  no  0  abstain  The motion passed.

A vote was taken on the amended resolution.

VOTE 4  21  yes  1  no  0  abstain  The motion passed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. FACULTY CONCERNS

1. Wallace asked if we have heard anything about the Institutional Need Committee. Durham said that he had decided to just use the whole Faculty Senate as that committee.

2. Wallace asked if we have had any response from our letter to the Board of Governors regarding last May's changes to the Faculty Handbook. We have not.

3. Moore asked about the Capital Improvements Fund list. It has been distributed and Rankin, the library, and the Methodist Church are high on the list. It was suggested that we ask Jane Helm for an updated report at the beginning of each semester from now on.

B. BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING.

At the last meeting a name was selected for the new convocation center, capital improvement reports were given, and tenure/promotion recommendations were taken care of. All tenure recommendations were sent on to the Board of Governors; all promotions were approved. It was announced that we will have minutes from the Board of Trustees meetings on the web soon.

C. CHANCELLOR'S REVIEW COMMITTEE.

The committee is close to having a document to distribute to all students, faculty, staff, and selected people in town and in the county. It's a short evaluation and should be out this semester.

D. POST-TENURE REVIEW PRELIMINARY DRAFT.

A draft document (see attachment #2) entitled "Policies and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at Appalachian State University" was distributed to senators by the members of the Post-tenure Review Committee established last fall. Caton suggested that this procedure produces a great deal of extra work, especially for members of small departments. Lee said that her department had already spent a lot of time developing a different procedure that would now have to be thrown away. Caton suggested that an item 0 be added to the list as a triggering mechanism for
the rest of the procedure, that if a person received a "vote of confidence" he or she would not be obligated to do the rest. Butts wanted to clarify that this process is not a "detenuring" process. Neufeld suggested that the policy is a positive one because persons with good reviews can be rewarded. Moore wanted to know why the chair gets to choose one committee member. Wallace wanted to know if this procedure applies to the chair. Parker stated that our university has no choice in this matter, we have to do it. Neufeld asked that the committee consider the suggestions heard and come back with a report in May.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. CHILD CARE COMMITTEE.

No report.

B. TENURE/PROMOTION PAY RAISES.

Provost Durham said that it would cost $350,000 per year on a continual basis to avoid leapfrogging one person over another if the Senate's new proposed policy on rewarding faculty for tenure and/or promotion is adopted. There is some apprehension on the part of deans and chairs because this money would have to come out of existing salary monies.

C. FACULTY PRIVACY RIGHTS COMMITTEE.

This committee met last week, has more meetings scheduled this semester, and will continue their work next year. Due to some members cycling off the Senate, four new members will be needed for next year.

VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE.

(done previously)

B. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.

See attachment #3 called "Utilization of Part-Time and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty" which contains some guidelines from the AAUP. The Committee asks that the Administration determine exactly how many full-time faculty equivalents they routinely need and begin converting their non-tenure-track positions to full-time tenure-track ones.

C. AGENDA COMMITTEE.

Neufeld announced that the changes to the Faculty Senate Guidebook (change in name from Faculty Senate Handbook) are completed and asked for endorsement from the Senate.

VOTE 5 16 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

D. BUDGET COMMITTEE.
No report.

**E. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE.**

Winsor reported that he attended the Traffic Management and Safety Committee meeting and reported to that Committee what has been discussed at previous Faculty Senate meetings.

**F. CHANCELLOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

Distance Learning is still a major concern throughout the University system. The Board of Governors recommended a 6% pay raise for next year, all merit, and that the last 1% of reversion monies be dropped. The deal with the Methodist Church came through. We paid $2.7 million. The Chancellor's house is getting run-down and out-of-date. A new one may be built further up the hill. The funding formula was changed again, giving ASU about $100,000 more a year.

**G. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.**

The Committee put forth the following replacements for university committees. Their service will start at the beginning of the Fall 1998 semester and will continue until the end of the second summer session in the year 2001:

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROCEDURES - Ken Lurie (Music) will serve another term.

ADMISSIONS - Larry Ellis (Economics) will replace Albert Harris (Decision Sciences) and Earlene Campbell (Library) will replace Lynne Lysiak (Library).

CORE CURRICULUM - Harriette Buchanan (LAP) will replace Rennie Brantz (History) and Alicia Aldridge (Management) will replace Ray Larson (Accounting).

PATENT AND COPYRIGHT - Robin Taylor (Management) will replace Carol Truett (LES).

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY - Matthew Robinson (Political Sci/Criminal Just) will replace Jeff Tiller (Technology).

VOTE 6 18 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

**H. COMPUTER COMMITTEE.**

No report.

**I. WELFARE AND MORALE COMMITTEE.**

No report.

**VII. NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS FOR 1998-99.**
Since Neufeld is one of the candidates on the slate, Parks ran this part of the meeting. The slate of candidates is: Chair - Howard Neufeld; Vice-Chair - Gayle Weitz; and for Secretary - Mike Moore.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT OF OLD SENATE**

**IX. CONVENE NEW SENATE.**

A vote on the slate of officers was taken.

| VOTE 1A | 13 yes | 0 no | 0 abstain | The motion passed. |

A motion was made to adjourn and it seconded.

| VOTE 2A | 5 yes | 0 no | 0 abstain | The motion passed. |

The meeting adjourned around 6:15.

Submitted by Dee Parks

---

### APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY

**FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET**

**APRIL 13, 1998**

**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>ABSENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNHOLT, ALAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYD, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATON, DAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY, ROBERT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBSON, BILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMERMUTH, DAVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORGAN, HOWARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASKILL, PAUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXC - EXCUSED
Harvey Durham, Ex-officio

VISITORS: James Ivory, English; Clinton Parker, Academic Affairs; Bobby Sharp, Institutional Research; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs

VOTE 1: Approval of March minutes as amended
VOTE 2: A call for the question on the Welfare of Students' Committee resolution
VOTE 3: A vote on amending the above resolution
VOTE 4: A vote on the amended resolution
VOTE 5: Approval of Faculty Senate Guidebook revisions
VOTE 6: University Committees recommendations

NEW SENATE
APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
April 13, 1998

VOTING SYMBOLS: Y=YES N-NO A=ABSTAIN ABSENCE
NAME OF SENATOR: 1A 2A
ABBOTT, RICHARD EXC
ANDERSON, STELLA Y Y
ARNHOLT, ALAN Y
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, EDWIN</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLISS, LEN</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYD, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATON, DAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBSON, BILL</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMERMUTH, DAVE</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORGAN, HOWARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, DEBRA</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYNOR, PATRICIA</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISKIN, HOWARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDREW</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE, TERESA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGARRY, RICK</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MIKE</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUFELD, HOWARD</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEER, CHARLIE</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITZ, GAYLE</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINEK, JON</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINKLER, LINDA</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYATT, TONI</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE 1A: A vote on the slate of officers  
VOTE 2A: Adjournment

April 13, 1998  
Attachment #1

Text of James Ivory's address:

On behalf of the Faculty subcommittee on Academic Integrity, I wish to thank the members of the Faculty Senate for extending me this invitation to discuss the role of Faculty in light of the passage of the student referendum on the Honor Pledge.

While I wish to make a brief opening statement, I hope to spend most of my time with you today attempting to answer questions and to promote some productive discussions related to your thoughts regarding this issue as it relates to faculty.

First, through the legislation in November 1996 that created the Academic Integrity Committee, the Faculty Senate has revealed needed insight and leadership that has led to raising the bar
regarding the academic climate here at Appalachian. Due to the leadership of the Faculty Senate, this university will never return to a climate in which student apathy perceives cheating--in its many forms--as a "victimless crime" or where faculty fears have led to many faculty turning a "blind eye" to this very significant problem.

Second, the Faculty subcommittee and I have been considering some significant proposals on how to better educate new and existing faculty on the newly-adopted pledge and the currently-being revised code. For example, by adding components on Academic Integrity to some required Freshmen courses like English 1000, we can ensure that incoming students are made fully aware of how seriously Appalachian takes Academic honesty. Furthermore, by adding an additional component to new-faculty orientation, new faculty will no longer be uneducated regarding the procedures related to this issue--and to be later overwhelmed or misguided if such a situation regarding academic dishonesty should arise. While these are some significant and productive proposals in the right direction, the subcommittee still has much work left in implementing them. Significantly, the results of the student referendum have validated much of what we have currently been considering.

Third, while the newly-adopted honor pledge will not reduce every instance of cheating to zero; no honor pledge can accomplish that task. It will, however, over time begin to suppress those voices who insist on achieving academic success through dubious means. Currently, the atmosphere is one in which students openly discuss the blatant nature of cheating on this campus with little thought to how this openness works to embrace and accept this form of academic dishonesty. And while academic dishonesty roams so freely in the minds of so many, the quality of work accomplished by those who achieve it in an honest fashion is lessened.

Furthermore, the value of what we as faculty do in the classroom is also diminished if we continue to accept this lack of academic ethics that we as professionals must condemn. On March 18th and 19th during the SGA elections, the student body sent both faculty and administrators a clear message. That message is that we--the students--believe in Honor and we will embrace and endorse a system and a university that also acknowledges the importance of Academic Honor. In that vote 80% of the students who voted for the Academic Honor Pledge. This sends us the faculty a clear message that we must raise the bar as well regarding Academic Integrity in our classrooms. Will we sit or stand idly by, or will we press forward to celebrate this brave effort--based on faith in us--on the part of our students?

While we sit here and hope to prepare our students to succeed and to think critically about the wory? As we examine the world "out there"--what some reductively call the "real world" as compared to academia, we find numerous instances where the power of the signature stands for personal as well as financial integrity. Although the increased need for authentication by signature may point to the significance and value of integrity in the power of one's signature. Why then are we so unwilling to ask students to live up to similar standards while in college when the degree that they will have earned from Appalachian will have so much impact on both their personal as well as financial lives? And their successes or failures will indirectly reflect on how well--or not so well--we have done our jobs at Appalachian in preparing them to succeed.
As I suggested earlier, no pledge or code can eradicate all forms of Academic dishonesty. However, the opportunity through the work placed before this body and its constituents can impact the quality of academic life at Appalachian in ways that previous legislation could only dream about. Not only will our work on Academic Integrity enhance the quality of the classroom, it will impact Appalachian's regional and national reputations as a university that respects and enforces the tenets and long-standing traditions of Academic Honesty, which are held in such high esteem at so many of this nation's well-respected universities.

And lastly, what more significant and long-lasting gift might the Faculty Senate want to give this university as it approaches its centennial and as humanity approaches its millennium?

April 13, 1998
Attachment #2

Policies and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at Appalachian State University Draft

Introduction
Tenure was defined by the American Association of University Professors in its 1940, "Statement of Principles" as "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 the society" (Van Alstyne, 1993, pp. 407-409). According to a more recent publication, tenure is, "a statement of formal assurance that thereafter the individual's professional security and academic freedom will not be placed in question without the observance of full academic due process." (Finkin, 1996, p.4).

The Code of the University of North Carolina affirms that academic tenure exists, "to promote and protect the academic freedom of its faculty." In its 1993 report entitled Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, the Board of Governors reaffirmed the value of tenure, stating, "The purpose of tenure is to assure faculty members academic freedom and protection against improper abridgments of the freedom of inquiry through teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activities; and to protect the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other sources of confining orthodoxies" (pp ii). The report also stated that "the quality of the University depends ultimately on the quality of its faculty," and noted that "historically, tenure has been a common feature of all major universities and colleges in the United States and crucial to the attraction and retention of outstanding faculty members" (p. ii). In addition, the report stressed, "How that system (tenure) operates, the policies and procedures followed, and the standards applied will determine in large measure, the quality of the faculty and of the University" (p. ii). The recommendations in this report are intended to strengthen the system of tenure and protect the concept of academic freedom while
assuring continuous improvement in the quality of the faculty as they carry out the institutional mission of teaching, research and service.

**Traditional Evaluations of Faculty**

As long ago as 1982, authorities agreed that tenure and rigorous evaluation are not incompatible concepts (Chait & Ford, 1982). Moreover, about that same time, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues recommended that campus administrators work closely with faculty to develop systems of evaluation for tenured faculty (*Academe*, 1983).

Evaluation of faculty members is a routine part of academic life. Faculty members typically are products of rigorous terminal degree programs and have undergone multiple evaluations before they receive their degrees. Faculty applying for positions also undergo thorough review and evaluation for initial appointment. As probationary members of the faculty, new professors undergo systematic reviews for reappointment, and a multi-year cumulative review (usually over a six-year period) to determine if their work to date is acceptable and if they show sufficient promise in teaching, research, and service to deserve continuing affiliation with their institutions. Only those faculty whose performance is found to meet these high standards and whose abilities fit the needs of the institution become tenured. In reviewing the tenuring process, one report has noted that "the striking thing about the university, compared to a typical corporation, is not the number of college graduates employed there with secure jobs but the number of high-level employees who don't expect to be allowed to stay" (McPherson & Winston, 1996, p. 101). Once achieved, tenure neither protects faculty from further evaluation nor obviates the need for continuing productivity and competence.

Many other forms of review are also an accepted part of academic life. For example, the scholarly work of faculty is reviewed by peers prior to publication and/or presentation, grant proposals receive rigorous reviews from panels of experts, artistic works are reviewed before being accepted for exhibit or concert performances, and teaching is evaluated by both students and peers. Faculty members are also reviewed as a part of programmatic and institutional accreditation studies. Indeed, few other types of work require such constant review and assessment of worth and performance as does the work of academicians.

Tenured faculty members in North Carolina also experience annual reviews of their productivity in all aspects of their work. This process is well accepted and has been regarded by many institutions as a form of post-tenure review. However, annual reviews are generally carried out on all faculty including probationary and fixed-term, as well as tenured faculty, and may have the limitation of reflecting only the accomplishments of the immediately preceding academic year, while full post-tenure reviews are carried out only on tenured faculty and reflect evaluation of a body of work over a period of several years. The results of annual reviews are used in making decisions about salary increases, in providing information concerning nominations for awards, and may be a component of the record used for making tenure, reappointment, and promotion decisions. Results also become a part of the permanent record of the faculty member. Less often, the results of annual reviews may be used to assess an individual's progress on a previously established professional development plan or may become a part of a multi-year review documenting continuous progress across a faculty member's career. The results of post-tenure reviews, in contrast to annual reviews, are generally used to evaluate a faculty member's
contributions as they help promote the goals of the department and institution and to provide information to each faculty member regarding her/his career development over time.

The following points will guide Appalachian State University's response to the mandate of the Board of Governors to initiate post-tenure review at the constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina.

1. A Post-Tenure Review Committee consisting of the department chair (who serves as ex-officio chair of the committee), two peers* chosen by the faculty member and one peer chosen by the department chair will be appointed for each tenured faculty member to be reviewed.

2. Tenured faculty will be reviewed in reverse order from the date of their last formal review by the Department Personnel Committee. Approximately one-fifth of the tenured faculty in a department will be reviewed in any one year. Once the rotation is established, the faculty member will be reviewed every five years barring any intervening formal review by the Department Personnel Committee.

3. One month prior to the date of the formal review of the tenured faculty member, the faculty member will submit a portfolio that MUST include information from the preceding five years and cover the following areas: all student evaluations from a minimum of three different courses during the past five years when possible, results of direct classroom observations conducted since the last formal review, copies of course syllabi, copies and/or citations of scholarly presentations, publications and/or creative activities, documentation of professional services and goals for the immediate future.

4. Each member of the review committee, within one month of the receipt of the portfolio, will provide a written evaluation to the chair on each of the three areas of responsibility (teaching, research or creative activity, and public service). Forms for this purpose may be developed by the departments. Comments on each of the areas of responsibility should be brief and to the point.

5. The department chair will provide both the committee and the individual faculty member a written summary of the evaluation. Both positive and negative results will be shared with the faculty member in a conference with the chair. (It is suggested that this be a part of the existing annual Spring conference.) In the instance of a particularly strong positive evaluation, appropriate rewards will be considered. In the instance of a decidedly negative evaluation, the committee will recommend remediation including the possible allocation of additional resources, a time-line for demonstrated improvement, and a clear statement of the consequences of failure to improve. These consequences must be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter IV of the Faculty Handbook and Chapter VI of The Code of the University of North Carolina.

6. An appeals committee consisting of at least three but no more than seven faculty members will be elected for each college, school and the Library. The appeals process must be initiated within 90 days of the date of the conference with the Chair. Findings of the appellate hearing will be shared with the faculty member and chair. If either party does not accept the findings of
the Appeals Committee, the grievance process as outlined in Chapter IV of the Faculty Handbook may be invoked.

*Each department is to determine their peers. (Peers may be restricted to the department or come from an allied department if the faculty so decides.)
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Attachment #3

Academic Policy Committee
Utilization of Part-time and Non-tenure-Track Faculty


Page 79
1. "Institutions should limit reliance on non-tenure-track faculty. We recommend as guidelines that institutions limit the use of special appointments and part-time non-tenure-track faculty to no more than 15 percent of the total instruction within the institution, and no more than 25 percent of the total instruction within any given department."

2. "In circumstances in which an institution has legitimate needs for a specialized class of faculty in part-time or fractional-time positions, the institution should have policies that provide for their long-term contract stability and for tenure."

Additional statements:

Page 79
"Institutions which habitually employ many part-time and "temporary" full-time faculty members should calculate how many full-time faculty equivalents they routinely need and begin converting their non-tenure tract positions to full-time tenure-track lines."

Page 80
"Institutions should develop plans for a period of transition that project a timetable and numbers for consolidating part-time assignments into full-time tenure-track lines."

Page 51
The concern is two-fold:
"(1) that part-time faculty members not be exploited, and (2) that they not be engaged to replace full-time faculty members with a result that would undermine the protection of academic freedom which faculty tenure provides and the amount of just compensation which faculty members have achieved."