APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 30, 2001
(approved as written)

At 3:18 p.m. on April 30, 2001, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)

B. ED PILKINGTON. Ed Pilkington thanked the Senate for their work on faculty governance and bid them farewell upon his retirement. He noted that all the awards he has received are a direct result of the academic freedom, courageous leadership examples, and cooperative spirit the Faculty Senate and the Administration together gave him. He noted that it has been a long and sometimes bitter, sometimes sweet campaign, but we have won together. Pilkington challenged senators to continue to seek truth, honor, and compassion together.

C. SENATORS’ REPLACEMENTS. Weitz noted that Janice Pope will be replacing Ute Jamrozy beginning today and for the upcoming Senate year and that William Atkinson will be replacing Sandie Gravett for the upcoming year.

II. MINUTES
A motion was made and seconded to approve the April 9 minutes as written.

VOTE # 1 yes 19 no 0 abstain 0 The motion passed.

A vote was taken on Weitz’s recommendation for senators’ replacements.

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

III. GUEST SPEAKERS

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. EQUITY OFFICE/GRIEVANCE PROCESS AD-HOC COMMITTEE
Final Report. Discussion followed as to whether to take action on the report now or wait until the August Senate meeting. Since the document is complex, Simon made a motion to table the report until the August meeting and it was seconded.

VOTE # 3 yes 21 no 0 abstain 0 The motion passed.

B. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
Final Report. Gates reviewed the Committee’s final report.

C. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
Final Report. Rardin reviewed the Committee’s final report.

D. WELFARE AND MORALE
1. **Final Report.** Arnold reviewed the Committee's final report.

2. **Motion FS00-01/04b-01 - Evaluate the Procedures, Expectations, and Staffing of the Appalachian House and the New York Loft.** Arnold reviewed the motion. Koch reinforced the Committee's recommendation that an intern is needed to help run the residences otherwise it is impossible for a faculty member to get any work done or leave the premises. Simon suggested that the Off Campus Facility Advisory Board be sensitive to faculty members who have families. A vote was taken on the motion as written.

   VOTE # 4  yes 23  no 0  abstain 0  The motion passed.

E. **COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

1. **ASU Structure Committee.** Moore noted that this university Committee has been formed as a result of the Committee on Committees not being able to complete its task of reviewing university committees. The Committee consists of Moore, Weitz, Anderson, Bill Bauldry, Bill Harbinson, Bobby Sharp, and Harvey Durham. The purpose of the Committee will be to examine the structure of decision-making within Academic Affairs. It is currently a nameless committee and has not yet been charged.

2. **Motion FS00-01/04-04 - Faculty Handbook Committee.** Moore moved to untable FS00-01/04-04. 

   VOTE # 5  yes 23  no 0  abstain 0  The motion passed.

In place of untabled FS00-01/04-04, the Committee submitted FS00-01/04-04a2. Weitz moved to add a friendly amendment to strike section E under the Agenda Committee responsibilities in the Faculty Senate Guidebook, which reads that the Agenda Committee assists the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in preparing and revising the Faculty Handbook. A vote was taken on the motion as amended.

   VOTE # 6  yes 24  no 1  abstain 0  The motion passed.

3. **Final Report.** The Committee submitted its report.

4. **Committee Report.** Moore noted that the Fringe Benefits Committee apparently is under a new name: the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee but that as far as he knows this name change is not official. Ward gave a philosophical background to the name change noting that since becoming director of Human Resource Services, Len Johnson has been uncomfortable with the term, fringe benefits. It was noted that the Senate had no objections to the name change.

   Moore noted that in reviewing the Traffic Management and Safety Committee (TMSC), faculty members on the Committee have concerns about its role being changed and diminished arbitrarily by being confined to reviewing only oral appeals. The Committee on Committees recommends that the Senate examine the operation of the TMSC and a vote was taken.

   VOTE # 7  yes 23  no 1  abstain 0  The motion passed.
Moore noted that in reviewing the Academic Integrity Board, the Committee on Committees recommends that the Faculty Senate examine the role and operation of the Academic Integrity Board since a new academic integrity structure and code has been instituted. A vote was taken.

VOTE # 8  yes 24  no 0  abstain 0  The motion passed.

F. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
1. Final Report. Abbott reviewed the Committee’s report.
2. Faculty listserv. Discussion followed on the use of the faculty listserv for too many sundry campus uses. Abbott noted that it appears that faculty delete messages that come across the faculty listserv without reading them so a plan needs to be implemented so that faculty are apt to read messages pertaining to the Senate. It was recommended that emails concerning the Faculty Senate come from a user name of Faculty Senate. It was also recommended that possibly certain areas across campus become owners of the faculty listserv so that they can handle their own messages. The Campus Planning Committee will look into the situation further and bring a motion to the Senate in the fall.
3. Bus stops outside Whitener. Moore asked Abbott if the Committee has talked to Jane Helm regarding the bus stops outside Whitener Hall. Moore then made a motion which was seconded that, The Faculty Senate insists that the bus stops outside Whitener Hall be moved away from the building immediately. Discussion followed and a vote was taken.

VOTE # 9  yes 23  no 0  abstain 1  The motion passed.

4. Miscellaneous. Barber noted his concern regarding the possibility of someone being killed in the circle between Edwin Duncan Hall and Raley Hall and under the crosswalks that say Yield to Pedestrians that no one yields at. Barber noted that we cannot just sit here and let time pass by waiting for this day. Barber will talk with the Campus Planning Committee regarding his concerns and the Committee will bring forth a motion.

Pope noted her concern regarding the crosswalk on Bodenheimer Drive where cars fly down the hill and do not yield to pedestrians. Truett recommended that during certain times of the day a traffic officer direct traffic.

G. BUDGET COMMITTEE
1. Final Report. Gravett reviewed the Committee’s report. Gravett noted that she will be rotating off of the Senate this year but that she would act as a consultant to the Committee.
2. Faculty Salary Monies. Weitz read a statement from Dr. Durham regarding the list noting that he has generated a list of positions which are primarily administrative in duties and responsibilities and have developed a categorization (e.g., assistant and associate deans, program directors, assistant program directors, etc.) of those positions. With few exceptions it will be my intention to give top priority to the assistant and associate dean positions and find funding for them from sources other than 101-1310 funds. Given the magnitude of budget reductions we may have to make for the 2001-2002 fiscal year, I do not believe we will be able to make much progress on this project, but we'll see. Dr. Durham will work with the Senate on a plan.
3. Rally in Raleigh. Weitz noted she received an email from the Faculty Assembly chair which initially came from the President of the UNC Association of Student Governments regarding a rally that will be held in Raleigh on Wednesday, May 2. The one simple demand will be that the war on education must stop.
4. Faculty Senate's role regarding the budget reduction proposal. Weitz read a clarification statement regarding the Senate's role in the budget reduction proposal sent by the Chancellor to Molly Broad. Recently some faculty have expressed concern about the Faculty Senate's role in the university's recent budget reduction proposal. I would like to share with the Senate some of my thoughts about the questions raised.

I believe strongly in shared faculty governance and my goal, as Faculty Senate Chair, remains to improve and strengthen this at Appalachian. But the degree to which shared governance occurs is largely dependent upon the openness of the administration. For shared governance to function well, administrators and faculty must work together with some degree of mutual trust. I do trust that we (faculty and administration) all want the same thing--for Appalachian to be the best university it can be. And I believe faculty should play a strong role in developing and implementing policy. Such has not always been the case here, and we must continue working to change that.

When the call to reduce Appalachian's budget by nearly 7% came from the Office of the President, The Provost quickly held a meeting of the Deans Council on Wednesday afternoon and called me that afternoon and requested that I attend as Senate chair. I took this as an opportunity to participate in shared governance and as an affirmation of trust, so quickly got a babysitter and went. I was the only non-administrator there. The dire financial situation was revealed and the Provost asked for advice--where to make cuts and what to protect in Appalachian's budget, and to do so in less than two days! I desired broader input, but felt it inappropriate for me to solicit advice from all faculty via the listserv or just from my friends, so I contacted the Faculty Senate Cabinet (the elected committee chairs and officers of the Senate). I hastily solicited their advice about what could be cut and what should be protected via email before leaving town at 6 AM the next morning to observe a student teacher in Durham. I expressed that my own immediate response was "to protect faculty and faculty positions and to look for cuts in administration, technology, off campus instruction, and travel." In addition, I said that I was "not sure as to how public this information should be at this point, so please use discretion."

All responding cabinet members confirmed that faculty and academic programs should be protected. One cabinet member thought it necessary to share my email with others, because it appeared to him as if my asking Faculty Senate Cabinet members for their input was an attempt to substitute cabinet members' judgment for that of the faculty's. And that doing so amounted to acting in secret from the faculty and raised concerns that the cabinet was acting as if they were elitists.

As a result, I heard from two faculty members in the Political Science and Criminal Justice Department that they had read my email and were concerned that the cabinet was acting in secret and not soliciting and thus not representing faculty opinion.

For the record, I did not provide Dr. Durham with any specific recommendations for cutting our budget. However, I did repeatedly recommend that faculty and faculty lines be protected. (As it turns out, the Chancellor reported that Appalachian was the only institution in the UNC system that did not propose cutting faculty positions.)

I do not desire secrecy; in fact, I have pushed at every opportunity for this information to be shared with faculty. But it seemed to violate trust for me to take it upon myself to share this information with faculty before the administration was willing to do so (not that I didn't want to!). I'm sure that others in my place might have acted differently, but this felt like the right thing for me to do at this time, given the rushed circumstances.
Participating in shared governance is difficult. It is easy to become discouraged and apathetic. But I still possess strong ideals and powerful hope that we can and will continue to strengthen and improve its effectiveness here at Appalachian. But I am also realistic about that process, knowing that change is slow and most often comes in small steps often involving compromise. I am neither secretive nor elitist, and the Senate should not be characterized as such either. I am just trying to do the best I can, responding to many pressing faculty and university issues.

At this time Rardin put forth a motion and emails regarding the informal charging of Senate business via the Cabinet. Arnold noted that several emails were unfortunately missing from Rardin’s packet. Simon added that he received a verbal tongue lashing from a colleague regarding the uselessness of the Senate while Long noted she received a comment just the opposite—that Weitz had acted in a very professional manner and did the best she could given the short time frame for input.

Several senators noted they had a problem with the resolved section of the motion (that it censors the chair of the Senate). Rardin responded that this (motion) is a verbatim quote from Robert’s Rules of Order and that the purpose of the motion is to send a signal to faculty at large that the Senate is committed to its rules of order and carrying out its charter.

Moore noted that he would oppose the motion because one cabinet member had raised a caution whether the cabinet should act without consulting faculty, but before the cabinet could discuss or address the concern, the email from Marv Hoffman appeared before all cabinet members. And then emails from Ruth Ann Strickland and Bill Dobson. In a sense, the process was hi-jacked to respond to the public charges.

Bush recommended the Faculty Senate review its operating structure in light of the concerns raised.

Yaukey added that the possibility of shared governance was squelched from the beginning by the General Administration’s demand for input from campuses in such a short turn-around time. There was no time for faculty to come together for discussion.

Weitz noted that the Cabinet is an elected body composed of Senate committee chairs elected by committee members. Weitz added that she wanted a broader base of input other than the executive committee of the Senate and friends; she thought the elected cabinet would be a better advisory group.

McKinney asked if it would be alright if the resolution was submitted as a paragraph in the minutes (without the whereases). After some discussion, Rardin noted that the motion will remain as it is. Allen called for the question.

VOTE # 10  yes 20  no 2  abstain 2  The question was called.

A vote was taken on the motion as written.

VOTE # 11  yes 3  no 18  abstain 3  The motion failed.

Weitz asked Ward if he had an update on the budget reduction. Ward replied that he did not; they have heard nothing back from the legislature. He noted that the UNC Administration has elected not to try to combine all of the combined cuts from each institution into a single document; they would pass on 16 separate submissions to the legislature. The legislature would then have the burden of picking what they want to cut. It is hoped that the legislature will view Appalachian as a financially well-run institution; but it is a virtual certainty there will be no
roll-over funds available next year.

H. AGENDA COMMITTEE
No report.

I. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY HANDBOOK CHANGES
1. Chapter III changes. Moore noted that the Committee met with Clinton Parker on April 11 to review numerous comments made by Vice-President for Academic Affairs Gretchen Bataille regarding Chapter III prior to its submission to the Board of Governors. Moore called attention to what Bataille noted as minimal tenure criteria for Associate and Full professor that do not require achievement beyond good teaching. Weitz added that Dr. Durham is meeting with Bataille today to discuss her comments/concerns.

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. FACULTY SENATE STRUCTURE
Weitz noted that this would be a good project for interested senators to do during the summer when there is not a lot of Senate business going on. Weitz asked for volunteers to serve on the committee. Those volunteers include Koch, Gates, Petschauer, and Simon. Others who would like to volunteer were asked to notify the Senate office.

B. LIST OF CONCERNS PASSED TO NEW SENATE
Weitz reported that the list of concerns for the new senate will come from the unfinished business portion of the annual reports as well as other sources.

C. OTHER CONCERNS
1. Workload document. Weitz reported that the Council of Chairs at the last meeting proposed continuing an ad-hoc committee with the Faculty Senate regarding implementing the workload document. Weitz asked senators to contact the Senate office to volunteer to serve on the committee.

2. Strategic Planning Commission workshop. Weitz reported that she and Abbott were invited to attend the Strategic Planning Commission workshop last Friday where the Commission was asked by the Board of Governors to tweak the current mission statement and submit its proposal to the Chancellor on Monday (today). Weitz distributed to senators the final proposal of the revised mission statement. Discussion followed. A motion was made regarding the new mission statement and discussion followed. Butts suggested that the statement about Appalachian being committed to excellence be returned to the new document. Several senators noted the new statement is ungrammatical. McKinney called for the question

VOTE # 12 yes 23 no 0 abstain 0 The question was called.

A vote was taken on the motion.

VOTE # 13 yes 22 no 0 abstain 1 The motion was approved.

NEW MISSION STATEMENT MOTION.
The Faculty Senate of Appalachian State University believes that the University's current mission statement is superior to the proposed new mission statement because the new statement deletes the phrase concerned with commitment to excellence at Appalachian. But if the new mission statement must go forward, the Faculty Senate asks that it be grammatically correct.

3. Advertising on Appalachian web pages. Muir noted a colleague's (and his) concern
with the advertising on Ray’s weather page. The concern will be given to Dobson so that he can take it to the ITEC committee.

4. Selling clothing on campus. Moore asked on behalf of a faculty member why private vendors have university space to sell private clothing outside the Bookstore. He asked that the policy of selling clothing on campus be looked into. The Campus Planning Committee will look into this.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. STATUS OF RESOLUTIONS

Weitz reported that the status of past resolutions will be put on the Senate’s webpage this summer.

B. 2000-2001 FACULTY SENATE REPORT

Weitz read a synopsis of the final reports:

- It has been a productive year as these annual reports reveal. Some of our accomplishments include:
  - recommending tenure for chairs and deans at the time of hiring
  - recommending the elimination of the rental text program
  - recommending the adoption of the new Academic Integrity Code
  - recommending simplifying the Post Tenure Review Process
  - recommending a tuition increase to raise faculty salaries across the board
  - examining standing university committees

In addition to the work of the standing committees, several ad hoc committees composed of senators, faculty, and administrators were created.

Some of their accomplishments include:

- recommending changes to faculty workload
- recommending a process to regularly evaluate the deans
- recommending changes to the Equity Office and Faculty Grievance Process (still pending Senate approval)
- revising the Faculty Handbook

I want to thank each of you for your efforts in these endeavors and all the others matters addressed this year. In addition I would like to thank the committee chairs and officers (AKA the Cabinet): John Abbott, Stella Anderson, Chip Arnold, Jeff Butts, Paul Gates, Sandie Gravett, Andy Koch, Mike Moore, and Patrick Rardin for their leadership; and to Michelle Hill for her dedication. It has been a most productive year!

I feel privileged to have served as Chair of the 2000/2001 Faculty Senate. I applaud your dedication and participation in shared faculty governance, and thank you for your efforts.

Weitz presented Rick Abbott with a certificate of appreciation for his service on the Senate. Senator Edwards, Fox and Gravett will also receive certificates although they were unable to receive them in person.

VII. NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS 2001-2002

Weitz noted nominations received thus far: Rardin nominated Koch for chair and Koch
nominated Rardin for vice chair. Weitz then opened the floor for further nominations:
Pope nominated Gates for vice chair
Moore nominated Weitz for chair
Simon nominated Moore for secretary

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate.

VOTE # 14 21 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore, Secretary

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 30, 2001 (new Senate)
(unapproved)

I. CONVENE NEW SENATE
A. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
At 6:20 p.m., Weitz welcomed new senators and asked that everyone introduce themselves.

B. ELECTIONS
Senators were asked to vote for chair, vice chair, and secretary of the Faculty Senate.
Results were:

CHAIR:
Andy Koch - 10 votes
Gayle Weitz - 15 votes

VICE CHAIR
Paul Gates - 17 votes
Patrick Rardin - 8

SECRETARY
Mike Moore - 25 votes

C. COMMITTEES
Weitz announced Faculty Senate committee compositions, adding that with the exception of one person, everyone had their first choice of committee preference. The committees met to elect their chair.

Campbell moved and Marking seconded to adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:30.
Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore, Secretary

---

**FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET**

*April 30, 2001*
*(2000-2001 Senate)*

VOTING SYMBOLS: Y=yes  N=no  A=abstain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SENATOR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, RICHARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATKINSON, WILLIAM</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT, KEVIN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBSON, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, DEBRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVETT, SANDIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDREW</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>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG, BETTY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MICHAEL</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIR, KEN</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPE, JANICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARDIN, PATRICK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUETT, CAROL</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITZ, GAYLE</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Harvey Durham, Ex-officio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SENATOR</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATKINSON, WILLIAM</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT, KEVIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE 1: Approve April 9 minutes as written

VOTE 2: Senators replacements recommendation

VOTE 3: Motion to table action on the Equity Office/Grievance Process report until the August meeting

VOTE 4: Motion FS00-01/04b-01

VOTE 5: Motion to untable FS00-01/04-04

VOTE 6: Motion FS00-01/04-04a2

VOTE 7: Motion to examine the operation of the Traffic Management & Safety Committee

VOTE 8: Motion to examine the role and operation of the Academic Integrity Board

VOTE 9: Motion to move bus stops outside Whitener Hall

VOTE 10: Call for the question

VOTE 11: Motion regarding the informal charging of Senate business via the Cabinet

VOTE 12: Call for the question

VOTE 13: Motion regarding the proposed new mission statement

VOTE 14: Adjournment

VISITORS: Stella Anderson, Management; Robert Bush, Management; Bill Griffin, Foreign Languages and Literatures; Peter Petschauer, History; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs

FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
April 30, 2001
(2001-2002 Senate)

VOTING SYMBOLS: Y=yes  N=no  A=abstain

Dr. Harvey Durham, Ex-officio
VOTE1: Motion to adjourn

Campus Planning Committee Report:
Faculty Senate email sent to all ASU faculty is often ignored because many faculty members automatically delete messages from Michelle Hill, Faculty Senate secretary, in order to avoid reading the assorted general campus unit announcements that are piped through the Faculty Senate Office. The Senate should adopt a means to help the faculty discern different types of email business. One mechanism would be for the campus units to discontinue relying on the Faculty Senate Office and Ms. Hill as the forwarding mechanism for campus announcements and instead would use the SUBSCRIBERS list or other general ASU broadcast email lists. A message from Ms. Hill would then indicate a Faculty Senate communication. Another solution would be for Ms. Hill to maintain two email profile identities: her current one and another where "Chair, Faculty Senate" appears as the sender. The latter would only be used to send or to forward announcements from the Chair.

Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Handbook Changes
Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Handbook (Mike Moore)
The committee met with Senior Associate Vice-Chancellor Clinton Parker on April 11 to review numerous comments made by Vice-President for Academic Affairs Gretchen Bataille on chapter 3 of Appalachian's Faculty Handbook prior to its submission to the Board of Governors. This meeting resulted in the committee members' assent to some changes Bataille requested such as the inclusion in Appendix E of Phased Retirement policy, the use of certified mail to make official notices, and a stylistic change. Bataille also suggested that hirings for chairs and deans and at the Full Professor rank come with tenure, a practice that the Faculty Senate has already begun to address. Bataille also strongly recommended that Appalachian change its requirements for promotion to Associate and Full Professor in sections 3.4.2.6.2 and 3.4.2.6.4 of the proposed "new" chapter 3 (see Senate web page for the texts). Bataille noted that our requirements do not "impose any expectations for research or service" at those ranks. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Harvey Durham will meet with Bataille on April 30 the discuss her concerns and explain Appalachian's policies and practices along with our committee's assessment of her comments. It may be that Bataille will insist that the changes to the requirements for promotion to these ranks be included in our Faculty Handbook, and the ad hoc committee members would like to inform the Senate about this proposal.
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Report of the Committee on Committees, April 30, 2001

Committee members were able to survey and assess some of the University committees' work, but because of time constraints it was not able to assess all. The committees assessed (with the reports on file in the Faculty Senate Office) were:

Academic Integrity Board
Academic Policies and Procedures
Admissions
Awards
Core Curriculum
Fringe Benefits
Non-Tenure Track Faculty
Traffic Management and Safety

We note that the Fringe Benefits Committee, which is listed under that name in the "new" Faculty Handbook (at 7.3.4.6) and on the Faculty Senate website apparently goes under a new name: the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee.

This review suggests that Faculty Senate should examine the operation of the Traffic Management and Safety Committee. Faculty members of that committee have concerns about its role being changed and diminished arbitrarily by being confined to reviewing only oral appeals, that it has no role for advising Business Affairs on relevant issues, and that the committee is often not able to achieve a quorum for business.

This review suggests that Faculty Senate should examine the role and operation of the Academic Integrity Committee, which may not be fulfilling all of its possible service, and whose members may not be aware of the nature of its business because it does not appear to be meeting. This may
be of significant concern since we have instituted a new academic integrity structure and code for which there could be a more significant AIC role.

Motion FS00-01/04b-01 - Evaluate the Procedures, Expectations, and Staffing of the Appalachian House (Washington DC) and the New York Loft

We recommend that directors of the Appalachian House and the New York Loft for the past five years be invited to discuss their experiences with the Off Campus Facility Advisory Board and that they be encouraged to describe problems they encountered and to offer suggestions as to how situations might be improved for faculty who agree to manage either facility.

We recommend that positions at both facilities be prominently advertised to faculty in both the Appalachian Scene and over the internet and that the Off Campus Facility Advisory Board hold a public meeting at least once each academic year to promote the positions, describe expectations, and answer questions.

We recommend that scholarly projects once again be considered as a basis of judgment in choosing directors of these facilities.

We recommend that a permanent internship be provided for each facility, with the understanding that the intern would share responsibility for the managing of the facility. We suggest that the internship be tied to credit hours so that the student would take these responsibilities seriously.

We recommend that both facilities establish specific hours for guests checking in and out.

Rationale: These directorships were originally established as an opportunity for faculty development. As the managerial expectations have increased over the years, the positions have devolved largely into clerical duty. At the present time, faculty directors must be on call at all hours, leaving little time for research or enjoyment of the area. As a result, fewer faculty are willing to apply for these positions, and the possibility of establishing permanent staffing excluding the faculty has been discussed. We feel faculty staffing of these positions promotes morale, collegiality, and professional growth. The appointment of faculty scholars also emphasizes that the university is a place of learning and that teaching may occur in places other than the classroom.

Motion FS00-01/04-04a2: Creation of a new Faculty Senate standing committee called the Faculty Handbook Committee

Create a new Faculty Senate standing committee called the Faculty Handbook Committee whose responsibilities will include oversight of changes to the Faculty Handbook proposed by Faculty Senate and approved or modified by the Chancellor or the Provost; to inform the Senate about the progress of Faculty Handbook changes from the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees and to
the Office of the President and the Board of Governors; to work with those responsible for publishing the Faculty Handbook to make sure it is widely and easily available to faculty and is up-to-date; and to monitor, as well as to advise and inform the Senate regarding all proposals for changes in the Faculty Handbook, from wherever they originate. The composition of the committee should include the chair of the Faculty Senate, the immediate past Senate chair and two additional faculty members (Senators included); the chair of the committee must be a sitting Faculty Senator.

With this new committee in place, section E under the Agenda Committee responsibilities in the Faculty Senate Guidebook, which reads that the Agenda Committee, assists the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in preparing and revising the Faculty Handbook, should be deleted.
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**Academic Policy Committee**

I. Committee Charges

During the current academic year, the Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee was charged with working on the following ten issues:

1) Following up on implementation of review of department chairs
2) University copyright and intellectual property policies
3) Department chair responsibilities
4) Faculty grievance procedures
5) Faculty reporting requirements
6) Tenure for outside chairs
7) Tenure for outside deans
8) Separation of department chair and DPC
9) Informing faculty of DPC hiring recommendations
10) Procedure to guide department chair reviews by faculty

II. Completed assignments

The Academic Policy Committee completed its work in seven of the areas assigned; responsibility for work on the other three topics was transferred to other Senate Committees. Work in these seven areas resulted in five motions brought to the full Senate, one report to the full Senate and the creation of one ad hoc committee which will include the APC chair. These include:

A. Motions passed:
   1) Tenure for outside chairs
   2) Tenure for outside deans
3) Separation of department chair and DPC
4) Informing faculty of DPC hiring recommendations
5) Procedure to guide department chair reviews by faculty

B. Report:
Department chair review schedule

C. Committee:
Joint ad hoc committee with the Council of Chairs to examine the role and responsibilities of department chairs

III. New and Carried-over Items

During the course of the year, many new items were brought up by various members of the Senate and eventually assigned to the Academic Policy Committee. Some were immediately earmarked for work next year (new) and some had preliminary work done on them which will be resumed next year (carried-over). These issues, some of which will be re-addressed during the summer, include:

- Promotion and tenure standards
- Role of part-time and adjunct faculty
- Academic Progress Reports
- Holmes Convocation Center scheduling
- Professional Graduate Certificates
- Intellectual Property/Distance Learning agreements
- Administrator term limits
- Drop/repeat/incomplete policy
- Division I-A football

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Gates
Chair, Academic Policy Committee

budget committee

I. Resolutions

A. In September the Budget Committee brought to the Senate floor a resolution in support of a tuition increase for faculty salary competitiveness. While the percentages finally recommended by the Administration to the Office of President were different in the final
formulation determined in December, the resolution also advocated that this increase be a single amount across the board for all faculty.

B. In January, the Budget Committee reported on the allocation of 101-1310 funds for purposes other than faculty salaries. An accompanying resolution setting timetables for the return of this money to faculty salaries was passed.

II. Other Matters

A. The Budget Committee studied forming a Budget Oversight and Planning Committee. While most members believe this committee to be necessary, action was delayed until a study of overhauling senate committees can be completed.

III. Upcoming Concerns

A. With the upcoming budget cuts, the Budget Committee should take the lead in monitoring what cuts are made and reporting such to the faculty. Ideally, the Budget Committee can also provide the forum for faculty input prior to any final decisions about cuts.

B. 101-1310 funding needs to be carefully monitored. The Provost has established his own priority list which should serve as a beginning point. As the budget will be tight next year at the minimum, the need for movement on this issue becomes simultaneously more difficulty to make and more necessary than ever. A working committee should be established consisting of administrators and senators to mark yearly progress and make recommendations to keep on the timetable of the January 2001 resolution.

C. Continued attention to ASU faculty salaries as compared state and nationwide must be given every year. This information should be publicized to the faculty.
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Campus Planning Committee
Committee members: John Abbott (chair), Bill Dobson, and Debra Edwards

The Campus Planning Committee met once as a whole during this Senate year. Individual members acted on behalf of the Planning Committee at other times. The Committee focused on the following major concerns:

1. Faculty Senate representation on the following bodies:
   - ASU Space Utilization Committee
   - ASU Strategic Planning Committee

   Outcome: Chair of Campus Planning Committee named to both committees.
2. Faculty Senate contact with The ASU Foundation and The ASU Board of Trustees.

   Outcome: Chair of Faculty Senate and Chair of Campus Planning Committee invited to attend meeting of both bodies as guests.

3. In response to a faculty "concern" that the ASU Board of Trustees' endorsement of the proposed Daniel Boone Parkway will indicate an endorsement by the faculty, requested the Chair of Faculty Senate to discuss with Chancellor Borkowski.

   Outcome: The Chancellor informed of the concerns of the faculty regarding the endorsement by the Board of a project about which there is no consensus among the faculty.

4. Concern about the use of the nominal Faculty Senate listserv for too many sundry campus uses.

   Outcome: Policy for listserv use completed in draft form for discussion at the April 30, 2001 Faculty Senate meeting.

Concerns for the 2001/2002 Campus Planning Committee:
- Regular meetings with Jane Helm and other regarding issues pertinent to campus planning, particular new construction plans (Rankin, Library, new recreation building).
- Faculty concerns about parking when Whitner Lot is closed for library construction.
- Where are the "Restructuring the University" report recommendations?

Committee on Committees
Members are: Mike Moore (Chair), Mitchell Craib (resigned 12/2000; replaced by Martha Marking), Ute Jamrozy (resigned from Senate March 2001), Betty Long, Harold McKinney, Margaret Yaukey (assigned to the committee in March 2001).

9/11/00: Recommendations for committee membership reported to the Senate. Recommendation for a representative of the Graduate School to serve on the Patents & Copyright Committee reported to the Senate (motion defeated and item given to Academic Policies Committee for investigation and report).

10/09/00: Recommended appointments of faculty to University Committees:

   Eric Reichard to Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee
   Diane Sides to Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee
   Teresa Lee to Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee

1/22/01: meeting in Whitener 223 to assign responsibilities for finding nominees for university committee vacancies. Also to review wider responsibility for assessing university committees
and assignment of committees to members. (Note to successor: there is a lot of organizational work that is preliminary to this task.)

CoC is responsible for finding and recommending faculty candidates for election to FGHC and FGMC and Faculty Assembly and reporting them to Senate Elections Officer. Recommended to Senate chair that nomination and election procedures be reviewed and the Faculty Senate Guidebook be updated to reflect them.

CoC may be responsible for selecting the nominees to stand for election to the Teaching Enhancement Committee and to University Research Committee (Graduate School). It did not perform this duty this year.

2/5/01: Recommended appointments of faculty to University Committees:

Christopher Curtin (Art/FAA) to Research Council for this semester.

The following recommendations (4/09/01) resulted from divying up responsibilities among committee members to find nominees and confirm they were willing to serve on the university committees. A suggestion: when seeking nominees for the committees, check with the committee chair to see if there are any members whose terms are expiring but who may have some special responsibility or representation at another group on behalf of the committee. It is not necessary to reappoint members, especially if one design is to get as many faculty involved in committee work as possible; but there may be some whose re-appointment would be especially valuable to the work of the committee.

The Motions resulted from ongoing discussions of Senate business and just emerged from the chair of this committee.

4/9/01: The Committee on Committees made following recommendations to the Faculty Senate:

MOTION 1. That the Faculty Senate strongly recommend to the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs that the Faculty Senate Chair teach a one-course load during his or her term in order to perform the myriad duties required to effectively lead and represent the Senate and Faculty and to work closely with all levels of administration from the Trustees to departments, and most importantly, with individual faculty. Administrative and collegial responsibility such as just described is required but it cannot come at the expense of the chairperson's personally important and professional commitment to teaching. This is a signally important office for the university and for its faculty, and such assignment of the chairperson's time should maximize the quality of the chairperson's work.

MOTION 2. Create a new Faculty Senate committee called the Faculty Handbook committee whose responsibilities will include oversight of changes to the Faculty Handbook proposed by Faculty Senate and approved, modified, or disapproved by the Chancellor or the Provost; to inform the Senate about the progress of Faculty Handbook changes from the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees and to the Office of the President and the Board of Governors; to work with those responsible for publishing the Faculty Handbook to make sure it is available in hardcopy
and electronic formats, is up-to-date; and to receive, deliberate, and recommend to the Senate all proposals for changes in the Faculty Handbook, from wherever they originate. The composition of the committee should include the chair of the Faculty Senate, the immediate past senate chair and two additional faculty members (Senators included); the chair of the committee must be a sitting Faculty Senator.

MOTION 3. That Faculty Senate approve the following recommendations of faculty to serve three-year terms on these University Committees:

**Academic Integrity Board:**
- James Young, Geography & Planning
- Lawrence E. Brown, Chemistry

**Academic Policy and Procedures Committee:**
- Jon Beebe, Music
- Holly Hirst, Math
- Dan Hurley, English
- Margot Olson, Family & Consumer Sciences

**Admissions Committee:**
- Susan Golden, Library
- Dorothea Martin, History

**Awards Committee:**
- Beth Cramer, Library
- Robert Creed, Biology
- Robert Falvo, Music
- Marie Hoepfl, Technology
- Eva Hyatt, Marketing
- Sara Zimmerman, C&I

**Core Curriculum Committee:**
- Ann Viles, Library
- Harriette Buchanan, IDS
- Michael Lane, For. Langs/Lit
- Jean De Hart, Communications
- Alicia Aldridge, Marketing

**Fringe Benefits Committee:**
- James Allan, Geology

**Library Services Committee:**
- Eli Bentor, Art
- Susan Bogardus, Family & Consumer Sciences
- Pamela Kidder-Ashley, Psychology
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee:
   Michael Lane, Foreign Languages & Lit.
   Christine Pollard, Music

Patent & Copyright Committee:
   Amy Weiss, Library

Registration and Calendar Committee:
   Susan Lutz, Theater & Dance
   Jim Morris, HLES

Traffic Management & Safety:
   Robert Bush, Management

Cultural Affairs Advisory Board: That the terms of two sitting members be extended for an additional two years in order to accomplish full staggering of faculty member terms. These members, whose terms would then expire in 2004 are Patrick Rardin, Philosophy & Religion and Elizabeth Dodd, C&I.

Unfinished business as of 4/09/01:

--Find replacement senators for resignations.

--The Committee began studying the procedures and make up of University Committees, but was unable to complete the job. This study was last done three years ago; but was undertaken again partially because the Senate Guidebook recommends it be done and partly because of another initiative to study the committee structure at Appalachian. Some committee members did not finish, one resigned the committee and Senate. The 2001/02 CoC may have to finish the job and recommend any changes in the functioning of the committees.

A special form for making inquires of the committee chair and at least one additional faculty committee member was devised. It could be sent out by email with a follow-up by phone. The form is here:

Interview/Assessment questions: (to be asked by CoC members and reported by them)

1. Committee Name:

2. To whom it reports:

3. Dates of last two meetings:
   attach copies of any minutes/repts. for those meetings
   If no formal minutes, how are records of actions kept?
4. Annual Report for 1999-2000 (attach, if appropriate) AR is not required, nor are minutes, but maybe should be

5. Membership (List of current members and terms, appointment procedures [staggered terms, university area of representation]: is this adequate in practice?

6. Purpose/Responsibility of Council/Board/Task Force:
   Describe, include any foundation documents or other documents that describe its purpose.

7. Interview with Council Chair:
   a. If chair is a faculty member, does s/he have reassigned time for this business?
   b. How does the council function?
   c. Is the business mostly policy formulation or implementation or oversight/assessment?
   d. If the council has policy-making responsibilities, is there evidence that it has reviewed all its policies within the last year? Are there congruities of business with any Faculty Senate committees?
   e. Has the council's business changed recently? Any overlap with other bodies?
   f. How might the council's work be improved?
   g. How does the Council comply with university archival policies?

8. Interview with at least one committee member, preferably faculty.
   Ask the same questions being asked of the chair.

9. Committee member makes summary and any observations about the council being reviewed and the report being submitted to the CoC, after listing answers to the above eight items.

--Need to appoint members of new Faculty Grievance Assistance Committee.

Welfare and Morale Committee
Committee members: Chip Arnold (chair), William Atkinson, Bill Barber, Jerry Fox, and Joan Woodworth (Stella Anderson for fall 2000)

During the academic year, the Welfare and Morale Committee took on several issues that are now in varying states of resolution.

One on-going project is the establishment of a Faculty-Staff lounge. Over the summer of 2000, a space adjacent to the dining area in Welborn Hall was reserved for a temporary lounge until new space could be found. Furniture from Academic Affairs has been placed in the area, but at this
time no one has met to establish rules for its use. This is a task that will need to be undertaken next year.

The Committee was asked to investigate the rights and privileges of retired faculty and faculty on phased retirement. A report was made to the Senate detailing these privileges, and possible future action may yet be taken to improve the situation.

While investigating the above issue, the Committee discovered that the university had no plans to provide free slip accounts to faculty once the university modem pool became obsolete. The Committee reported that this issue to the Senate and no further action was taken. Since that time, however, further word is that the university will make reasonable efforts to keep the modem pool active and this service should be available to faculty for some time to come. The Committee feels that a Senate representative should serve as a member of the Information Technology Advisory Committee and report on decisions such as the above.

The Committee reminded the administration of proposed changes to the Post-Tenure Review Process made the previous year. The Committee felt the process should be simplified and made less redundant. Dr. Durham seems likely to accept the proposal.

The Committee proposed a resolution in opposition to the Governor's Directive to Place Funds Designated for the State Retirement Plan into an Emergency Reserve Account. It also protested proposed increases in coverage premiums for the State Employee Health Plan and possible reduction of benefits. The Senate passed the resolution and it was forwarded to the Governor.

The Committee was asked to investigate proposed changes to faculty directorships of the New York Loft and the Appalachian House in Washington, DC. A series of suggestions for improving these positions will be made at the April 30th Senate meeting.

Welfare of Students Committee

The Committee members are: Patrick Rardin (chair), Richard Abbott, Patricia Allen, and Kathleen Campbell.

The Committee began the academic year with charges to answer the following questions:
- How well does General Studies advisement benefit Students?
- How well do the Core Curriculum and Special Designators work?
- Is the Noel-Levitz Retention Survey of Students Intrusive?
- Should we keep the Text Rental Systems at Appalachian?

Mid-year, charges to investigate General Studies and Core Curriculum were withdrawn as the charges were refocused on the use of 101-1310 money. In their place, the Committee was charged to continue work on Academic Integrity Code. The Committee also took upon itself the charge of investigating Americans with Disabilities Act.
The Committee submitted motions to Faculty Senate as follows:

Motion FS00-01/12-02: Eliminate the Textbook Rental Program at Appalachian State University. The motion passed 4 December 2000.

Motion FS00-01/03-01: Approve the February 2001 draft revision of the The Academic Integrity Code. The motion passed 19 March 2001.

Motion FS00-01/04-02: Whereas, Americans with Disabilities Act: Title II Subpart B, Subsection 35:130, paragraph (B) (7) states:

A public entity shall make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when the modifications are necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of disability, unless the public entity can demonstrate that making the modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program, or activity;

Resolved, That Faculty Senate calls upon Appalachian faculty to modify course requirements (attendance, assignments, examinations, make up work, etc.) and statements thereof in syllabi to be in compliance. The motion passed 9 April 2001.

The Committee expects to continue investigation of Noel-Levitz Retention Survey into the next academic year. The Committee will also be concerned with Appalachian's alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies and how they impact student health.

---

**Equity Office/Grievance Process Committee**

Final Report of the Equity Office/Grievance Process Committee

Committee members: Kim Albertine, Bill Bauldry, Linda Bennett, Sheldon Hanft, Len Johnson, Bob Richardson, Linda Robinson, and Gayle Weitz (chair).

Our charge was to review the Equity Office and the grievance processes at Appalachian State University, citing problems and recommending solutions if warranted. The committee focused on the Faculty Grievance process and the Equity Office, making the following recommendations.

**Recommendations for the Equity Office:**

1. Change the name of the Equity Office.
2. Clarify the charge of the "Equity Office":
   - To educate the ASU community on issues of diversity, workplace harassment, etc.
   - To support the University's Equal Employment Opportunity program.
   - To assist grievants (those concerning faculty and staff) in setting up a "facilitated
discussion" between disputing parties with a mutually agreed upon third party. Possible sources for this third party are Hubbard Center, Counseling Center, Counseling Department, "Equity Office", non-campus, etc. In special circumstances, the University would pay for a non-campus person.

- To investigate the issues in unresolved "facilitated discussions," providing a factual report devoid of all recommendations to the grievant, the person grieving against and this person's immediate supervisor.
- If/when the "facilitated discussion" fails, to refer the grievant to his/her respective grievance process. (Cases involving staff to Human Resources, Cases involving faculty to the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee).

3. The "Equity Office" Director should report directly to the Chancellor.
4. There is currently an Acting Director of the Equity Office. We strongly suggest having a search (internal or including external candidates) to fill this position on a permanent basis.
5. Review the "Equity Office" Director annually in February, discussing the report with the Director and also the Chancellor. The reviewing committee will be comprised of the SGA President, the Chair of Staff Council, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Council of Chairs, the Director of Human Resources.

Recommendations for the Faculty Grievance Process:

1. Drop the current Mediation Committee.
2. Change the hearing committee as follows:
   - Elect for a two-year term, six faculty members (five members ? two professors, two associate professors, one assistant professor, and one alternate) each year to serve on the Grievance Hearing Committee. Emphasize to nominees that this is a long-term commitment requiring impartiality and objectivity.
   - This group of twelve will annually elect from its membership, a Chair of the Hearing Grievance Committee.
   - The Chair will appoint from the membership five members and one alternate to serve on a hearing committee if a grievance is filed. (The qualifications for selection will be similar to those used in obtaining jurors.)
   - This hearing committee will see its case through to the end, regardless of when their two year terms end.
   - Require that all Grievance Hearing Committee members obtain comprehensive training, including that from a lawyer.
3. Require that all grievances (except disciplinary actions) first go through a "facilitated discussion" with a mutually agreed upon third party. Possible sources for this third party are Hubbard Center, Counseling Center, Counseling Department, Equity Office, non-campus, etc. The University would pay for a non-campus person.
4. Specify the use of legal counsel:
   - No lawyers for either side will be allowed to be present or participate in the "facilitated discussion," but legal counsel may be sought by either side.
   - Lawyers for either side will be allowed to be present and participate in the pre-hearing and the hearing.
   - The hearing committee will have access to an independent lawyer suggested by a General Administration lawyer. (In 2001 this was David Parker.)
5. Require that at the pre-hearing, all pertinent information/files be exchanged.
6. Educate the ASU community regarding witnesses:
   - Both the grievant and the administrative representative(s) are entitled to talk with any potential witnesses who wish to talk.
   - Witnesses may not be compelled to speak with any party to the hearing, nor may they be compelled not to talk with either party. Interference with witnesses is inappropriate and will not be tolerated.
7. Have the University attorney hire a "court recorder" for the hearing. (The university will pay for this service.)
8. Clarify the hearing committee’s decision:
   - The hearing committee will make its decision within ten working days after receiving the transcript of the hearing.
   - The hearing committee will present a written recommendation to the Chancellor, accompanied with a face-to-face verbal discussion.
9. Clarify the Chancellor’s role in the Faculty grievance process:
   - The Chancellor has 60 days to render his/her decision.
   - If the Chancellor’s decision does not concur with that of the hearing committee’s, he/she must communicate these reasons in detail to the grievant and the hearing committee.
10. The Grievant has ten days to file for an appeal of the Chancellor’s decision to the Board of Trustees, who have up to 120 days to render their decision. (The grievant may then appeal this decision to the Board of Governors, as the present system allows.)
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Motion RE: the informal charging of Senate business via the Cabinet
I move that:

Whereas, some Appalachian faculty are concerned that Faculty Senate appears to be conducting its business in private under the aegis of an unofficial body known as "the cabinet."
Whereas, their concern is based on an e-mail from the Chair of the Faculty Senate to the cabinet in which Faculty Senate business is charged to the cabinet informally,
Whereas, the charge is the creation of two lists of Appalachian faculty to be presented to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, one is who to cull and the other is who to protect in meeting university budget cuts,
Whereas, the cabinet is asked to use discretion so as to protect the privileged access of the Chair of Faculty Senate to meetings such as that of Deans Council,
Resolve that, all Faculty Senate business that is not in the ordinary routine is to be brought before it by the motion of a Faculty Senator or by the presentation of a communication to Faculty Senate.
Rationale: The following e-mails make evident that the credibility of Faculty Senate is in jeopardy and that it will be damaged if not action is taken. At a minimum, Faculty Senate must publicly commit itself to its formal rules of order for meeting its charter. (As the e-mail to follow is a part of the rationale, I request that they be included in the minutes of this meeting.)

Subject: your response is appreciated
Date: Wed, 18 Apr 2001 17:43:32 -0400
From: Gayle Weitz <weitzgm@appstate.edu>
To: "andersnse@appstate.edu" <andersnse@appstate.edu>, "Edwin T. Arnold" <arnoldet@appstate.edu>, "buttsja@appstate.edu" <buttsja@appstate.edu>, "gatesph@appstate.edu" <gatesph@appstate.edu>, Gayle Weitz <WeitzGM@appstate.edu>, "gravettsl@appstate.edu" <gravettsl@appstate.edu>, "kocham@appstate.edu" <kocham@appstate.edu>, mike moore <mooremj@appstate.edu>, "rardintp@appstate edu" <rardintp@appstate.edu>, john abbott <abbottjp@appstate.edu>

Cabinet members:

This afternoon I was invited to attend a meeting of the Deans Council in which Harvey and Jane disclosed that today they were informed by Molly Broad that they would have to submit a prioritized list of permanent cuts from Academic Affairs amounting to 6.5 million dollars by Monday morning. No one thinks the state legislature will actually cut this much, but the list is required. The university system as well as ASU does not approve of this micro-managing by the state legislature and will try to keep the list as vague as possible by using codes instead of names of individuals and programs. I would like to solicit your advise as to what/where/who would faculty (you) suggest cutting and what/where/who faculty (you) would most protect? I'd like an answer by Thursday night. I wish that we could discuss this at the cabinet meeting on Monday, but that will be too late. I need to have a response to Harvey by Friday morning. I'm also not sure
as to how "public" this information should be at this point, so please use discretion. (I do not want to negate future inclusion by Senate Chairs in such meetings.) Thanks.

(Off the top of my head, my answer would be to protect faculty and faculty positions, and to look for cuts in administration, technology, off campus instruction, and travel. I also think that such a reduction in budget should be reflected in a proportionate reduction in student enrollment, but I doubt that will/can happen.)

- Gayle

From: Marvin Hoffman <hoffmanmk@appstate.edu>
Date: Thu, Apr 19, 2001, 9:47 PM
To: WEITZGM@appstate.edu
Cc: ANDERSNSE@appstate.edu, ARNOLDET@appstate.edu, BUTTSJA@appstate.edu, GATESPH@appstate.edu, GRAVETTSL@appstate.edu, Andy Koch <KOCHAM@appstate.edu>, MOOREJM@appstate.edu, RARDINTP@appstate.edu, ABBOTTJP@appstate.edu
Subject: Re: your response is appreciated

A faculty senator shared with me the message dated April 18 from Gayle Weitz to the Senate Cabinet regarding a request from the Provost for input into a response to the UNC President about possible budget cutbacks.

After reading the message from the Senate Chair, I was appalled at the tone and content of the message and told the Senator why I feel as I do. I hope that each of you takes a moment to consider the awful implications of what she has asked you to do.

Quoting, "I would like to solicit your advise (sic) as what/where/who would faculty (you) suggest cutting and what/where/who faculty (you) would most like to protect?...I'm not sure as to how "public" this information should be at this point, so use discretion."

I am appalled because her request asks a very few persons to make snap judgements about important issues. On what basis, pray tell, will you base your input? Friendships? Departmental affiliation? Ideology?

I would accept it as wholly legitimate for the Faculty Senate to monitor the process in behalf of the faculty to see that the choices made by the administration seem to be based on objective data and appear justifiable. I find it completely unacceptable for a small group of people to address this issue on the basis of their personal beliefs, prejudices or loyalties.
In nineteen years at Appalachian I have never heard of the Senate leadership doing anything, in secret from the faculty and possibly the entire Senate, that so undermines its credibility. I think you should be fair to everyone but remember that dozens of faculty members spent hundreds of hours preparing and participating in any number of program self-studies, Graduate School program reviews, responding to UNCGA lists of low enrolling programs and Department Self Studies. Either those efforts were a useless sham or they will give some objective data about what Appalachian's response should be to President Broad. However, I don't accept a list prepared by the Senate Chair, prepared in secret consultations that the faculty knows nothing about. In my opinion you will be more be of more service to the faculty if you say nothing than to submit in the name of the faculty a list compiled in secrecy by ten individuals that identifies who "you" want to cut.

I cannot believe that the process she asked for actually represents your feelings about how to provide "faculty" input. Who are you representing? How does doing this in secret further the concept of faculty representation? Actions like you may soon be embarking upon do nothing to further confidence in the Senate.

Marvin K. Hoffman
Appalachian State University
Political Science/Criminal Justice
Boone, NC 28608
Internet: HOFFMANMK@appstate.edu

Phone: 828-262-3075
Fax: 828-262-2947

From: Ruth Strickland <strcklndra@cp.appstate.edu>
Date: Mon, Apr 23, 2001, 5:21 PM
To: durhamhr@appstate.edu, borkowskif@appstate.edu, weitzgm@appstate.edu
Cc: arnoldet@appstate.edu, buttsja@appstate.edu, gatesph@appstate.edu, kocham@appstate.edu, abbottjp@appstate.edu, rardintp@appstate.edu, gravettsl@appstate.edu, mooremj@appstate.edu, andersnse@appstate.edu
Subject: budget cut memo dated April 18 from Dr. Weitz

I recently learned from a colleague about a message dated April 18 from Dr. Gayle Weitz, president of the faculty senate. It requests the Senate cabinet to give input to Dr. Durham in response to pending budget cuts.

When I first saw the memo, I was struck by the budget cuts. My attention focused on that aspect of the letter and not the more troubling issue.
Now, that I have examined it again, I am very alarmed by the language it contains. Much discussion lately from the faculty senate has focused on collegial decisionmaking, shared governance and faculty involvement in university affairs. This letter indicates a certain hypocrisy, an arrogance and a total lack of regard of other faculty members' opinion.

Let me quote directly from Dr. Weitz who directs her missive to nine faculty members in the so called "cabinet": "I would like to solicit your advise as to what/where/who would faculty (you) suggest cutting and what/where/who faculty (you) would most protect?" The letter goes on to say that she wants an answer by Thursday night and further says "I'm also not sure how "public" this information should be at this point..."

Now, we all know about the budget cuts. But I did not know that the faculty senate was able to engage in secret decisions about budgeting or if this kind of decisionmaking is even within the bounds of their charter. I did not know that this information was not "safe" for regular faculty (such as me) to hear about or that I somehow could not possibly comprehend it.

Certainly, the faculty senate should be consulted. They are an important representative body. Still, the faculty senate as a representative body has an ethical obligation to consult with all faculty. I never dreamed in my wildest imagination that they could make such choices in one night that would determine the fate of all of us without first consulting the faculty they are supposed to represent. This point raises the next set of questions.

Who does the faculty senate represent? How can these kinds of decisions be made by a cabinet of nine people in one night? These secret kinds of discussions completely undermine the credibility of the faculty senate in my mind. When so many people and programs are affected, it only seems fair to openly discuss these types of decisions and seek input from all those affected.

I believe that this memo should be circulated to every single faculty member on this campus. Faculty should be allowed to judge for themselves whether this approach is collegial and democratic and representative of their sentiments. Faculty should know what their representatives are doing. They should know about the cabinet.

In my opinion, this memo should be admitted to the minutes of the next faculty senate meeting and explanations of it should be offered. It is extremely offensive, especially given the language from the
faculty senate lately about how their opinions aren't considered and how they want to participate in shared governance.

What about the rest of us? By what right do they claim this kind of authority?

As of today, other faculty have read this memo. It will not remain "secret" as hoped. Others, besides me, have already expressed displeasure. If this isn't discussed in the faculty senate, I will find other routes to publicize this decisionmaking style even if I have to go to a major newspaper (and I don't mean the Mountain Times). Those who know me know that I am as good as my word--that I will do what I say I will do.

This type of decisionmaking has not and will not go unnoticed. Those of us who are not elected to the faculty senate are not unintelligent and our opinions matter.

Cordially,
Ruth Ann Strickland

---------------------------------------
Ruth Ann Strickland, Professor
Political Science and Criminal Justice
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608
Phone no.: 828/262-6169
FAX: 828/262-2947
E-mail: strcklndra@appstate.edu

Subject: Proposed Motion
Date: Sat, 28 Apr 2001 15:54:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Ruth Stuckland <strcklndra@cp.appstate.edu>
To: rardintp@appstate.edu
CC: hoffmanmk@appstate.edu, strcklndra@appstate.edu

Dear Professor Rardin:

Having read Dr. Hoffman's eloquent response to the motion, I wholeheartedly agree with his sentiments and would like to reiterate some of my own. As we discussed over the phone, I too am concerned about the tenor of Dr. Weitz's e-mail and the apparent willingness of a few to engage in secretive, unrecorded discussions.
I strongly urge that some frank discussion occur in the Faculty Senate about how decisions are reached and that some reference to the organization's charter be made. It is a public organization and must be accountable to all faculty.

I believe that the Faculty Senate will be strengthened, not weakened, by openly addressing the decisionmaking process—although some may disagree with that sentiment. Legitimacy is a fragile thing and once trust and loyalty are lost, they are very difficult to recover. Like Dr. Hoffman, I truly don't know how other faculty will react if this issue is not addressed by the Faculty Senate and then later, somehow, they hear about it through the rumor mill. However, I can speculate.

I believe many will feel that they are not fairly represented, that they are not trusted with sensitive information, and that the Faculty Senate is totally in the administration's pocket. Remember what Dr. Durham said to me in my interview to become chair of the PS/CJ department. He said: "If I asked for the formation of two lines—one administrators and one faculty—I would expect to see you in the faculty line, not in the administrator line." In other words, chairpersons are faculty first. If chairpersons are faculty members first, then certainly the president of the Faculty Senate [who is supposed to represent all faculty] is a faculty member first. Dr. Durham's advice might also be shared with Dr. Weitz or whomever is elected to serve as president of the Faculty Senate.

The notion that Dr. Weitz and the Cabinet must keep information secret from fellow members of the Faculty Senate as well as from all faculty in order to gain access to the administration is ludicrous. The Faculty Senate president has a choice—when presented with the notion from administrators that information is too sensitive for others to know about it, they can either agree or disagree. Her tendency should be to disagree and calmly explain why hoarding information, especially about something like budget cuts, is a bad idea. This can be done without losing credibility with the administration and also not losing credibility with faculty. The willingness to hide information, as defended by Dr. Weitz, is a dangerous tendency and in the end, it will quash debate and the kind of fruitful discussion a deliberative body like the Faculty Senate needs.

I think your motion is a good one as long as the context of its origins is discussed. Otherwise, it will appear to come out of the blue. I give you full permission to use any of my e-mails or communications in the presentation of your motion. In fact, I hope you will quote me.

Although I don't have any experience akin to Dr. Hoffman's in public management, I fully understand the consequences of furtive decisionmaking. It almost always leads to flawed decisions and a tendency to "groupthink."

Thank you for sharing the motion with Dr. Hoffman and I. I appreciate your willingness to engage in a dialogue that Dr. Weitz is unwilling to pursue with me. I hope you will make the motion because I believe the legitimacy and credibility of the Faculty Senate depends on it.

Best regards, Ruth Ann

Patrick Rardin wrote:
Dear Professors Hoffman and Strickland:

I am informing you of my intention to make the following motion at the 30 April 2001 meeting of Faculty Senate.

Whereas; some Appalachian faculty have expressed concern that Faculty Senate appears to be conducting its business in private under the aegis of an unofficial body known as "the cabinet"

Resolve that; all Faculty Senate business that is not in the ordinary routine be brought before it by the motion of a member or by the presentation of a communication to Faculty Senate.

I have two questions for you that I hope you can answer before 3:00 pm 30 April 2001.

1. Will the passage of the motion allay the concerns you expressed in your recent e-mail message (19 April and 23 April, respectively) to me?
2. May I, if necessary, introduce your e-mail into the minutes of the meeting?

Subject: A second attempt to send my message
Date: Sat, 28 Apr 2001 17:30:49 -0400
From: "Marvin K. Hoffman" <mkhoffman1@earthlink.net>
To: rardintp@appstate.edu

---------- Forwarded message ----------

Date: Sat, 28 Apr 2001 14:56:05 EDT -
From: Marvin Hoffman <hoffmanmk@appstate.edu>
To: Patrick Rardin <"rardintp D"@appstate.edu>
Cc: Ruth Ann Strickland <strcklndra@appstate.edu>
Subject: Re: A Motion

Patrick:

I do not believe that we know each other so I appreciate your taking the time to write to me about this issue.

My concern in writing my original message to the "Faculty Senate Cabinet" was to express my strong concern that a very small group of individuals appeared ready to express, in behalf of the faculty, the purely subjective opinions of eight persons about where to make the budgetary reductions sought by the General Assembly leadership. I felt that if such recommendations were made by the eight members identified in the original message, particularly if they identified WHO should be cut, as was indicated in Gayle Weitz's message, it would do great harm to the Faculty Senate. I urged each of the eight to avoid such a course of action because no data was to be considered other than responding off the top of one's head.
I cannot speak to whether your motion will allay anyone's fear about the Faculty Senate but I feel that whatever course of action is taken will be harmful if it does not result in greater openness.

In today's technological world it seems to me that communications can be easily made more open unless there is a personal preference for confidentiality or there is a compelling and legitimate reason that something be kept in the hands of a few such as in a personnel hearing.

In this instance, the apparent desire to recommend "who to cut" and "who to protect" did not meet the second of my two criteria and therefore my feeling was that the first reason could be the one that was operative.

For nineteen years I have trained local government managers that two of the surest ways for them to get into trouble and possibly be fired is to either give some of the members of the city council more or different information than is given to all the board, or to create a climate in which the city's leadership conveys to the citizenry that we have made a decision but you, the citizens, cannot know about it. There is a moral to that example that could be applied, I think, to the current situation.

Given there was an already existing perception held by a significant number of faculty members that the Faculty Senate chooses issues and positions that at times do not typify the preferences of the larger faculty community, I urged caution.

I recognize that painful choices may yet have to be made about cuts but I urge that all of the Senators consider whether engaging a non-public "discrete" communication will ever be an acceptable way to speak in behalf of the faculty.

I have no objection to your reprinting, quoting, or discussing this message or my earlier message to the Cabinet in which I initially raised my concerns.