At 3:15 p.m. on September 10, 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. AAUP CONFERENCE. Weitz asked senators to think about attending this year’s AAUP conference on shared governance October 12-14 at Howard University. This year’s conference is Mission & Governance: Integrating a Shared Vision.
   C. CHANCELLOR ADVISORY MEETINGS. The first Chancellor Advisory Committee meeting is this Monday, September 17 at 3:15 in the Chancellor Conference Room. Weitz noted the Welfare and Morale Committee will attend the September 17 meeting and welcomed anyone else who would like to attend.

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   A. NANCY FOSTER. Nancy Foster spoke to the Senate about the benefits of NC Flex and how it can save faculty money. Open enrollment is from October 15-November 9. NC Flex is composed of five different components: 1) reimbursement account for health care; 2) reimbursement account for dependent care (daycare for children or elderly daily care); 3) vision care insurance plan; 4) dental insurance plan, and 5) accidental death and dismemberment insurance policy. Why should you participate in Flex? To help save you money by lowering the amount of taxes you pay. And to help curb out-of-pocket expenses. Foster has scheduled a meeting on October 16 at 10:00 a.m. in the Student Union. Dental plan representatives will be there. Foster reminded everyone that if you participate in NC Flex, you can only make a change if the family status has changed. The web site for NC Flex is http://www.ncflex.org
   Foster distributed to the Senate an information sheet on the NC state medical plan. She reported there is a proposal in the NC legislature right now. It is an optional package that they wanted to recommend that would have lower premiums (lesser benefits), a higher deductibles ($500), and out-of-pocket expenses increased from $1500 to $2000.
   Koch asked if there has been any discussion by the state about changing the policy about losing any money one has left over in their Flex account at the end of the year to the State. Foster noted that they did look at trying to get it as a rollover for one year but was not passed.

III. MINUTES
   Anderson asked for an amendment in the second to the last paragraph of V.A. The sentence beginning with, Since it would be difficult..... will be stricken and the following sentence inserted. Investigation and advocacy should be handled separately. Marking added that the voting sheet did not have her name on it (and she was present and voting).
   A motion was made and seconded to approve the August 20 minutes as amended.
   VOTE # 1 21 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.
IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

1. Use of Convocation Center Report - Mr. Edward Crawford, director of the Center, informed the Committee that it is for security reasons that the facility cannot be used by the faculty. Since there are vendors located in the building, security has to be very careful. Secondly, the facility is just not an athletic structure. Many different events take place in the center and the floor has to be taken up and replaced a number of times. Mr. Crawford is willing to meet with the Senate concerning the issue.

Simon added that insurance does not cover faculty coming in there. Additional security would need to be added to check IDs, etc. Mr. Crawford also said that the Center is not just an athletic facility--it is a Convocation Center. Simon added that the facility was built by state funds but that it is a self-supporting facility that generates funds to operate it.

Weitz asked that the Committee look further at the issue and bring back to the Senate a recommendation.

2. Freshmen Progress Report - This has come out of the office of General Studies which is under the Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services Joe Watts. Mr. Watts stated to the Committee that he has the literature to defend this process. However, the Committee would like to express its concern over an unilateral position taken by an administrator on implementing the process without seeking faculty advice. Mr. Watts is willing to meet with the Senate on this issue.

Weitz noted that for the sake of moving Senate meetings forward, that informational items (i.e., committee reports) be read prior to the meeting so that most of the Senate’s time can be spent on action items. She added that if anyone has any questions about the reports, that they are more than welcome to ask.

B. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

University committees recommendations. The Committee presented their recommendations for University committee and Faculty Senate replacements. (note - all terms are for the 2001-2002 Academic Year only):

Academic Integrity Board
Donna Horbury (Psych) to replace Robbin Derry (P&R)
Amy Weiss (Library) to replace Fred Wilson (Psych)

Patent and Copyright Committee
Barry Kurtz (Comp. Sci) to replace Richard Rupp (Eng)

Teaching Enhancement Committee
Rebecca Cranston (FCS) to replace William Proulx (TD)

Academic Policies and Procedure Committee
Steve Simon (His) to replace Dan Hurley (Eng)

Faculty Senate
Deborah Crocker (Math) to replace Bill Dobson (Bio) as an Arts and Sciences representative.
Tom McLaughlin (Eng) to replace William Atkinson (Eng) as an Arts and Sciences representative.
Steve Millsaps (Econ) to replace Kevin Barrett (Acc) representing the College of Business

The Committee still must find replacements for: Kathleen Campbell (Art) representative At-Large
Woodworth and the rest of the Senate welcomed new senators.

C. WELFARE AND MORALE

Report - (1) We are working on comparing the document for post-tenure review suggested by the Senate with the document prepared by the Post-tenure Review Committee. There are still questions that the committee document needs to resolve (such as the role of the dean) before it is complete. (2) The committee is exploring solutions to the problem of smoking at the entrances of buildings where others must pass through a lot of smoke. (3) We are also making progress on the "Faculty-Staff Lounge". We will know more by the time of the meeting on Monday.

Weitz added that Dr. Durham has just sent a response to the Senate’s last spring motion regarding this issue.

Woodworth added that Yaukey and Arnold are working on the NY Loft/AppHouse issue.

Weitz added that Dr. Durham has just sent a response to the Senate’s last spring motion regarding this issue.

Woodworth reported that she has seen the Faculty/Staff lounge and that it is a nice facility. She added that the Committee was supposed to come up with a policy for its usage, but that she thought the Committee was going to propose that a policy was not needed; just post the hours and note that it will not be loaned out for meetings of any kind. Woodworth has spoken with Peggy Ellis, Staff Council President, about calling the facility the Jimmy Smith Faculty/Staff Lounge. Ellis will consult the Staff Council tomorrow at their meeting. If the Staff Council is in favor of its naming, the Welfare and Morale Committee will bring a motion to the next Senate meeting regarding its name and brief policy. Woodworth finished by saying that if the faculty and staff show enough interest in this lounge, then a (bigger) lounge in the new cafeteria may be considered.

At this time, the Chancellor arrived.

II. GUEST SPEAKERS, continued

B. CHANCELLOR BORKOWSKI. The Chancellor told the Senate that Appalachian would honor their commitment to faculty raises using the $150 tuition increase if it was passed by the legislature.

The Chancellor noted that he is concerned about some staff being able to afford the new health insurance premiums. He read a letter from an Appalachian staff member who wrote to the Chancellor about the difficulty they will have paying the new premiums. Butts asked if, through the Foundation, a fund could be set up so that those who wished to could donate money that could be used for those who are struggling to pay their insurance premiums. The Chancellor said he appreciated the gesture and would look into it. He also said he was open to other suggestions.

The Chancellor reported that he met on September 29 with the Appalachian Learning Alliance. There is substantial interest in having Appalachian programs at community colleges. The approach has been collegial and there have been no territorial issues. The Chancellor added that this is a good way to meet the General Administration’s increased enrollment requirement without bringing students to campus. Hickory has the highest unemployment rate; when jobless rates increase, student enrollment increases. Hickory is very interested in having additional higher education programs. The Chancellor noted that space is needed in Hickory for a Higher Education Learning Center. Parker noted that the Higher Education Learning Center would not only be utilized by Appalachian, but by the other local colleges and UNC system schools. Truett
asked if anyone was going to address the issue of the fact that students are realizing that it is costing them twice as much to take a course on campus than off campus. Parker responded that they are aware of the issue and that if the trend continues in the next couple of years, this might mean a significant reduction of graduate programs taught on campus.

Crocker questioned if the quality of education would suffer. The Chancellor responded that if it does, he wanted to know about it. He said that there are four approaches in taking courses off campus. One is reassignment for faculty. The second is through interactive web-based courses. The third is through interactive video. The fourth is by hiring community college faculty that meet departmental qualifications and are approved by the department. The Chancellor stressed that departments must have the ultimate approval of the quality of courses.

The Chancellor reported on the survey of off-campus students that was taken last year. The students asked for three things: 1) a copy of the student newspaper, The Appalachian; 2) notification of all events on campus; and 3) an Appalachian picture ID. Truett added that those students who come to campus cannot even have picture IDs made because the facilities close at 5:00 p.m. (as well as other facilities).

The Chancellor reported that he met this week with the student newspaper staff regarding the increasing concern of alcohol abuse on campus. It is a growing issue on campuses across the nation. The Chancellor said that steps will be taken by the next football game on the 29th to discourage alcohol use at games. He thought that faculty can be helpful; that there are certain classes that simply by their nature are amenable to talking about this issue. Allen asked if Appalachian still had the University van that was involved in the deadly crash last fall. If so, could it not be set out at the football game to remind students what drinking and driving can do. The Chancellor asked Parker and Ward to follow up on this. Yaukey asked if local police could be parked on Stadium drive pulling students over and giving them breathalizer tests. Pope asked that whatever measures are taken, that if faculty are informed of those measures, then faculty can help. Visitor Rachel Bowling suggested meeting with fraternities and sororities. Weitz suggested that the Drug and Alcohol Policy be revisited by all the constituents on campus so that there is input from students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

Koch asked if money raised for the Foundation during the successful Campaign could be used to support faculty in terms of research, travel, matching funds for grants; especially now that the money is tight. The Chancellor responded that before the campaign was launched, potential benefactors were contacted and surveyed to see how the money was to be spent. After collecting the results, certain interests had to be curtailed. The Chancellor said that it would be interesting to see what the support would be for finding private funding for research.

Anderson asked the Chancellor what the status was on the Center for Capitalism. The Chancellor replied that it has been reshaped into a proposal for a Center for an Ethical Global Economy and sent to the prospective donor. The Chancellor has not yet received a response from the donor and added that the proposed Center for Capitalism is dead.

The Chancellor thanked all for their effort and work at the University.

The Senate took a break at 4:50 and reconvened at 4:55.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS, continued
D. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE

Rardin reported that the Committee is waiting for the Student Government Association first meeting before the Committee sets an agenda.
E. BUDGET COMMITTEE

1. Report. Petschauer noted that there are several things that the Budget Committee is supposed to keep of tract of. Petschauer asked for senate input on a resolution passed last April by the Faculty Assembly suggesting that all campuses establish a budget oversight planning committee. Petschauer also noted that the Committee is supposed to make more open the financial situations on campus. The Committee hopes to make the data obtained by Jane Helm more easy to understand. Petschauer added that some areas on campus are more open about their budget processes than others and that the Committee would like to make more open those areas that are not.

2. AAUP Forum on the Appalachian Budget Process. Butts reported that the open forum will be held on Friday, September 21 at 2:00 p.m. in the Linville Falls Room. Dr. Durham and Ms. Helm have agreed to attend and answer questions.

3. 101-1310 update. Durham reported that the Faculty Senate passed a four-part resolution regarding the expenditures of 101-1310 funds (which are used to pay faculty salaries) and that they were approved by the Chancellor. Durham noted that beginning with this year, there will never be another vacant faculty position. There was concern that those positions would be taken away by the state so someone will be rotated into those positions for a period of time during the year. He added that the money will still be available to be used. Butts asked about graduate assistantships. Durham responded that there will still be positions for graduate assistantships. About $1,000,000 comes out of the Graduate School for assistantships and the rest comes out of deans' offices, Academic Affairs, and the Development office.

Weitz asked Durham when could the lapse salary money report be disclosed. Durham replied after July.

Weitz asked that since it appears that the tuition increase will go through and the money generated will be used to raise faculty salaries, she would like to reiterate that the Senate recommended the money be distributed equally to all faculty. Durham responded that he has met with deans and that the money will be apportioned for merit, for some across the board raises, and for some adjustment of inequitable salaries.

F. FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE

Promotion and Tenure guidelines. Weitz reported that they have met with Betsy Bunting and a few other people about a request from Gretchen Bataille who wants us to change our Handbook in reference to promotion and tenure guidelines. Bataille is, at this time, suggesting that all the ranks (professor, associate, and assistant) have under their guidelines the wording, "Demonstrated skill in teaching and recognized accomplishments in the following: teaching; research or other germane creative activity; and professional service to the university and/or to the public." Weitz asked for feedback from senators and their constituents about how department merit and promotion/tenure guidelines fit in with these changes. Koch noted that this constitutes a change in the contract between faculty and the university and that it needed to be looked at carefully. Discussion followed about that fact that some departments have 12-hour workloads and that this would increase their workload even more.

Rardin asked who is raising this issue and why. Moore responded that the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at General Administration questioned the regulations. Moore reported that in June, the Board of Governors changed the structure of decision-making. The Board of Governors gave complete power over Faculty Handbook policies to the Office of the President. Butts noted that this was the first he had heard of this and that this was troubling in terms of what that does to the balance of power at the Office of the President and what that does
to participatory governance at all the UNC institutions. Weitz responded that she was told that the rationale behind it is that the Board of Governors always rubber stamps recommendations from the Office of the President. Butts replied that it is a huge symbolic change. Weitz said she would bring it up at the Faculty Assembly meeting. Anderson added Bataille is looking at all UNC Handbooks and looking towards as much uniformity as there can be.

Rardin asked that the proposed change go out over the faculty listserv so that all faculty can review it. Moore will work on the wording.

**G. AGENDA COMMITTEE**

Faculty Senate agenda. Weitz reported that she has heard from all of the committees (except for Welfare of Students who is waiting for SGA to meet) and that she has sorted their agendas down by Senate meeting dates. Weitz asked to try to stick to the schedule as much as possible so that at the March and April meeting, a large percentage of the work is not being done at that point.

**H. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Report. The Committee submitted the following report:
The Committee met with Jane Helm, Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs on 27 August 2001, 3:30 - 5:00 pm. The committee and Ms. Helms discussed:
1. Bus parking beside Whitener Hall. With the movement of the Whitener parking lot entrance and the completion of the traffic circle, idling AppalCart buses should no longer be sitting beside Whitener Hall.
3. Rankin Science Building. Three-year project that will encompass the construction of an additional 24,500 square foot building in green space between Rankin and Octagon' building; the demolition of the oldest portion of Rankin; and the construction of a new portion of Rankin on that site. Bond funds for the CAP Building and Rankin are mixed for new science facilities.
4. Bookstore renovation and addition. Site work nearly complete. May contain a market similar to the one in Trivette Hall, a bank, travel agency, copy center. A café is planned. Renovation will take 18 months and the addition, another 18 months.
6. New Pool, BKG Demolition, Welborn Demolition. These projects all hinge on the construction of a new pool, then the demolition of BKG and construction of new dining hall, and then the demolition of Welborn cafeteria. Location for pool has changed several times, but may be located across Bodenheimer Drive from Walker Hall.
7. Turchin Visual Arts Center. Bid completed for Phase I renovations, including elevator. Phase II construction in bond funding and is still in planning phase.
11. Bond Overhead. State construction office has directed that 5% of the bond funding be used for local campus project administration costs, hiring new personnel to supervise projects. ASU is requesting relief from this requirement at this level to keep more of the funding in construction.

Ms. Helm offered to send the Committee regular construction project updates. She also prepares a Powerpoint
presentation on construction projects for the Board of Trustees on a quarterly basis, which may be appropriate to share with Faculty Senate.

Weitz suggested that Helm give her slide presentation at the Budget Open Forum on the 21st. Weitz then asked Abbott if he has ever heard of a building committee. Parker noted that there are as many building committees as there are buildings. Except for Parker, Helm, and Clyde Robbins, membership on these committees varies per building and that there is no other committee that oversees these committees. Simon asked if when the Convocation Center was being built if its building committee ever said anything about faculty use of the Center. Parker responded he did not recall any measures being made, but there was discussion about it.

Koch asked about the status of the new library. Abbott and Woodworth responded that an architectural style has been presented to the Committee, but for any further information, one would need to contact Mary Reichel. McLaughlin reported that at the open forum which was held for the university community, other than library faculty, only a handful of people attended. He added that speaking to the planners and designers eased a lot of his concerns and was sorry that there was so few faculty in attendance. Parker added that there would be open stacks and that the square footage would be around 140,000 square feet of utilized space. That would increase the utilized space by around 50,000 square feet.

V. OLD BUSINESS
There was no new business.

VI. NEW BUSINESS
A. COUNCIL OF CHAIRS MEETING
Weitz gave a report of the August 30 Council of Chairs meeting, where there was discussion about the Senate’s proposal to abolish the rental text system and finding other means for saving students money. The Council of Chairs is going to look into this again. Weitz asked Allen to send the information she researched to the Council.

The Council of Chairs was asked by the Deans’ Council what their opinion was on having deans serve on chair search committees. Weitz asked senators what they thought about this. Anderson replied that the Senate has already stated that at the end of the search, Deans already have their say. Weitz thought maybe the Senate should reiterate their position. It was noted the new chair search policy removed deans as ex officio members of search committees.

B. BOARD OF TRUSTEES REPORT
Weitz reported on the Board of Trustees meeting. At the meeting, the issue of I-A football was brought up again. The problem does not look like it is going to go away and that the Senate needs to be poised and ready with a stronger statement of a faculty point of view. A statement will be brought to the October Senate meeting and anyone who would like to give input should contact Weitz. Anderson asked who wanted the move to I-A. Weitz responded that there is a strong group of alumni (which no one knows how many), and that within that group are two Board of Governors members who are ASU alums.

C. FS0102/09-03 RESOLUTION REGARDING IMPROVING THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF APPALACHIAN TO NEW FACULTY
Weitz noted that Petschauer put forth the resolution. Weitz reminded senators that someone is going to have to do this work. Butts added that this may be something that the Council of Chairs might be interested in. After some discussion, the resolution was approved as amended.
VOTE # 3  22 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

FS0102/09-03 - Resolution Regarding Improving the Attractiveness of Appalachian to New Faculty
Whereas, one of the most disturbing national trends is that out of 4000 graduate students at research universities only 37% are interested in academic careers.

Whereas, minority graduate students find careers in higher education even less attractive than their Caucasian colleagues. (For both: a talk by Cathy Trower, Harvard School of Education)

Whereas, reasons that increasing numbers of very talented people do not opt for academic positions are the dreadful job market in some disciplines, the unattractiveness of academic life (especially the research/teaching trap), the broken tenure process, stinking pay, and (until this year) attractive options outside of academe.

Whereas, increasing numbers of institutions find themselves in a similar dilemma as Appalachian and they, like Appalachian, have ideal locations (that is, still the most prominent reason nationally for faculty to chose one university over another). Yet, we all are under constant pressure to improve salaries and benefits so that faculty can afford to live in these good locations.

Whereas, some institutions have created innovations approaches to chose their institutions over others. North Dakota, for example, instituted a loan forgiveness program; Columbia University purchased faculty apartments (visions of our past?) and established a private school for children of faculty members; Penn State bought 222 houses (community development) and assists in placing faculty members in them; Riverside, CA, made available a national chain bookstore, boutiques, and Starbucks in its vicinity; one major bank in Florida waves the down payment on the purchase of houses for teachers; SAM*S grants a discount to teachers signing up for its program. (Closer to home, The Charlotte Observer reported this spring that Bank of America instituted a program that allows teachers to obtain houses without the usual down payment.)

Therefore, be it resolved, that Appalachian create a small task force, including a few specifically knowledgeable faculty members and administrators, a real estate person, a banker, University Advancement, and maybe someone with other specialized expertise in health care, who will suggest workable options to the Senate and the administration that will keep Appalachian attractive to new and continuing faculty at a time when the legislature and other givens seem to turn less in our favor.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS, continued
1. EQUITY OFFICE/GRIEVANCE PROCESS AD-HOC COMMITTEE
1. FS0102/09-01 Motion to Change the Faculty Grievance Process. Marking asked for clarification on point 2.c. (The qualifications for selection will be similar to those used in obtaining jurors.) An amendment to add the following at the end of the sentence was suggested, in obtaining jurors, accounting for conflicts of interests. Point number 5 was reworded to say, Require that at the pre-hearing, all available information/files generated by both parties that will be used at the hearing as evidence be provided. It was clarified that
terms will be staggered. It was also clarified that for point number 3, there would be no attorneys. Point number 6 was reworded to state, \textit{After the pre-hearing, any additional information that will be used during the hearing must be shared with both parties prior to being introduced.} Point number 11 was clarified to say, \textit{... ten working days...} Weitz noted that she will go through the whole document and change the wording to \textit{ten working days.} Point 7.c. was changed to, \textit{..., nor may they be restrained from talking with either party.} Weitz added that any changes made need to equal the playing field and not stack the deck for one side or the other. There was discussion on where it should be stated that the chair of the committee has the right to refuse evidence. It was decided that this was a procedural issue and will be covered in a different document. A vote was taken on the document as amended.

\begin{verbatim}
VOTE # 4   22 yes   0 no   0 abstain   The motion passed.
\end{verbatim}

Weitz said for the next meeting, she would try to have the motion in legal jargon.

2. \textbf{FS0102/09-02 Motion to Change the Equity Office}. There was discussion on where investigatory work would be done. McKinney asked how it was handled at other universities. Rardin asked what was wrong with investigatory work being done by the administration. Weitz responded it was viewed as biased investigatory work because an administrator was doing work for the administration. It was noted that maybe it is a perceived assumption that investigatory work is done bias-free, especially when the investigatory body reports to someone in the administration. Moore added that he thought that administrators are given a specific responsibility, as part of their job, to investigate and enforce university policy. So by putting this back to the administration, they can do the investigation and train themselves to do their own job and share what it finds during the discovery process. The Equity Office would be concerned with equity--EEOC concerns, diversity issues, etc. Bush noted that a grievance committee has to rely on its own investigation and asked where a grievance committee can go to get investigatory help. The question then became what does the Senate want to do in assisting faculty in an investigation and if the Senate does want to recommend assistance, where should that help be housed. Rardin asked if a person has a complaint, why do we need a special office. Could they not go to the administrator in charge. Then that administrator would be in charge of the investigation. Allen called for the question.

\begin{verbatim}
VOTE # 5   10 yes   11 no   0 abstain   The question did not pass.
\end{verbatim}

Koch noted that this is a complicated matter and that it should not be dealt with under the force of a clock. The motion was tabled until the October meeting. Weitz asked that senators think what the focus of an equity office should be. Rardin added that senators think about the naming of it as well.

Weitz asked senators to think about item IV.A.3. for the next meeting (Betsy Bunting\textsuperscript{s} suggestion that Appalachian have two hearing committees). She also asked them to consider item IV.A.4. (the Grievance Hearing Committee shall determine its own rules of procedure).

Simon moved to adjourn and it was seconded.
VOTE 6  21 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore

---
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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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROCKER, DEBORAH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL, KIM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUGHLIN, TOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MIKE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIR, KEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETSCHAUER, PETER</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPE, JANICE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITZ, GAYLE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWORTH, JOAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YAUKEY, MARGARET

VISITORS: Bill Bauldry, Math; Rachel Bowling, SGA; Josh Brown, The Appalachian; Anthony DeBetta, The Appalachian; Clinton Parker, Academic Affairs; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs; Nathan A. Winkler

VOTE 1: Approve August 20 minutes as amended
VOTE 2: Committee on Committees�� recommendations
VOTE 3: FS0102/09-03 - Resolution regarding improving the attractiveness of Appalachian to new faculty
VOTE 4: FS0102/09-01 - Motion to change the faculty grievance process
VOTE 5: Call for the question
VOTE 6: Adjourn

Chancellor's response to the Faculty Senate's recommendations regarding 101-1310 funds:

(A) The Faculty Senate receive a detailed accounting at the end of every fiscal year of the reversion of funds paying Athletics personnel to 101-1310 lines. This accounting will specify how much money is generated by student athletics fees designated for this purpose as well as a reporting of the names and position numbers of the persons whose salaries are no longer supported by 101-1310 money and a reporting to where and to whom the recovered positions and/or funds will be allocated. This accounting will continue until the non-teaching athletics personnel are no longer paid from 101-1310 funds. This process should take no longer than the end of FY 2003.

    response: Beginning with the 2001-2002 fiscal year the only faculty salary funds being expended in the athletics area will be for that portion of the salaries of athletic personnel who teach. The funds being paid for the teaching duties of athletic personnel are appropriately paid from 101-1310 funds.

(B) All Associate and Assistant Deans, Directors of Development and other predominately administrative personnel (Equity Office, Enrollment Services, etc.) be paid from lines other than 101-1310. Predominately will be defined as classroom instruction at less than 12 hours per academic year. This policy should be in effect by the end of FY 2006.

    response: Attached you will find a listing of areas in Academic Affairs which have positions referred to in (B) above which are paid in whole or in part from 101-1310 funds (i.e., $1.7 M). Also included on this list are amounts being expended from 101-1310 for these positions. This in not an all inclusive list of such positions but does give a starting point to begin switching the funding of these positions from faculty salary funds to other funding sources in Academic Affairs. Given the fiscal constraints under which we are working this year and the distinct possibility we will continue at reduced funding levels for several years, it will not likely occur that this policy will be "in effect by the end of FY 2006."

(C) All administrative stipends will be paid from lines other than 101-1310. This change should be in effect by the end of FY 2006.
**response:** I assume this refers to administrative stipends paid to department chairs. The last sentence in the response (B) above applies to this recommendation.

(D) At the end of each fiscal year, the Faculty Senate will receive a reporting of every vacant faculty line and to what purpose the funds in that line were used.

**response:** Unexpended funds from faculty positions become lapsed salary independent of the status of a position. Until the 2000-2001 year lapsed salary funds were allowed to accumulate and then were "rolled over" for one-time expenditures, primarily for instructional purposes. Such funds at the end of the 2000-2001 year were not accumulated and rolled over because of concern that the General Assembly would rescind our carrying such funds forward into the current year given the position the State finds itself in with respect to budget deficits. Rather, prior to July 1, 2002, we identified lapsed faculty salary funds and other lapsed salary funds and expended them before the end of the last fiscal year. It will be our policy in the future to have no vacant positions at the end of a given fiscal year.

Also recommended by the Faculty Senate is that funds generated by tuition increases for faculty salaries may not be used to achieve any of the goals stated above. This is approved. Assuming we will receive the tuition increases of $150 per year per student for each of this fiscal year and the next one, a report will be made to the Senate at the end of the second fiscal year regarding the expenditure of these for faculty salary increases.

**Partial Listing of Administrative Positions Paid from 101-1310 Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Affairs (3 positions)</td>
<td>$155,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programs (2 positions)</td>
<td>$90,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance Program (3 positions)</td>
<td>$167,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Officers (2 positions)</td>
<td>$97,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Computing Services (1 position)</td>
<td>$73,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Center (2 positions)</td>
<td>$168,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services (1 position)</td>
<td>$68,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences (5 positions)</td>
<td>$294,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (2 positions)</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (3 positions)</td>
<td>$224,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine and Applied Arts (1 position)</td>
<td>$78,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FS0102/09-01 - Motion to Change the Faculty Grievance Process:
1. Drop the current Mediation Committee.
2. Change the hearing committee as follows:
   a. Elect for a two-year term, six faculty members (five members - two professors, two
      associate professors, one assistant professor, and one alternate rank open ) each year to serve on
      the Grievance Hearing Committee. Emphasize to nominees that this is a long-term commitment
      requiring impartiality and objectivity.
   b. This group of twelve will annually elect from its membership, a Chair of the Hearing
      Grievance Committee.
   c. 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, accounting for conflicts of interests.)
   d. This hearing committee will see its case through to the end, regardless of when their two
      year terms end.
   e. Grievance Hearing Committee members will participate in a training workshop sponsored
      by the University.
3. The faculty member may initiate 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:
   a. No lawyers for either side will be allowed to be present or participate in the "facilitated
      discussion," but either side may seek legal counsel.
   b. Lawyers for either side will be allowed to be present and participate in the pre-hearing
      and the hearing.
   c. The hearing committee will have access to a UNC system lawyer (not an Appalachian or
      GA lawyer) suggested by a General Administration lawyer. (In 2001 this was David Parker.)
      The client in this relationship is the Grievance Hearing Committee, thus protecting
      communication between the Committee and the attorney under the attorney-client privilege.
5. Require that at the pre-hearing, all available information/files generated by both parties that
   will be used at the hearing as evidence be provided.
6. After the pre-hearing, any additional information that will be used during the hearing must
   be shared with both parties prior to being introduced.
7. Educate the ASU community regarding witnesses:
   a. No person is required to be a witness or to talk to anyone.
   b. Both the grievant and the administrative representative(s) are entitled to talk with any
      witnesses who wish to talk.
   c. Witnesses may not be compelled to speak with any party to the hearing, nor may they be
      restrained from talking with either party.
d. Interference with witnesses is inappropriate and will not be tolerated.

8. Have the University attorney hire a "court recorder" for the hearing. (The university will pay for this service.)

9. Clarify the hearing committee’s decision:
   a. The hearing committee will make its decision within ten working days after receiving the transcript of the hearing.
   b. The hearing committee will present a written recommendation to the Chancellor and the grievant (and the Provost in non-disciplinary cases), accompanied with a face-to-face verbal discussion.

10. Clarify the Chancellor’s role in the Faculty grievance process:
    a. The Chancellor has 60 days to render his/her decision.
    b. If the Chancellor’s decision does not concur with that of the hearing committee’s, he/she must communicate these reasons in writing and in detail to the grievant and the hearing committee.

11. The Grievant has ten working 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.)

Draft of the 2001/2002 Faculty Senate Agenda:
(Welfare of Students input is forthcoming)

September:
Grievance process and Equity Office (ad hoc)
Chancellor as guest speaker

October:
Professional certificates (APC)
Student evaluations (APC)
Loft/App House (Wel. & Mor.)
Status of Restructuring the University recommendations (Camp. Plan)
Review of university committees (Comm. on Comm)
Budget cuts (Budget)

November:
Voting on-line (APC)
Parking (Wel. & Mor.)
Lapsed salary money (Budget)
Administrator’s salaries (Budget)

December:
Part-time faculty (APC)
On-line handbook (Handbook Com.)
Health Insurance (Wel. and Mor.)
Smoking (Wel. and Mor.)
January:
Departmental EOAs (Wel. & Mor.)
List serve policy (Wel. & Mor.)
Faculty salaries (Budget)

February:
Human research guidelines (APC)
Paperwork (Wel. & Mor.)
Space Committee (Camp. Plan.)

March:
Promotion and Tenure (APC)
Peer institutions (Wel. & Mor.)
Report on university committees (Comm. on Comm.)
University budget committee (Budget)

April:
DPCs (ad hoc)
Workload implementation (ad hoc)

Faculty Senate homepage
Appalachian State University homepage