The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Marking at 3:18 pm in the William Strickland Conference Room in I.G. Greer on Monday, April 16, 2007. Senators Horton, Kaenzig, Mamlin, and Tiller were not in attendance.

I. Announcements:

A. Chair Marking welcomed senators and asked visitors to introduce themselves. Visitors were Dr. Tim Burwell (Academic Affairs), Mr. Jason Radford (Undergraduate Student), and Ms. Mang Chang (Student Government Association).

B. Chair Marking referenced Dr. Aeschleman’s memorandum, dated March 28, 2007, when informing the Faculty Senate about the newly developed standards for the purchase of computers and classroom technology equipment.

C. Chair Marking reminded the Faculty Senate about the upcoming Staff Council silent auction and scholarship benefit on Thursday, April 19, 2007.

D. Chair Marking noted that she will provide in a forthcoming email the website address for the Quality of Online Courses. (Email dated April 16, 2007 indicated website address as www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/thinklink/index.cfm)

E. Chair Marking announced that Senator McBride is the chair of the newly-formed ad hoc committee that will implement the recently approved changes in the structure of the Faculty Senate. Senator Harris and Dr. Stella Anderson are committee members.

F. The Emeritus Faculty Procedure Ad Hoc Committee Report (MCBRIDE, Williams, Marking) will be presented at the April 30, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting.

G. The Faculty Senate end-of-year social has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 2, 2007 from 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm in the Solarium.

II. Visitors Reports:

A. None.

III. Minutes:

A. Chair Marking asked for a motion to approve the March 19, 2007 Faculty Senate minutes. Senator Felkel moved and Senator Malloy seconded. Motion was passed. (See Vote #1).

IV. Provost’s Report:

A. Dr. Aeschleman commented that he and Chair Marking are compiling a list of all pending motions from 2006-2007 academic year so he can respond back to the Faculty Senate on April 30, 2007. Furthermore, he will forward any motions to the Board of Trustees that need their action so that any policy changes can be implemented as soon as possible.

B. Dr. Aeschleman reported that the average salary increase for continuing faculty was 9.42% and the average for the UNC System was 8.53%. The average salary for 90% of the assistant and associate professors disciplinary ranks is at the 90th percentile of a benchmark group of 129 peer institutions.

C. Dr. Aeschleman noted that, relative to the 2002-2003 and 2005-2006 academic years, teaching workloads, measured by student credits hours per FTE, were down approximately 10%. On average, this 10% decrease should convert to a reduction of approximately 2 students per section. The Provost explained that this was due primarily to the creation of 34
faculty lines from the campus based tuition increase in 2002-2003 and because 45 part-time teaching positions were converted to ¾ time.

V. Committee Reports (Committee Chair’s name is in caps.)

A. Academic Policies (HUELSMAN, Butts, Mamlin, Smith, Williams)

No Report.

B. Agenda Committee (MARKING, Arnold, Harris, Marland)

No Report.

C. Budget Committee (STRAZICICH, Marland, McBride, Scherlen)

Senator Strazicich reported that the committee met with Dr. Aeschleman, Dr. Burwell, and Mr. Lovins on April 4, 2007 to discuss budget-related matters. (See Appendix A). Senator Strazicich commented that the budget process appears to be more transparent and quantifiable than in the past. He recommended that the Budget Committee meet with administration once a year to review the budget process. No further discussion.

D. Campus Planning Committee (TILLER, Arnold, Kaenzig, Ramey)

No Report.

E. Committee on Committees (LAMBERT, Horton, Malloy, Mines)

Senator Lambert reported that Committee Annual Review Forms will be emailed to selected committees this week with a return deadline of April 30, 2007. Senator Arnold commented that university election results will be forthcoming. He noted that the Faculty Senate office has not received any completed ballots from the Library. Senator Scherlen responded that he did not receive a ballot. Chair Marking stated that the Faculty Senate office will look into this situation. Chair Marking remarked that university committee websites will be reviewed this summer. Some committees are operating without a complete slate of members.

Motion FS 06-07/04-01 to approve the following nominations for university committees passed. (See Vote #2).

Academic Integrity Board

Adam Newmark (PS)
Ellen Cowan (GLY)
Steve Smith (COM)

Academic Policies and Procedures

Jon Saken (PHY)
Ron Marden (ACC)
Jeff Butts (BIO)
Gayle Weitz (ART)

Admissions Committee
Jeanne Murphy (LRE)  
Carl Tyrie (COM)

**Arts and Cultural Programs Advisory Committee**

Eric Reichard (TEC)  
Emily Daughtridge (THR)

**Awards Committee**

Kenneth Johnson (LIB)  
Melanie Greene (COE)  
Robin Byerly (COB)  
**Vacant (COB)**  
Michael Kernodle (FAA)  
James Anderson (Music)  
**Vacant (Music)**  
**Vacant (A&S)**

**Core Curriculum Committee**

Gwen Robbins (A&S)  
Jon Saken (A&S)  
Sue Williams (FAA)  
Beth Cramer (LIB)

**Library Services Committee**

Monica Pombo (COM)  
Bradley Nash (SOC)  
Jeff Hirst (MAT)

**Registration and Calendar Committee**

Patrick Rardin (P&R)  
Charles Kreszock (TEC)

**Traffic Policy**

Ellen Carpenter (FCS)  
Eric Frauman (RM)  
Tom Jamison (LES)

**University Bookstore**

Tim Harris (LRE)

F. Faculty Handbook Committee (MARKING, Arnold, Gates, Marland)

**Motion FS 06-07/04-02** to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.2.1 to the *Faculty Handbook* as stated in Proposal #1.

**Proposal #1**

7.2.1 AGENDA COMMITTEE

**Proposed:**
The Agenda Committee shall be defined as the elected officers and the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate and shall meet at least once prior to each regularly scheduled Senate meeting to formulate and approve (by the vote of the members in attendance) the agenda for each upcoming Senate meeting. The Agenda Committee also:

a. prepares the agenda for general faculty meetings
b. refers matters to the appropriate committee; and
c. handles other business pertaining to agenda matters.

**Rationale:**
The Parliamentarian is not an elected officer of the Faculty Senate but is helpful to include in determining correct procedures regarding motions, etc. for the Senate meetings. The Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and the past chair of the Faculty Senate have not currently been participating on this committee. It is assumed that the past Senate Chair could be contacted for advisory purposes if needed.

Discussion concerning Proposal #1 included a question from Senator Marland who inquired about the history of having former senate chairs serving on the agenda committee with the added comment that their participation could be useful, yet should they be required if they are no longer on the Senate or if they are retired. Senator Arnold stated that retired faculty should not serve on a committee that is forming policy for presently employed faculty. Committee members can solicit advice from retired chairs when warranted. Senator Scherlen stated his concern about allowing former chairs to serve on this committee if they are not attending any senate meetings with the exception that former chairs could be consulted in an advisory capacity. Senator Ramsey remarked that former chairs could be invited to attend without voting privileges. Senator McBride called the question. Motion passed (See Vote #3). Motion to approve Proposal #1 passed. (See Vote #4).

**Motion FS 06-07/04-03** to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.2.4 to the Faculty Handbook as stated in Proposal #2. Motion passed. (See Vote #5).

**PROPOSAL #2**

**7.2.4 CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Proposed:**
a. considers matters of faculty concern relating to long-range and physical planning;
b. serves as Faculty Senate liaison with the Strategic Planning Commission; and
c. investigates problems arising from the condition or management of the physical environment on campus.
d. Senate will assign a member of this committee to serve on the University Council on the Safety of the Campus Community.

**Rationale:**
This is a relatively new council and direct communication between that body and Faculty Senate has been beneficial. A faculty senator has been sitting on this committee since its inception and we are codifying this process.

**Motion FS 06-07/04-04** to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.3.4.7 to the Faculty Handbook as stated in Proposal #3. Motion passed. (See Vote #6).

**PROPOSAL #3**

**7.3.4.7 FACULTY AND STAFF BENEFITS COMMITTEE**

**Proposed:**
a. Members on Committee: 6 - 3 faculty (2 elected from the Faculty and 1 from the Faculty Senate Committee on Welfare and Morale), and 3 staff; and the director of Human Resource Services shall serve as an ex officio, non-voting, member.

**Rationale:**
This committee could benefit from having two members of the committee being elected from the faculty at-large as opposed to all members coming from the Faculty Senate Committee on Welfare and Morale.

G. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (FELKEL, Ehnenn, Harris, McKinney)

Senator Felkel reported on the committee’s findings regarding the teaching loads of tenure and tenure-track faculty in their respective departments. (See Appendix B).
H. Welfare of Students Committee (RAMSEY, Carpenter, Davison)

Senator Ramsey introduced a proposal that he received from Dr. Lyle Schoenfeldt, Department of Management, College of Business, regarding a percentage-based system for granting Latin Honors. (See Appendix C). Senator Ramsey reported that he had received a large number of emails from the College of Business, in particular, and other departments in response to the Faculty Senate’s motion to increase GPA requirements (Motion FS 06-07/12-02 passed on February 12, 2007 by Faculty Senate). The Welfare of Students Committee made a motion to send Dr. Lyle Schoenfeldt’s proposal to the Faculty Senate’s Academic Policies Committee for further review and consideration. Motion FS 06-07/04-05 passed. (See Vote #7). Discussion concerning this motion included the following comments: Senator McBride reminded the Senate that since Motion FS 06-07/12-02 to increase GPA requirements had already passed and been referred to the AP&P Committee that no additional motions needed to be approved at this time in this regard. Senator Evans stated that the College of Business is very concerned about the issues of raising GPA requirements and grade inflation. Senator Malloy remarked that there needs to be a campus-wide or system-wide discussion on grade inflation. Senator McKinney commented that the Faculty Senate should duly consider and take action on proposals that are submitted to the Senate. Senator Butts noted that the AP&P Committee has not received any directives nor made any recommendations concerning the Faculty Senate’s motion to increase GPA requirements.

VI. Unfinished Business

A. None.

VII. New Business

A. Chair Marking presented the Board of Governors’ Post-Tenure Review Draft Policy for discussion. Senator Ehnenn stated her concern, in reference to Guideline #1, about increasing or giving more rights to non-tenure track faculty.

Senator Felkel made the observation, in reference to Guideline #2, that there is the possibility of receiving positive annual reviews yet being told you are not performing could be grounds for filing grievances. Senator Ramsey wanted more clarification of the wording in Guideline #2. Chair Marking read an email she received in which the individual stated that the relationship between post-tenure reviews and annual reviews needs to be more specific because as written the annual review seems meaningless. Senator Ehnenn remarked that completing performance reviews are very time consuming. There was no discussion regarding Guideline #3.

Chair Marking read an email she received regarding Guideline #4 in which the individual stated that any number of scenarios could evolve in which faculty’s public criticism could be seen as not good performance relative to the mission of the institution, college, or program. Furthermore, more explicit language in regard to protecting faculty in this regard is important. Another concern was what would happen if the university’s mission changed and a faculty member’s productivity was not in agreement with this new mission—would the faculty member be held responsible? Senator Ehnenn remarked that tenure provides a certain amount of academic freedom and this right might be eroded if the mission of an academic department changes. For example, if a department decides that quantitative research is more inline with their mission, what would happen if a faculty member is conducting qualitative research. Will the faculty member be judged as not supporting the department’s mission? Senator Ramsey commented that he was uncomfortable with the language in Guideline #4. The wording seems too broad that it could become dangerous; moreover, the guideline does not explain nor defines the limits of “relative to the mission.” Senator McBride commented that mission statements give direction to an organization, are necessary, and should not be seen as a device to micro-manage faculty. Senator Malloy stated that performance should be evaluated relative to the mission of the respective academic program. Senator Smith noted that faculty should support innovation and organizational change within their respective departments. Senator Ramsey recommended that any inference or specific wording that would censor faculty criticism of university affairs should be deleted. Senator Ramey asked what are the outcomes of post-tenure reviews? Dr. Aeschleman responded that the Board of Governor’s motivation is to “toughen up” the review process because they feel that there have been too few negative annual reviews. Furthermore, the Board of Governors’ feels that the annual review process should be a mechanism for removing tenure faculty who are not performing. Senator Butts remarked that their concern should be to make certain that the policies that are adopted by the Board of Governors are faculty-friendly and congruent with the ideas of self-determination and self-governance. Senator McBride stated that there is a need to address the issue of productivity and tenured faculty. Senator Ramsey remarked that post-tenure review is an assault on tenure. Senator Ehnenn asked whether collectively we want to support an academic culture based on trust or fear. There was no discussion on Guideline #5.
Chair Marking read an email from an individual regarding Guideline #6 in which they stated their opposition to not allowing faculty members in consultation with department chairs to select their respective peer review committee members. Senator Ramsey voiced his opinion about the necessity of having faculty input in the selection of peer review committees. Senator Butts commented that faculty members should be able to suggest faculty members for their peer review committee if they are not allowed to select them. Senator Smith noted that it should be mandated that at least one faculty member in your department is on your peer review committee. Senator Ramey suggested using a random selection process wherein names of all tenured faculty members in your department are placed in a hat and selected randomly. Senator Harris stated that post-tenure review is unnecessarily redundant since there are other established review bodies in place. Senator Price voiced her support of this guideline stating that otherwise faculty would select their friends to participate in their peer review.

There was no major discussion regarding Guidelines #7 and #8. Senator Price stated that there needs to be a system in place for evaluating “mentoring peers” in response to Guideline #9. In response to Guideline #10, several senators commented that there are no incentives for earning a positive post-tenure review other than financial. Senator Strazicich offered several suggestions which included eligibility for fellowships and the possibility of gaining a flexible teaching workload.

B. Chair Marking asked for volunteers to serve on the newly-formed ad hoc committee that will decide how to implement the recently approved Faculty Senate Motions FS 06-07/03-11 through FS 06-07/03-17 regarding the restructuring of the Faculty Senate. Senator McBride (Chair), Senator Harris, and Stella Anderson are the current members. Senator Williams volunteered. Chair Marking would like this committee to include one or two more faculty from across campus.

C. Chair Marking asked for a motion to send Motion FS 06-07/04-06 to the newly formed ad hoc committee mentioned in Section VII. Item B for their review and consideration. Motion failed. (See Vote #8).

Motion FS 06-07/04-06: Faculty who serve on the Faculty Senate for an entire three-year term will receive a one course (3 hour) reduction in teaching for the academic year following the completion of their term.

Rationale:
This would provide an additional form of compensation and, perhaps, more incentive to encourage faculty to run for election and serve on the Faculty Senate. As a result, a larger and more diverse pool of faculty might be encouraged. This may also create a higher regard for the Faculty Senate.

Senator Ramsey moved and Senator Price seconded to approve the following motion:

Faculty who serve on the Faculty Senate for an entire three-year term will receive a one course (3 hour) reduction in teaching for the academic year following the completion of their term.

Senator Butts moved and Senator Williams seconded to postpone this motion until the April 30, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting for further review and discussion. Motion passed. (See Vote #9).

D. Chair Marking reminded the Faculty Senate Committee Chairs to submit their annual committee reports to the Faculty Senate office.

E. Chair Marking noted that there will be two Faculty Senate meetings on Monday, April 30, 2007—First and Second Sessions. Newly-elected Faculty Senators will begin their Senate service at the commencement of the Second Session. Chair Marking reminded the Senate that nominations and elections for Faculty Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary will occur during the first and second sessions, respectively.

Chair Marking asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Senator Smith moved and Senator Marland seconded. Motion passed. (See Vote #10). The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, Chip</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butts, Jeff</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>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Ellen</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>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>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Mike</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>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felkel, Brian</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>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Tim</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</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>Horton, Julie</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>Huelsman, Tim</td>
<td>A</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, David*</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>
<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>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>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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamlin, Nancy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marland, Eric</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride, Jeff</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney, Harold</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Jammie*</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramey, Michael</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Colin</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherlen, Allan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</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>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strazicich, 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiller, Jeff</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>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Betsy</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*David Johnson (HIS) is replacing Diane Mines for Spring 2007 as she is taking an OCSA leave.
*Jammie Price (SOC) is replacing Beth Davison for Spring 2007.

Vote #1: Motion to approve the March 19, 2007 Faculty Senate minutes.
Vote #2: Motion FS 06-07/04-01 to approve the nominations for university committees.
Vote #3: Motion to call the question.
Vote #4: Motion FS 06-07/04-02 to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.2.1 to the Faculty Handbook.
Vote #5: Motion FS 06-07/04-03 to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.2.4 to the Faculty Handbook.
Vote #6: Motion FS 06-07/04-04 to approve the proposed changes to Section 7.3.4.7 to the Faculty Handbook.
Vote #7: Motion FS 06-07/04-05 to refer the proposal from Dr. Schoenfeldt regarding Latin Honors to Faculty Senate’s Academic Policies Committee.
Vote #8: A motion to send Motion FS 06-07/04-06 to the ad hoc committee on the Faculty Senate restructuring.
Vote #9: A motion to postpone Motion FS 06-07/04-06 until the April 30, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting.
Vote #10: Motion to adjourn.

Appendix A

Subject: Meeting with Stan Aeschleman, Tim Burwell, and Greg Lovins
Committee: Faculty Senate Budget Committee
The Faculty Senate Budget Committee, consisting of Mark Strazicich, Chair, Eric Marland, and Jeff McBride met with Stan Aeschleman (Provost), Tim Burwell (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), and Greg Lovins (Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs). The meeting began at 4 pm and was completed at 5:15 pm. The following topics were discussed.

1. Briefly describe how the budget process works. At the state level, there is a base or “continuation” budget. This bi-annual budget is based on state appropriations and tuition revenue. The state is currently planning a new two year budget. Some adjustments occur each year, mostly for faculty and staff salaries. There is also an “expansion” budget. This budget is composed of new money proposed by the Board of Governors and funded by the General Assembly. The General Assembly is not able to fund all expansion budget requests and sometimes cannot fund any expansion items. The current top operating priority in the expansion budget is for student financial aid. The second operating priority is to increase faculty salaries. The top capital priorities in the expansion budget are (1) funding for the College of Education building and (2) funding for an Allied Health building. The overall budget is approved by the General Assembly sometime between August and November. After ASU receives their budget, then funds are distributed to the different divisions (most goes to Academic Affairs). Our continuation budget is based on projections each fall (with some adjustments). We cannot carry over big monetary reserves. This year we had about 30 faculty positions in reserve. The UNC System uses a “matrix” formula to determine how many new faculty positions are allocated to the campus based on the growth in student credit hours in discipline and level. On campus, a separate matrix is used to help determine the total number of new faculty positions going to each college. It too uses changes in student credit hours (not the number of majors) along with other inputs from the departments to determine needs. The matrix has been in use for two years. The actual distribution of the new faculty positions within each college is determined by the Dean.

2. Recently, a task force was created to come up with a list of indicators to evaluate our Master’s programs. For example, based on SAT scores and admittance rates, the quality of students in our undergraduate programs is stronger than in our graduate programs.

3. Currently, indirect (overhead) money generated from external grants totals approximately $600,346 out of $11,000,000 in external grants.

4. Average faculty salary increases allocated by the state (in percent) are the same at all 16 universities in the North Carolina system.

5. The plan is to bring average Full Professor salaries up to the 60th percentile this year based on the peer group we have identified. Erskine Bowles wants to bring all faculty salaries in the UNC system up to the 80th percentile in two years based on a different peer measurement scheme.

6. Formulating the ASU budget is an on-going process, and the process is more quantifiable and transparent than in the past. As a result, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee recommends meeting once each year with administrators to explain the process and current budget.
Appendix B

FYI #1:
We asked chairs from the academic departments to provide information regarding the teaching loads of tenured/tenure-track faculty in their respective departments. The table below summarizes our findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAA:</th>
<th>Fall Avg hrs</th>
<th>Spring Avg hrs</th>
<th>Year Avg hrs</th>
<th>Avg. # of courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater and Dance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB-Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB-Teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arts and Sciences:**

| ANT                          |              |                | 2.44         |                   |
| CS                           |              |                | 2.6          |                   |
| ENG                          |              |                | 2.714        |                   |
| G&P                          |              |                | 2.9          |                   |
| IDS                          |              |                | 2.56         |                   |
| Math                         | 10.27        | 8.73           | 19           |                   |
| P&R                          |              |                | 2.733        |                   |
| PHY                          |              |                | 10.33        |                   |
| PSY                          |              |                | 2.75         |                   |
| School of Music (2)          | 10.5         | 10.3           | 10.4         |                   |
| COE (3)                      | 9            | 9              | 9            | 3                 |

(1) The Technology courses often include labs or studios, which would increase contact hours.
(2) MUS courses are standard type courses. AMU are calculated as 3 contact hours = 2 load hours. ENS generally count as 3 load hours.
(3) Based on information from all four departments. There may be some variation across faculty members, but this is typical across the college.

FYI #2:
Our committee was also asked to look into benefits comparisons between ASU and other UNC-system schools. After looking at benefits listed on line at ECU, NCSU, UNC-A, UNC-C, UNC-CH, UNC-G, UNC-Pembroke, UNC-W, WCU, and WSSU, we noted very few differences. The only differences noted were (1) discounts at some area business and (2) UNC-W offered faculty a small university-paid term life insurance policy. These findings were forwarded to Angie Miller and should come before the University Benefits Committee.

Appendix C

Proposal from Dr. Lyle Schoenfeldt, Department of Management, College of Business, via email to Chair of Student Welfare Committee, Dr. Colin Ramsey, on March 19, 2007.

Colin:

Thanks for your reply. I will be brief. In looking this over, I find a number of prominent universities have Latin honors based on a percentage of rank in the respective college. The typical arrangement seems to be the top 5,000 percent as summa cum laude, the next 10,000 percent as magna cum laude, and the next 15,000 percent as cum laude. Thus the top 30% in a college graduate with Latin honors. This is simple, straight forward, and would solve the tremendous inequities that currently exist.