April 14, 2003 Minutes

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
(approved as amended)

At 3:21 p.m. on April 14, 2003, Chair Gates convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 I. G. Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Chair Gates welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)
B. Chair Gates announced that Senator Yaukey had been circulating App House petitions and that the response had been good. The Chair encouraged senators to pickup and circulate blank petitions among students and faculty.
C. A Faculty Assembly Survey was circulated among senators. Chair Gates noted that the survey was being administered by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee of the UNC Faculty Assembly. The trial survey was being sent out to all UNC Faculty Senates in an effort to examine the ratio of faculty to administrators.
D. Chair Gates reported that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee met on April 7, 2003 and focussed on parking issues. The Chair noted that senators attending the CAC meeting had reminded the Chancellor of upcoming increases in parking. The senators also informed the Chancellor of the Senate's motion proposing to add a $1 surcharge for parking during campus events. According to Chair Gates, ASU Staff Council had also supported the $1 parking surcharge. The Chair revealed to senators that the Chancellor was in favor of the $1 parking surcharge motion. The Chair noted that Chancellor Borkowski had asked Jane Helm to look at the $1 surcharge and come to the May 5th, Faculty Senate meeting with any calculations and information on the issue.
E. Chair Gates announced that the elections deadline was Friday, April 11th. The ballots would be tallied and election winners would be announced after Easter Break.
F. Chair Gates informed senators that the Council of Chairs was in support of the Senate's Workload Document. According to the Chair, the CoC had reaffirmed their endorsement of the Workload Document.

Senator Koch briefly introduced a motion from the floor regarding reaffirmation of the workload document to be implemented by the Administration. Senator Koch presented the proposed motion and Senator Arnold seconded.

Motion from the floor: the Faculty Senate reaffirms its support of the workload document and requests that the Administration implement provisions of the workload document as soon as feasible

VOTE 1 19 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

II. VISITORS
Dr. Alan Hauser gave a brief report on ASU graduation rates. He passed around a summary chart
of 3 years of reports from the NCAA & UNC institutions. The chart was based on a 6-year graduation rate that compared ASU students, student-athletes receiving financial aid and recruited student-athletes. Senator Woodworth pointed out that in the past the reports had been based on a 5-year graduation rate and asked why had the graduation rate been increased to 6-years. Dr. Hauser explained that by increasing the graduation rate from 5 years to 6 years, the NCAA and the UNC systems could produce a better profile of students graduating within a more reasonable time frame. Dr. Durham pointed out that ASU ranks as one of the top four UNC institutions, with respect to graduation rates by student athletes.

Barry Sauls of ASU Parking and Traffic reported and discussed campus parking & traffic construction issues. According to Mr. Sauls, the latest information from the Design and Construction Office was to postpone the elimination of Whitener parking lot until after graduation. Mr. Sauls talked about losing a grand total of 353 faculty/staff parking spaces due to campus construction. He pointed out that the construction of the new library would impose a loss of a little less than 300 spaces plus the recreation center construction would eliminate 80 faculty/staff parking spaces (located directly across from Walker Hall). The good news, according to Mr. Sauls, was that ASU faculty and staff would eventually get all of their parking spaces back, the bad news was that faculty and staff would have to live with the inconvenience during construction. He noted that there would not be much parking that would be convenient to Whitener Hall until a new parking deck was built next to the new library. "First thing that we want to do is to move the Graduate Assistants out of Raley and Legends parking lots. The plan will be to move Graduate Assistants to the football stadium parking lot as well as move them out of Legends parking lot where the Graduate Assistants would then be moved to Hill Street parking," said Mr. Sauls. Mr. Sauls noted that shifting grad parking would free up about 100 spaces. Senator Koch and Senator McKinney had questions related to parking fees. Senator Anderson proposed that the hourly parking deck rate needed to be increased in order to absorb some of parking deck's outstanding debts. Mr. Sauls was not in agreement with Senator Anderson's suggestion to increase parking deck rates because he feared that the fees had already reached a maximum. He noted that "the deck had done exceedingly well" and averaged about $900 in daily revenue. Mr. Sauls also noted that one of the underlying reasons for constructing the parking deck was to cut down on students parking in "no parking" zones or in faculty/staff parking spaces. Mr. Sauls also informed senators that an upcoming decision on rates for parking would be determined before school was out. Senator K. Simon asked senators if they were interested in rescheduling a forum with Jane Helm. Senator Koch injected that forums are informative but do not allow the Faculty Senate to take a vote and move to action on the issue. Senator McKinney asked about how ASU compared with other universities operation of parking at events. Mr. Sauls replied that ASU was "pretty much in line with other universities who have events." Senator Moore had questions related to the fairness of campus parking fees, namely due to the fact that anyone could park for free on Rivers Street. Mr. Sauls responded that Rivers Street was "owned by the DOT" (not ASU) and that the DOT would prefer that ASU not permit parking on Rivers Street in the future. Mr. Sauls noted that the reason the DOT wished to eliminate parking on the Rivers Street stemmed from concerns for pedestrian safety. Senator Bortz pointed out that the state had allocated very small pay raises for faculty and yet the Administration was getting ready to increase parking fees which would, inevitably and unjustly, cut into faculty salaries. The Chair thanked Mr. Sauls for coming to talk to the Senators. Senator Koch presented another motion from the floor that requested Jane Helm to bring information
related to the tentative parking proposal, along with any recommendations and plans concerned
with campus parking and construction to the May 5th Senate meeting. Senator Koch presented
the proposed motion and Senator Waring seconded.

Motion from the floor requesting Jane Helm to come to the May 5, 2003 Faculty Senate Meeting
with a tentative proposal and recommendations for the proposed parking plans.

VOTE 2 19 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

III. MINUTES – March 17, 2003
Senator Allen moved and Senator Woodworth seconded to approve the March 17, 2003 minutes
with one correction.

VOTE 3 18 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

* The Final Committee Reports for 2002-2003 are attached at the end of the minutes.

A. Ad-hoc Committee on Deans Evaluations (WEITZ, Bauldry, Butts, Gates,)

For purposes of consistency and clarity, Senator Moore and Senator Allen suggested changing
the wording of several evaluation questions. Senator Moore suggested deleting the word
"adequately" and replacing it with the word "effectively" in motion FS02-03/04-03 under
Quantitative Questions, I.), sentences d. and e. Senator Moore went on to modify the wording of
motion FS02-03/04-04 under I., 4.), sentences a., c. and d. Senator Allen suggested inserting the
word "effectively" motion FS02-03/04-04, under I., 5.), a. through f. Senators agreed with the
modified wording of the questions (see amended motions written in vote 6 and 7 for specifics).
Note that the original evaluation questions are available for comparison in the March 17, 2003
minutes. Senator Koch raised questions and concerns about what the Faculty Senate's role in
administrative personnel reviews should (or should not) entail. Senator Koch informed senators
that the evaluation process was the responsibility of the Provost and not the Faculty Senate.
Chair Gates pointed out that getting involved in personnel decisions was not the original intent of
the evaluation document. Senator Bortz suggested dropping the evaluation document because the
Faculty Senate did not function as employers and the evaluations process ought to be initiated
from Academic Affairs. Senator Moore concurred but was concerned about Academic Affairs
initiating evaluations of administrators in the future. Senator Woodworth suggested that Senator
Koch write a revised summary of the Deans Evaluations. Senator Koch agreed and would present a revised or replaced summary and motion at the May 5th, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Bortz voiced concern about why and how the Administration had historically not shared important information like, administrative evaluations and the loss of App House with all faculty members. Chair Gates asked senators to vote on the four written motions from the Ad-hoc Committee on Deans Evaluations and then resume discussion on the topic.

FS02-03/04-01- Recommend the Council of Chairs develop a process addressing relationship with the Deans

VOTE 4 18 YES 1 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

FS02-03/04-02- Recommend the following demographic information:
A. Department (depends upon college or dean)
B. Faculty status (Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Adjunct, Part-time Lecturer, Other)
C. Gender (male, female)
D. Years at Appalachian (0-5, 6-12, 13-20, 21 or more)

VOTE 5 16 YES 2 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

FS02-03/04-03- Recommend quantitative, advocacy & narrative questions be used for faculty evaluation of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (as amended)-

QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONS:
1.) Administration:
   a. The Dean's office functions effectively and efficiently.
   b. The Dean effectively works with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).
   c. The Dean effectively administers graduate education programs.
   d. The Dean effectively oversees the production of graduate school/research publications.
   e. The Dean effectively oversees administrative aspects of the proposal preparation and submission process.
2.) The Dean makes fair decisions in appointing and re-appointing Graduate Faculty.
3.) Resources:
   a. The Dean effectively administers financial support for graduate students.
   b. The Dean effectively and fairly allocates the overhead from the grants.
4.) Leadership:
   a. The Dean effectively communicates policies and procedures, and the rationale for decisions.
   b. Within the university mission, the Dean has a vision for the Graduate School and for faculty research.
   c. The Dean is accessible and open to interaction with the faculty.
d. The Dean takes a leadership role in the recruitment and retention of graduate students.
e. I trust the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

5.) Advocacy:
a. The Dean effectively advocates for research/creative activity at ASU.
b. The Dean effectively assists faculty in finding appropriate funding for research/creative activity.
c. The Dean is an advocate for equal opportunity.

NARRATIVE QUESTIONS:
6.) Comment on your Dean's strengths.
7.) Comment on your Dean's weaknesses.
8.) Provide suggestions for improvement.
9.) Other comments.

VOTE 6 18 YES 1 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

FS02-03/04-04-Recommend quantitative, advocacy & narrative questions be used in faculty evaluation of the Deans Fall 2003 (as amended)
I. Question for the Dean of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Fine and Applied Arts, and the School of Music:
QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONS: (answers can be: "don't know" OR ranging from "strongly agree to strongly disagree")
1.) The Dean's office functions effectively and efficiently.
2.) The Dean makes fair decisions in regard to hiring, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.
3.) Allocation or resources, space, and workload:
a. The Dean allocates resources fairly among departments.
b. The Dean allocates space fairly among departments.
c. The Dean works to improve facilities of the college.
d. The Dean allocates workload fairly among departments.
4.) Leadership qualities:
a. The Dean effectively articulates a vision for the college that is in accord with the university mission.
b. The Dean effectively communicates policies and procedures, and the rationale for decisions.
c. The Dean supports faculty self-established professional goals that are in accord with the university mission.
d. The Dean is accessible and effectively interacts with the faculty.
e. I trust my Dean.
5.) Advocacy:
a. The Dean is an effective advocate for teaching.
b. The Dean is an effective advocate for scholarship/creative activity.
c. The Dean is an effective advocate for service.
d. The Dean is an effective advocate for needed space.
e. The Dean is an effective advocate for equal opportunity.
f. The Dean is an effective fundraiser.

NARRATIVE QUESTIONS:
6.) Comment on your Dean's strengths
7.) Comment on your Dean's weaknesses.
8.) Provide suggestions for improvement.
9.) Other comments.

VOTE 7 18 YES 1 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

Senators resumed their discussion involved with the process of deans evaluations. Senator Millsaps asked the Senate if it would be possible to produce a survey that asked faculty for their opinions about administrators. Chair Gates suggested The Appalachian newspaper could be a good source for conducting a survey. Dr. Durham cautioned senators that conducting a survey related to personnel matters could potentially result in legal problems related to free speech. Senator Bortz pointed out that it was illegal to publish personnel files and asked if the proposed motion that he was charged to produce at the next meeting was to include personnel files. Both Chair Gates and Senator Woodworth emphatically said, "No." Dr. Durham wanted to know what was the purpose of the proposed survey. Chair Gates replied that the survey would be used "to encourage personnel to take action." Senator Koch asked Chair Gates to first seek outside legal counsel regarding the survey before taking further action. Senator Millsaps and Senator Yaukey gave examples of how freedom of speech had been utilized through electronic and print media in order to conduct opinion polls and surveys related to topics such as sports, war and politics. They contemplated why the Senate's proposed survey was any different from those examples. Senators questioned and hypothesized why and how the Senate's proposed survey could result (or not result) in legal entanglements.

B. Budget Committee (ANDERSON, Bortz, Bush, Koch, Olson, Yaukey)
Senator Anderson talked about the motion from the Budget Committee. The original motion read: FS02-03/04-05-The Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Provost direct department chairs to share department operating budget information with their respective faculty. We believe that faculty should have an understanding of the plans for and the actual use of department operating funds.
Senator Moore suggested rewording the second sentence of the motion (see motion as amended below). Senators discussed why it was vital for department chairs to share departmental operating budgets with their respective faculty. Senator K. Simon wanted to know the number of departments that did not reveal their operating budgets. Chair Gates replied that "it was sporadic." Senator Bortz wanted the Senate to insist on enforcement of the proposed motion. Senator McKinney moved and Senator Moore seconded to call for the question.

Called for the question.
VOTE 8 14 YES 1 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The question passed.
FS02-03/04-05-The Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Provost direct department chairs to share department operating budget information with their respective faculty. Faculty should have the opportunity to understand the plans for and the actual use of department operating funds (as amended).

VOTE 9 15 YES 1 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion carried.

Senator Anderson talked about the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate Budget Committee Annual Report. One of the issues raised from the report concerned the amount of salary money that had been allocated for non-teaching personnel. Senator Anderson noted that it seemed like non-personnel salary monies could have been more effectively distributed. This is an ongoing issue and there was essentially still $2 million of the faculty salary money used for non-teaching personnel. Senators started to discuss more details of the report but Senator Moore noted that there was a lack of quorum.

Due to a lack of quorum the meeting ended at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Rardin,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY - FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
March 17, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Senator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</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>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORTZ, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTE 1: Motion from the floor: the Faculty Senate reaffirms its support of the workload document and requests that the administration implement provisions of the workload document as soon as feasible.

VOTE 2: Motion from the floor requesting Jane Helm to come to the May 5, 2003 Faculty Senate Meeting with a tentative proposal and recommendations for the proposed parking plans.

VOTE 3: Motion to approve the March 17, 2003 Minutes (as corrected).

VOTE 4: FS02-03/04-01- Recommend the Council of Chairs develop a process addressing relationship with the Deans.

VOTE 5: FS02-03/04-02- Recommend the following demographic information:

VOTE 6: FS02-03/04-03- Recommend quantitative, advocacy & narrative questions be used for faculty evaluation of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (as amended)-
VOTE 7: FS02-03/04-04-Recommend quantitative, advocacy & narrative questions be used in faculty evaluation of the Deans Fall 2003 (as amended)-
VOTE 8: Call for the question.
VOTE 9: FS02-03/04-05-The Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Provost direct department chairs to share department operating budget information with their respective faculty. We believe that faculty should have an understanding of the plans for and the actual use of department operating funds (as amended).

VISITORS: Dr. Alan Hauser, Philosophy & Religion; Jenny Ware, ASU Staff Council; Dr. Bill Ward, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Dr. Peter Petschauer, Director of Faculty & Academic Development for the Hubbard Center and Division Director for the History Department; Barry Sauls, Director, ASU Parking & Traffic; Jay Sutton, Assistant to the Coordinator of the Learning Assistance Program.

FINAL COMMITTEE REPORTS - 2002-2003

2002-2003 Faculty Senate Budget Committee Annual Report
 (Anderson, Bortz, Bush, Koch, Yaukey)

Completed Work

* FS02-03/12-1: Motion regarding private funding for athletic facilities
* Faculty/Staff Parking Permit Fee - Impending Increase
  - February Report
  - Motion FS02-03/02-01 Regarding Parking Fees for Campus Events
  - April Report from Barry Sauls (Dir, Univ. Parking & Traffic Dept.)

* Questions submitted to the Provost for his response
  - See Attached
* FS02-03/04-5: Motion encouraging the Provost to direct department chairs to share department operating budget information with their respective faculty

* Vacant Faculty Positions Report (as listed in the 2002-2003 BD-119 report)
  - Academic Affairs $1,494,464 (38.56 FTE’s)
  - Extension Instruction $1,327,803 (21.97 FTE’s)

  - See Attached
  Remaining Work

* Unused Faculty Salary Funds Report (Expenditures)
  Carry-over for 2003-2004 Budget Committee
  * Creation of a standing budget committee to work with the Provost to provide ongoing faculty input for the Academic Affairs budget and budgeting processes
  * Ongoing tracking of 101-1310 funds used for non-teaching personnel
  * Meet with the Provost to obtain answers to the previously submitted questions

---

**2002-2003 BD-119 Analysis**

101-1310 Funds used for non-teaching personnel Academic Affairs TOTAL = $2,034,000
Sali Gill Johnson Cultural Affairs 15 K
Perry Mixter Dir, Cultural Affairs 92
Henry Foreman Dir, Smith Gallery 54
Elizabeth Glass Freshman Seminar 35
Advisors 44
Arts & Sciences
Chuck Watkins Cultural Center 73
Richard Henson Assoc. Dean 97
Rainer Goetz Asst. Dean 69
Lee Williams Watauga Coll. 24
Peter Petschauer Hubbard Center 85
Business
Kathy Meier Dir, Advising 47
Doug May Dir, Acad. Comp. 78
Tim Burwell Assoc. Dean 120
Priscilla Kuzyszyn Advising 32
Education
Faculty Senate Budget Committee
Questions submitted to the Provost 2-27-03

1. As you know, questions have been raised about funds from 101-1310 (Regular Term Instruction) being used to pay personnel without teaching responsibilities. You have indicated that a number of administrative/support personnel have been moved to position lines paid from other (i.e., other than regular term instruction) funds. There seems to be no obvious way of insuring faculty that the funds that once covered those salaries do indeed remain in 101-1310.

As we mentioned in the Senate, this is, of course, not about individuals but about use of 101-1310 funds for individuals without teaching responsibilities. Take for example, the case of Linda Robinson. She was paid $61,750 from 101-1310 (2000-2001; position number 6269). She was then (2001-2002) moved to Academic/Student Support (187-1110; position number 6840). The remaining salary on the previous position (#6269) was then $10,990 – with that position listed as Vacant (and remaining vacant in 2002-2003).

While we recognize that some of the previous salary could have been moved to another position within 101-1310, we cannot verify such a move. The same is true with the case of Roachel Laney. He was paid $64,877 from 101-1310 (position number 0639). He was moved as well. That previous position (#0639) is now vacant and has a salary of $12,717. How can we account for these funds (as well as any others resulting from similar transfers)?
2. Are all of the FTE's listed for 101-1310 funded at the same amount (thereby accounting for the total $ figure for 101-1310)? How do you account for year-to-year changes? For example, if you look at the BD-119 (for 101-1310 Regular Term Instruction) from 1998 to present, the total FTE's listed have either remained the same or increased (presumably due to new positions). Likewise, the total $ figures for 101-1310 increased, and the average $ per FTE has increased. Would this summary information (FTE's, total $, average $ per FTE) address concerns that funds have been restored to (remained in) 101-1310 as administrative/support personnel have been moved to other budget categories?

3. We know that we have received a number of new faculty positions in the last few years (due to increased enrollment). Have all of these positions been allocated to departments (enabling departments to hire)? Why are so many vacant positions (fully-funded) listed in Extension Instruction? In 2000-2001, there were 15 vacant positions (each funded at $53-58,000) listed under 107-1310. In 2001-2002 there were 23 fully-funded vacant positions. Currently (2002-2003) there are 21 vacant positions (each funded at $50-62,000) listed under Extension Instruction (now coded as 101-1310). Thus, it appears as though a number of new positions have been available yet not utilized for some time. Do we have to account for these extension positions separately from other faculty positions? Generally, faculty would not simply be hired to teach in extension programs – most likely faculty would be teaching on campus as well as meeting the needs of extension programs.

4. What state funds are used for the Turchin Center?
5. What academic funds (operating funds and/or salary funds) are going to Appalachian Summer and Cultural Affairs?
6. How (on what basis) is E&T (Education & Technology) fee money allocated to the various colleges?
7. Our understanding is that, in addition to the $150 tuition increase for faculty salary increases, an additional $50 increase was collected. How have these funds been used?
8. Our understanding is that there is a proposal under consideration to address the competitiveness of department chairs' pay. This evidently involves an increase from 10% to 15% for the 9-month to 12-month contract, as well as retention of the chair stipend (approx. $2000-$4000) after a specified length of service? Where does this proposal stand? What was the impetus of the proposal? What is the policy for determining the salary for an individual that steps down as department chair, returning to full-time faculty status?
9. How much money (proceeds) is generated from the bookstore and food services? How are these proceeds used? What goes to academics, athletics, etc.?
10. How much money from Academic Affairs goes to Freshman Seminar, Learning Communities and similar programs. Specifically, what is the source of these funds?
We have recommended and pass the following motions: the review of department chairs, motion for resolution regarding search committee deadlines, motion regarding the director of the Equity Office, motion regarding review of administrators, motion requiring advisory boards to have written bylaws, motion regarding departments to have written policies and procedures, a resolution defending university employee benefits from any further cuts by the state legislature, information on ratio of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty to student credit hours taught by part-time faculty, and information for the Senate concerning the number of student retakes of courses and of student late drops of courses (a motion was made from the floor to ask AP&P to look into our liberal retake and late drop policies). Our motion regarding annual report forms did not pass.

In the future, the committee needs to review promotion, tenure, and merit guidelines; the question of collegiality; the establishment of bylaws, policies and procedures for the cultural museum, and to review the academic quality of the Freshman Seminar Program.

Stephen Simon,

Chair, Academic Policy Committee for 2002-2003

Annual Report of Welfare of Students Committee

(RARDIN, Lambert, McKinney)

At the beginning of the academic year Faculty Senate Chair Gates assigned Welfare of Students Committee the following areas to investigate: notice of student visits from Health Services to faculty, night maintenance and housekeeping in residence halls, single rooms for RA,s, General Studies advising, and evaluation of faculty on the web. Because the Welfare and Morale Committee filed a complete report on notice of student visits from health services to faculty, Welfare of Students Committee did not investigate the matter. Other priorities arose that precluded an investigation of the remaining issues. Chief among the Welfare of Students Committee's concerns were: increase penalty for sexual assault, administration of rape kits on
campus, Graduate Assistant parking, use of tobacco products on university property, links to private web pages on university web pages. The issue of links to private web pages on university web pages was referred back to Chair Gates for reassignment as the issue went beyond the committee’s charge. In a report submitted to the Senate, the Welfare of Students Committee informed the Senate that legal restrictions precluded any motion banning the use of all tobacco products in all university buildings. No motion on the matter was brought forward. The committee did bring forward a motion to allow Graduate Assistant parking in faculty spaces, but it did not pass the Senate. Motions for increasing the penalty for sexual assault and university administered rape kits did pass the Senate. The committee does not recommend pursuing any of the areas assigned to it by the Senate Chair at the beginning of the academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Welfare of Students Committee

FACULTY SENATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2002-2003 ANNUAL REPORT

Members of the committee for 2002-2003 were: Jeff Butts (Chair), Carol Truett, and Steve White.

I. 2002-2003 ASSIGNMENTS
Responsibilities assigned to the committee during the 2002-2003 academic year and progress toward meeting those responsibilities are listed below:
Recommend faculty members for service on University committees.
This responsibility has been discharged. Details are listed in Section II of this report.
Continue to review university committees following the periodic review schedule established in 2001-2002.

This responsibility has been met. Results of the review of committees in the current year are presented in Section IV of this report.

Review all university standing committees and add those committees to the Faculty Handbook if
needed, update the charge to all committees listed in the Faculty Handbook, and develop a policy on replacement of committee members for the Faculty Senate Guidebook.

This responsibility has not been met and should be continued to the 2003-2004 academic year.

II. Appointments to University Committees:
During the year, the Committee made the following recommendations for appointments to university committees:
October 14, 2002
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee
W. Edward Folts (Sociology/Social Work) for a three-year term to replace Dale Wheeler (Chemistry) representing the College of Arts and Sciences, Keith Davis (HPC) for a one-year term to replace Thomas Jamison (LES) representing the College of Education, John Abbott (Library) for a three-year term to replace Elizabeth Williams (Library) representing the Library

Core Curriculum Committee
Victor Mansure (Music) for a three-year term to replace Randal Outland (Music) representing the School of Music

Graduate Council
Dennis Grady (Pol Sci/Crim Just) for a one-year term to replace Matt Robinson (Pol Sci/Crim Just) representing the College of Arts and Sciences

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee
--John Turner (Sociology/Social Work) for a one-year term to replace William Hutchins (Phil/Rel)

Research Council
John Craft (Technology) for a one-year term to replace Patricia Mosher (HLES) representing the College of Fine and Applied Arts, Elizabeth Rose (Music) to replace Maribeth Yoder-White (Music) representing the School of Music.

November 11, 2002
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee
Ron Marden (ACCT) to a three-year term representing the College of Business

Faculty Assembly
Ken Muir (SOC/SW) to a one-year term as an alternate delegate
Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee
Joan Woodworth (PSYCH) to a one-year appointment as an alternate to the committee

Teaching Enhancement Committee
Jane Morgan (COM) as a one-year replacement for Roxanne Knudsen (COM) representing the College of Fine and Applied Arts

University Research Council
Mark Vogel (ENG) to a one-year term to replace Derek Paulsen (PSCJ)

III. MOTIONS PRESENTED TO THE SENATE
FS02-03/03-02- Motion regarding the charge of the Teaching Enhancement Committee- Passed on March 17, 2003
The charge of the Teaching Enhancement Committee shall be as follows:
"a. Members of the Committee: 14 - 11 faculty (3 from A&S, 2 from Bus, 2 from ED, 2 from FAA, 1 from MUS and 1 from LIB), 2 undergraduate students (chosen by SGA) and 1 graduate student (chosen by GSAS). The Coordinator of the Faculty and Academic Development program of the Hubbard Center will be an ex-officio (voting) member of the Committee. The faculty will be elected by the faculty in the unit that they represent. Faculty terms will be three years. b. Report to: the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. c. Areas of responsibility: 1) to work both in cooperation with the Hubbard Center and on its own to consider issues and make recommendations regarding the enhancement, evaluation, and recognition of teaching at Appalachian; and 2) to share among the faculty ways that teaching is being improved both at Appalachian and elsewhere."

The official charges to the Awards Committee and the Teaching Enhancement Committee have a significant area of overlap which has resulted in confusion regarding which faculty committee has responsibility for selection of nominees for the Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching and other teaching awards.

The current charge to the Awards Committee is:
"Members on Committee: 17 - 13 faculty (3 from A&S, 2 from Bus, 2 from FAA, 2 from Ed, 2 from Music, 2 from Lib), 2 staff, and 2 students (one undergraduate and one graduate). Faculty composition can be any faculty, including adjunct and part-time. In the event a member of the Committee wishes to seek an award, an alternate from his/her area will be recommended to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on Committees to serve for the duration of the awards process. b. Report to: The Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Areas of Responsibility: Selecting and facilitating university and external awards including but not limited to: ASU teaching awards, Board of Governors Awards, O. Max Gardner Award."
The current charge to the Teaching Enhancement Committee is:
"a. Members of the Committee: 14 - 11 faculty (3 from A&S, 2 from Bus, 2 from ED, 2 from FAA, 1 from MUS and 1 from LIB), 2 undergraduate students (chosen by SGA) and 1 graduate student (chose by GSAS). The Coordinator of the Faculty and Academic Development program of the Hubbard Center will be an ex-officio (voting) member of the Committee. The faculty will be elected by the faculty in the unit that they represent. Faculty terms will be three years. b. Report to: the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. c. Areas of responsibility: 1) to work both in cooperation with the Hubbard Center and on its own to consider issues and make recommendations regarding the enhancement, evaluation, and recognition of teaching at Appalachian; 2) to share among the faculty ways that teaching is being improved both at Appalachian and elsewhere; 3) to serve as the selections committee consistent with the guidelines submitted by the Board of Governors for the Board of Governors' Award for Excellence in Teaching."

This overlap in responsibility was discussed with the chairs of the two committees, and they agreed to resolve the overlap by changing the charge to the Teaching Enhancement Committee to eliminate the responsibility for selection of the nominee for the Board of Governors' Award for Excellence in Teaching.

IV. REVIEW OF COMMITTEES

The committee is charged with responsibility for periodic review of standing faculty committees. In October 2001, the committee presented to the Senate, and the Senate approved, a plan for review of standing committees on a three-year rotating basis. Under that plan, the standing committees to be reviewed in 2002-2003 were the Library Services Committee, Patent and Copyright Committee, Registration and Calendar Committee, and Teaching Enhancement Committee. In conducting the reviews committee members used the Committee/Council Review Form (developed in 2000-2001 and appended to this report) and assigned responsibility for review of one standing committee to each of the members of the Committee on Committees.

Review of the Library Services Committee:
The committee was assigned to Jeff Butts for review. The review is not complete at this time.

Review of the Patent and Copyright Committee:
The committee was assigned to Jeff Butts for review. The review is not complete at this time.

Review of the Teaching Enhancement Committee:
The committee was reviewed by Stephen White. Membership on the committee includes 11 faculty, 2 undergraduate students, and one graduate student. The Director of the Faculty and Academic Development Program is an ex officio member of the committee. The committee reports to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The charge to the

The Committee on Committees recommends no additional changes to the charge of the Teaching Enhancement Committee at this time.

Review of the Registration and Calendar Committee:
The committee was reviewed by Carol Truett. Membership on the committee includes 5 faculty, 2 staff, 2 students, and one representative from the Controller’s Office. The Registrar is an ex officio member of the committee. The committee reports to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Overall the committee appears to be functioning well with a focus on setting the University calendar. The chair of the committee raised some questions about the charge since the focus of the committee has been on setting the academic calendar and about the membership on the committee, specifically the purpose of having a representative from the Controller’s Office. The Committee on Committees recommends that the Registration and Calendar Committee review its charge and the composition of membership and make a request to the Senate next year if changes are necessary.

---

**Campus Planning Committee 2002-03: Final Report to the Faculty Senate, April 2003**

Committee Members: John Abbot, Trish Allen, Kevin Kennedy, George Olson, and Kathy Simon (Chair).

During the 2002-03 academic year the Committee as a whole was given no specific assignments by the Senate. As the Senate’s liaison with the Office of Business Affairs, the Committee met with Vice Chancellor Jane Helm on September 24, 2002. Ms. Helm gave an overview of the campus ten-year plan and the status of each building construction or renovation project to date. A detailed written report as to the status of each project and the source of its funding was written by Chair K. Simon and presented to the Faculty Senate during its October 14th meeting. Besides a follow up question regarding why a bridge had not been constructed over River St., the report generated little Senate response.

Under committee guidelines, the CPC chair is a member of the University Strategic Planning Commission. Simon was notified on October 31 that due to the “current and anticipated budget
“cuts” the University Strategic Planning Commission would meet regularly from November 2002 through Spring semester 2003 to review and revise the current 1999-2004 strategic plan and the planning process. Each of the SPC sessions were transcribed and the minutes were placed on the University’s Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning web page. Simon reported via e-mail to the CPC members and by announcements at subsequent Faculty Senate meetings where the minutes and reports could be found. No questions were asked of Simon regarding these meetings. Simon was appointed chair of the Enrollment Management Team and invited the CPC members to participate in its discussions, beginning in February. CPC Trish Allen has attended and participated in several of these meetings. Preliminary proposals to the administration from the five teams are expected in mid to late April.

A Campus Planning Commission/Business Affairs forum is scheduled for Thursday, April 10 at 3:30 p.m. in the student union. It is to provide an opportunity for the faculty at large to be informed regarding future building/renovation projects on campus as well as the status of current projects. A number of questions arose during the March 17 FS meeting concerning the impending loss of faculty/ staff parking spaces in the Whitener and Walker lots. Simon offered John Abbot’s proposal that Ms. Helm give a presentation at the next Senate meeting, but the senators decided that an open forum for all faculty was needed.

According to its guidelines, the committee is supposed to “investigate problems arising from the condition or management of the physical environment on campus.” The committee was given no assignments under this guideline. The physical environment of the main campus is extremely challenging because of all the fencing around the building projects. The committee can do little about this since safety concerns require these inconveniences. The problems will be compounded beginning summer session 2003: existing main campus projects will not be finished when the new library project starts up. It is recommended that the new committee monitor this area.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen M. Simon

FACUTY SENATE HOMEPAGE
Appalachian State University