At 3:22 p.m. on May 1, 2000, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors' names.)
   B. WELCOME NEW SENATORS. Weitz welcomed new senators: John Abbott, Patricia Allen, Jerry Fox, Steve Simon, Joan Woodworth, and Margaret Yaukey.
   C. TEMPORARY SENATORS. Weitz reported that temporary senators for the fall will be recommended at the September meeting.
   D. BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING. Weitz asked for volunteers to attend the June 2 Board of Trustees meeting. Rick Abbott and Chip Arnold will attend.

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   A. JONI PETSCHAUER. Joni Petschauer, Learning Assistance Program, spoke to the Senate on the Freshman Learning Communities Program, which is designed to foster a supportive context for freshmen academic work. This is accomplished by students being enrolled together in two to three classes during their first semester. Studies show that freshmen leave college because they are homesick so it is important to help them become academically and personally successful their first semester. Success is about making connections - a person, a department, a discipline, an interest.

   The Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory will be given to freshmen during Freshman Orientation. The Survey is a retention survey, asking students some personal questions and measuring students' ability/willingness to succeed. Arnold noted that a colleague thought that some of the questions were too personal and asked whose idea it was to conduct the survey and who will have control of the completed surveys and data. Petschauer answered that the Assessment Office, in coordination with General Studies and the Advisement Office, decided to implement the survey and that the Academic Advisement office will retain the completed surveys. Koch asked if students can opt out of taking the survey, and Petschauer answered that she did not know the answer to that question.

   Weitz recommended that the Welfare of Students Committee look into this issue.
   B. RYAN BOLICK. Ryan Bolick, recently elected Student Government Association President for 2000-2001, spoke to the Senate on where SGA would like to go next year. SGA would like to work cooperatively with the Faculty Senate to get some issues passed. Agenda items include an early payment program, getting the $25 Traffic appeal fee dropped, Project Nightlife, a four-day class week, dropping the +/- grading system, and unifying different groups throughout the campus and community.
Weitz asked Bolick when SGA meetings are. Bolick replied that they meet every Tuesday night at 7:00 in the Grandfather Mountain Ballroom and offered senators to attend. Weitz reciprocated the offer.

C. ALAN HAUSER/MARY QUINN. Alan Hauser and Mary Quinn spoke to the Senate regarding graduation rates for Appalachian student athletes and distributed a sheet of statistics to all senators. They reported that the graduation rates are very strong for Appalachian student athletes.

III. MINUTES
Campbell asked that section III.C.2 first paragraph, second sentence, be changed to state, 

...though they are not currently tenured....

Yaukey added that she was present at the meeting and voted on the two votes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended.

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

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
   No report
B. AGENDA COMMITTEE
   1. Faculty Senate committee assignments. Weitz noted that senators should have in their packets a list of the various Senate committees and their membership assignments. At the end of the meeting, Weitz asked that the committees meet to elect a chairperson and to go over some agenda items that pertain to each committee.
   2. Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule for 2000-2001. Weitz told senators that a list of meeting dates should also be in their packets.
C. BUDGET COMMITTEE
   Koch reported that the Committee is working on compiling a list of questions regarding the tuition increase issue.
D. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
   No report.
E. CHANCELLOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE
   No report.
F. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
   No report.
G. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
   No report.
H. WELFARE AND MORALE
   Post-tenure review process (FS00/01-05-01). Arnold reported that the Committee came up with proposed changes to the Post-tenure Review process that would simplify the PTR process by using materials that have already been produced. Weitz asked if this was a motion from the Committee and Arnold replied that it was. Barrett asked that a friendly amendment be made to delete #3 (a summary of student evaluations
for the past five years, with sample evaluations illustrating both strengths and weaknesses from the process since it seemed to duplicate #2 (annual reports for the past five years). The Committee accepted the friendly amendment.

Bortz moved and Campbell seconded to amend (amendment #1) the motion to state that PTR must apply to all persons holding tenured faculty ranks. Atkinson then moved that #4 (a brief document outlining the faculty member's own evaluation of teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service) be deleted. After some discussion, Atkinson withdrew his motion.

A vote was then taken on amendment #1.

VOTE # 2 21 yes 1 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

Discussion followed on the motion as it currently stood (without #3 and including amendment #1). Koch requested an amendment to the end of the second sentence in the first paragraph after #4: Someone teaching a 12 hour load or someone with extensive administrative duties cannot be expected to have ... The Committee accepted the amendment.

Moore asked Parker about the changes to the review process and how they will be implemented. Parker replied that a committee will be formed to look at all proposed changes and then make a recommendation to the Chancellor.

Dobson called for the question.

VOTE # 3 11 yes 11 no 1 abstain The motion failed.

Butts clarified that Post-tenure Review is not a state law--it is a General Administration policy. A poor PTR does not mean that one will lose tenure--it is not meant to be a de-tenuring process. Instead, the process calls for a remediation process.

Campbell moved to insert in the last sentence of the last paragraph...a clearly stated process for remediation... The motion was seconded. Bortz moved and Campbell seconded to add to the end of the final paragraph...that any remediation be implemented under the guidance of a PTR committee.

Campbell called for the question.

VOTE # 4 22 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

A vote was taken on Campbell's and Bortz's amendments.

VOTE # 5 13 yes 9 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

Dobson moved to close debate. The Senate then took a break (4:45pm) so that the Parliamentarian could check Robert's Rules of Order to determine how to proceed with Dobson's motion (motion #64 according to Robert). The Senate reconvened at 4:52 and a vote was taken, needing a two-thirds vote to pass.
VOTE # 6  13 yes  10 no  0 abstain  The motion failed.

After further discussion, Koch called for the question and Dobson seconded.

VOTE # 7  22 yes  0 no  1 abstain  The motion passed.

A vote was taken on the motion as proposed and amended.

VOTE # 8  23 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

V. OLD BUSINESS
   A. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE. Stella Anderson reported that in looking back through the records, the document that the Faculty Senate approved at the April 1999 meeting regarding the new Academic Integrity Code concurs with the document that the SGA approved except for a minor change that SGA accepted. Bill Ward noted that this change would be made and that the final code is now under his review.

   B. FACULTY WORKLOAD AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT. Koch moved for a vote of support from the Faculty Senate on the proposed "Statement on Reassigned Time for Scholarly Activities." Simon seconded.

VOTE # 9  22 yes  0 no  1 abstain  The motion passed.

Statement on Reassigned time for Scholarly Activities
Scholarship and other forms of creative activity are essential to the instructional mission of the university. The university must support the faculty in their research, scholarship, and creative endeavors.

Three hours per semester of reassigned time for scholarly activity should be granted to tenure track faculty whose tenure and promotion is based on an expectation of ongoing scholarship and creative activities. Three hours per semester of reassigned time should also be provided for those tenured faculty who are engaged in research and creative activities in order that they may better serve the students, the institution, and their professional goals and obligations.
[Approved WL committee 4/20/00]

C. FACULTY HANDBOOK REVISIONS AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT. Moore reported that the Committee was asked by Dayton Cole to review the new Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook. This portion of the Handbook needs approval only from the Board of Trustees and not the Board of Governors. The Committee met Sunday and with Dayton on Monday morning to review the document. There were some substantive changes that were made that have not been reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Those changes included: 1) the creation and maintaining of teaching portfolios; 2) search committee procedures; and 3) EOA requirements. After some discussion, Parker noted that he thought it would be OK to delete the section on search committees.
Butts moved and Rardin seconded that the Administration and the Ad-hoc Committee provide all senators with a copy of the new Chapter 4 before voting and sending it forward to the Board of Trustees. This means that the new chapter would not go before the BOT in June. Campbell called for the question.

VOTE # 10 22 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

A vote was taken on Butts motion.

VOTE # 11 23 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

VI. NEW BUSINESS
A. FACULTY CONCERNS
Privacy issue. Butts asked Dayton Cole what was the status of the motion that the Faculty Senate passed in April of 1999 regarding privacy issues. Cole replied that he has been working on the document with David Larry, who has done a lot of research on the issue. The document has yet to be reviewed by Dr. Durham.

B. SACS REVIEW. Koch reported that a survey will be sent to all faculty in the fall. The survey will provide the Committee valuable information and he asked senators to encourage colleagues to fill it out.

C. COMMITTEES MEET. Weitz asked Committees at this time to meet to elect a chairperson and to discuss issues appropriate for action.

Simon moved to adjourn and Gates seconded.

VOTE # 12 18 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore, Secretary

FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
May 1, 2000

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>
</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>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</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>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Patricia</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, Edwin</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson, William</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber, Bill</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attachment #1
May 1, 2000

FS00/01-05-01 - Proposed changes to the Post-tenure Review Procedure - The Faculty Senate continues to oppose a Post-tenure review process. But since one currently exists, the Senate recommends that the Post-Tenure Review Policy at Appalachian State University be changed in the following manner:
All tenured persons holding faculty rank should be subject to Post-tenure review, and when reviewed should submit the following materials:

1. Current curriculum vitae
2. Annual reports for the past five years.
3. A brief document outlining the faculty member's own evaluation of teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service.

The Post-Tenure Review committee should take into account the regular teaching load of the faculty member being reviewed. Someone teaching a 12 hour load or someone with extensive administrative duties cannot be expected to have accomplished the same degree of teaching effectiveness/scholarship/creative activities/service as someone teaching a regular load of nine or fewer hours per semester.

Since all faculty are required to be observed in a classroom situation at least once every three years, an additional classroom observation should not be required for Post-Tenure Review.

A copy of the PTR report should be given to the faculty member.

If the faculty member disagrees with the report of the PTR committee, s/he should be given reasonable time to collect and provide further material so as to rebut or clarify her/his situation.

Exemplary performance should be rewarded by a stated percentage salary increase. In the case of negative evaluations, a clearly stated process for remediation should be implemented under the guidance of a PTR committee.