APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
October 9, 2000
(11/13/2000 - approved as written)

At 3:22 p.m. on October 9, 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. CONGRATULATIONS. Weitz congratulated Michelle Hill for her 15 years of service at Appalachian and the Senate applauded her service.
   C. MEETINGS TAPE RECORDED. Weitz noted that the Senate meeting is being tape recorded because the Senate is following the Council of Chairs lead and that is it becoming much too tedious for Moore, Weitz and Hill to try to figure out what was said and when.
   D. SACS SELF STUDY SURVEY. Weitz reported that the self-study survey put out on the listserve needs all faculty input and encouraged senators to fill it out as well as their colleagues. The survey can be filled out via the web or by submitting a hard copy.

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   No guest speakers.

III. MINUTES
   Muir noted that section VI.A.4. should read, Gravett reported that for those special faculty appointments teaching 6 or fewer hours and temporary staff working 20 or fewer hours will receive reduced parking fees. Muir added that refunds will be awarded to those who qualify. Allen moved to approve the minutes as amended. It was seconded.

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

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
   A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
      1. Motion 00-01/10-04 Departmental Search Committees. Gates reported that this first motion probably needed a little explanation and noted that a meeting with Dr. Gretchen Bataille, Provost for the UNC General Administration, was held on Saturday morning. Bataille warned the Appalachian representatives (Gates, Anderson, Weitz, Gravett, Moore, Koch, and Parker) about what this might actually do if the search committee’s first choice declines the offer of employment and the second choice is hired and comes to campus and possibly learns that they were the second choice. Gates added that Bataille’s concerns came too late to add to the motion’s rationale, but wanted to make the Senate aware of her concerns. Weitz called for discussion on the motion.

      Koch asked Gates if what Gates is saying is that the comments of Bataille really might cause one to think about withdrawing this motion. Gates responded that it could go that far -- at least something to consider whether the Senate wants to vote this way. The motion is intended to
bring more openness and accountability into the system. Weitz suggested maybe a revision to the motion would be needed because we still need to designate to whom the search committees report. Currently, the search committee reports to the DPC. Part of this motion is that the search committee gives their recommendation to the department chairperson instead of the DPC. Anderson asked for clarification from Moore regarding the new Faculty Handbook - would not the new Handbook clarify that search committees turn over their recommendation directly to the department chair and not through the DPC? Moore responded that it depended upon how the department has organized its affairs; if the search committees are subcommittees of the DPC, then their recommendation would go to the DPC. If the search committee is independent of the DPC then their decision can go directly to the chair.

Bortz asked Gates for clarification as to what the objection was from Bataille. Were there problems other than a candidate possibly having hard feelings about being a second choice? Gates responded no, not one that Dr. Bataille could identify. Anderson added that Bataille did suggest that people should not contact the candidate to congratulate them on the position because the offer is not final until it is final.

Parker added that what he heard Bataille say as to when can the faculty know who was chosen is not until after the process is finished. Weitz added that what Bataille said was meant as in practice but not in procedure or that it was unlawful. Bataille was just exploring the problems that could arise if the faculty did find out sooner. Weitz added that the pool of people who would know would be expanded from the search committee and/or the DPC to the entire department so it is possible with our current system that the same problems could exist--it would just be a larger pool of people in which those problems could exist. Gates added that there is a lag time between the time when names go up from the department level until an offer is actually issued from the University and that longer time creates more opportunity for this informal discussion and premature contact with a candidate to take place. Koch responded that he thought that that is the bigger problem; he said he would like to see a motion to try to speed up the process between the interview stage and the actual offer being made.

Weitz noted that this motion is addressing the charge the Senate was given to decide where search committees would report. Weitz then asked the Senate what they wanted to do--did they want to deal with the motion or amend it somehow. Koch suggested tabling the motion until the Committee, based on the comments of Gretchen Bataille, checks to see if this is really what they wanted to put forth. Weitz asked what the Committee had to say. Gates responded that if the Senate decides that it needs more work then they would work on it. Moore responded that that is what chapter IV says; that some departments can have search committees that are subcommittees of the DPC and therefore would have to make their recommendation to the DPC. Departments can have search committees separate from the DPC so those separate search committees would report directly to the department chair. Weitz then asked the Committee to check what the proposed wording of the Handbook is and come up with, if need be, a motion that would address this charge. Moore reiterated Koch’s concern and that the Committee needs to address how to shorten the lag time from the department’s recommendation to when the final offer is made. Koch then moved to table the motion Butts seconded.

VOTE # 2 20 yes 2 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

2. Motion 00-01/10-05 Chairperson Process. Gates reported that this motion is to establish a procedure for implementing the decision last year approved by the Senate regarding
department chairs who come up for renewal. Weitz asked for discussion on the motion. Barber asked what if the procedure does become a referendum on the current chair. Gates responded that it would be hoped that the department, in deciding on continuance of the chair, would look at the needs of the department in the future and not ♦ has this person failed ♦ but is this person the best one to carry out where the department needs to go in the next 3-5 years. Koch added that in making this a formal procedure, it makes it less of a personal attack. It was clarified that while the motion states all faculty and staff of the department shall assemble, staff, faculty emeriti, adjunct faculty, and part-time faculty teaching less than six hours per semester shall not vote on whether to seek candidates for the position of Chairperson. Koch asked why include staff at all. Gates responded that as a member of the department, they have knowledge of department needs that would be valuable. It was asked that the motion state that voting would be done by secret ballot.

Moore noted he was mystified as to why the Committee brought forth this motion—what is the Committee trying to fix. Gates responded that the Committee is not trying to fix, but to establish a procedure for how a chair who arrives at the end of a term in office and how change is to be made if the department wants to do so. Moore responded that the Handbook as amended includes a requirement that the department faculty meet to discuss the reopening of the chair position. He wondered if the Committee was possibly trying to elaborate on the procedure that we now have in place. Moore added that the present procedures allow for department faculty to let the dean know whether they want an outside candidate as well as an internal candidate. Weitz added that this motion arose because of the motion that was approved regarding chair term limits which created a new scenario for the Handbook in that we would have a review of the chair or a possible opening of the position where there was not one before. Parker noted that a position has to be available in order to have an external search, but that a request for an external search does not preclude the dean from limiting the search to department members. However, the department is not required to initiate an external search just because availability of a faculty position happens to coincide with the reopening of the chair position.

Anderson stated that she thought that the motion specifies what occurs in the meeting. Fox noted that the original intent was to allow as much flexibility at the department level as possible. Koch added that in light of the language that is in the Handbook, he moved to table the motion and Bortz seconded.

VOTE # 3 15 yes 9 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

B. AGENDA COMMITTEE

1. Council of Chairs meeting report. Weitz reported that at the last Council of Chairs meeting, the Council unanimously proposed the following distribution of the tuition increase: funds will be split 65%/35% with the larger amount going towards faculty salaries and the smaller amount going to student financial aid. One hundred percent of the student financial aid allocation to go to the general scholarship fund. The 65% for faculty salaries would be for increases for tenure-track faculty, library faculty and full and part-time adjunct faculty. In the year 2001, the 65% for faculty salaries would go to colleges in relation to each college’s existing salary budget. In turn, colleges would be asked to allocate the increased money to faculty on the basis of merit and compression, i.e., internal equity. In the year 2002, the 65% for faculty salaries would go to colleges in relation to each college’s existing salary budget. In turn, colleges would be asked to allocate the increased money to faculty on the basis of merit and
peer market comparison, i.e., external equity.

2. Board of Trustees meeting report. There was an initial workshop of self-assessment of the Board of Trustees; how the Board actually views its function in reference to the Chancellor, the faculty, university. The BOT had very similar concerns that we have in terms of communication, power, and decision making. The Board seems open to concerns of the faculty and very willing to listen and have more communication with the faculty. Weitz will make sure that the BOT has access to the Senate minutes and agendas so they know the Senate’s concerns.

Another item was the assessment of the Chancellor by the Board of Trustees. Weitz is waiting to see if the results will be published. Weitz noted that with help from past Senate chairs, she filled out the assessment of the Chancellor which was included with all the other Trustees assessments.

3. Faculty Assembly meeting. Anderson, who attended in Weitz’s place so she could attend the Board of Trustees meeting, reported on the Faculty Assembly meeting. President Molly Broad spoke to the group regarding the bond referendum. According to polling data, about two-thirds of the voters are supportive of the bond referendum. Among the GA’s legislative priorities are competitive faculty salaries and benefits. Broad said the committee formed by the GA to look at faculty grievance procedures on campuses has fallen through the cracks because Dick Robinson, lead counsel for the GA, was chairing the committee and has retired. Broad has asked him to stay on and finish the work with the committee. But, according to committee members, Robinson has told them that he will be staying on for only a few more weeks.

Butts asked if there was discussion about the schools that will be asking for tuition increases this year. Anderson responded that there was limited discussion and that she got the impression that the GA fully expects other campuses to follow suit now that the Board of Governors has approved the first five schools requests. Butts asked if any thought has been given as to when those proposed tuition increases will become public knowledge since if it became public before November 7, it might weaken support for the referendum.

4. Chairs’ workshop. Weitz reported that she and Gates attended the chairs’ workshop on merit salary practice and were well-received by the chairs. Weitz noted that chairs’ discussion revealed approaches to merit pay that ranged from putting complete trust in a chair’s judgment to a bean-counting system. The merit concerns of the chairs seem to be very similar to the concerns of faculty. The Council may appoint a merit pay committee to study the issue further.

5. Dr. Gretchen Bataille meeting. Weitz reported on the Saturday meeting with Dr. Bataille, who received a series of questions in advance. One of those questions dealt with the Equal Opportunity Associate. Appalachian’s proposed policy did not come from the GA. Appalachian is responsible for developing its own policy about EOAs. Appalachian is similarly responsible for the way DPCs are run.

Bataille was concerned about Appalachian’s promotion and tenure guidelines and the lack of consistency across campus in procedures such as materials submitted by candidates. Bataille was surprised that we did not solicit outside evaluation letters in the process of considering faculty for tenure. She felt strongly that if we are going to have an EOA that that person needs to be a full-fledged voting member of the committee not a non-voting member; but this is a choice that Appalachian has made. Bataille was surprised that Appalachian has a policy of sending forward two or more names in the context of searches because she felt strongly that a departmental recommendation should be accepted. Bataille was also shocked that
Appalachian tenures assistant professors and that tenure and promotion should be recommended simultaneously. Weitz noted that the Senate will investigate these issues.

Bataille noted that Appalachian needs departmental by-laws in each department. Bataille will be sending a generic copy to Clinton Parker who will share it with the Senate.

**C. BUDGET COMMITTEE**

No report.

**D. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Dobson reported that the Committee is gathering data on various issues.

**E. CHANCELLOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

September 19th meeting. Weitz asked the other senators (Koch, Gravett, Simon, Allen) to report on the meeting. Simon reported that the program to Study Capitalism was the main focus. Koch added that $100,000 a year for ten years is being offered by a person to a Center for Capitalism. There are on-going discussions as to whether or not this is appropriate for Appalachian. Gravett added that there is a $250,000 gift regardless coming from this individual. It will be a $1,000,000 gift if this Center is established. It was noted that a committee with faculty representation has advised the Chancellor about the Center. Koch noted that the Chancellor characterized the possibility of this donor accepting the committee’s proposal is near zero. Weitz added that the senators present at the Advisory meeting encouraged the Chancellor to broaden the pool of faculty looking at this so as to include more humanities faculty.

**F. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

A vote was taken on the Committee recommendation that:

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE - Rebecca Cranston (Family and Consumer Sciences) replace Pat Knight (Curriculum & Instruction) (term expires 2001). Teresa Lee (Theatre and Dance) replace John Abbott (Library) (term expires 2003).

VOTE # 4  24 yes  1 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

**G. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE**

Rardin noted that the Committee’s report ([attachment #1](#)) was on the back of the agenda and invited to senators to submit questions of their own or from their colleagues for Mr. Mike Coston, Director of the Bookstore, within the week. Weitz noted that she was going to forward Rardin’s name to the Council of Chairs, which is also looking into the Bookstore operation, so efforts can be pooled. The Bookstore issue is scheduled to be on the December Faculty Senate agenda.

Fox noted that students should have input into this. Rardin responded that the Committee felt confident that it knew what that input is--that they want to retain the rental text system. Jeff Tew, a representative from SGA, added that an SGA survey last week showed that 93% of students wanted to keep the present textbook rental policy. Edwards asked if those students who completed the survey were aware of all factors about rental text programs.

**H. WELFARE AND MORALE**

Anderson reported that the Committee met with Hugh Hindman about the status of the GAs Task Force on grievance procedures, and to discuss with him how the grievance process can be improved. Hindman’s input has been shared with Gates of the Academic Policy Committee and now both committees will meet jointly on the issue.
I. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATION
Butts reported that the Committee’s first meeting will be this Wednesday.

J. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON WORKLOAD
Koch reported that the Committee will be meeting next Monday.

K. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY HANDBOOK CHANGES
Anderson reported that the Committee has put forth three motions which the Committee feels are the remaining issues of the new Chapter IV.

Motion 00-01/10-01 - The Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate move to delete the last sentence in section 4.1.2.3 and replace it with All Department Personnel Committees and/or Search Committees will appoint or elect one of their members as an Equal Opportunity Associate concerned with the business of the committee.

Anderson reported that she and Moore were asked to find out from other campuses whether or not they have an EOA role and if so how they handle it. Anderson noted that while at Faculty Assembly, she managed to speak to 12 of the 15 UNC institutions and not one of them have anything like an EOA at a department level. They have a Rick Howe or a David Larry or a Melissa Barth at an institution level that deals with these issues but not at a department level on each and every committee. Anderson added that Bataille suggested that if you are going to have such a thing, they need to be empowered by being voting members of the committee. Bataille does not believe that it is a legal requirement that EOAs be non-voting members. Anderson added that the Ad-hoc Committee’s recommendation is that DPCs and/or search committees appoint or elect an EOA and that they be a full voting member of the committee.

The discussion revealed that if a watchdog is needed it should come from outside the department.

Weitz noted that we have an existing Faculty Handbook and the proposed change coming from the Administration is that we have an EOA (non-voting) on every search committee and the DPC. She added the Ad-hoc Committee is suggesting that we revise that wording to one EOA person who is appointed or elected. The whole issue of an EOA notion is something that the Senate should probably look into, but that this is a far greater issue that this particular motion is addressing. The Senate needs to move forward with the Handbook and address whether we want an EOA (non-voting) on every search committee or DPC or do we want to go with some other version to address that particular proposal by the Administration.

Fox suggested that Rick Howe choose from each department an EOA, but that that EOA would serve as such outside of their department.

It was suggested that the issue of an EOA be left out of the new Handbook until such time that it can be addressed at a later date. Anderson asked Parker if at the December Board of Trustees meeting, the Handbook was still on the agenda. Parker responded that it is his inclination not to send the remaining sections of the Handbook to the BOT piece meal. He saw no way, since the Senate has not addressed Chapter III yet, that a comprehensive package of the remaining parts of the Handbook to the BOT. Anderson asked if Chapter IV could go ahead and be approved by the BOT and then be put into policy and be put on line until it can be printed.

A motion was made by Bortz and then seconded to table the motion until the November meeting.

VOTE # 5 13 yes 10 no 1 abstain The motion passed.
The Senate took a break at 5:03 and reconvened at 5:10 at which time Rardin moved to rescind Vote 5. Gates seconded.

VOTE # 6 19 yes 2 no 3 abstain The motion passed.

The options for the motion were put before the Senate: (1) end EOA at the department level; (2) a recommendation for an EOA (non-voting) from outside the department; (3) the current Administration proposal (a non-voting member who is tenured required on all search committees and the DPC); and (4) the Ad-hoc Committee’s proposal (a voting tenured or non-tenured faculty member). A straw vote was taken on each of the above options: (3) Y=0 (2) Y=10; (4) Y=6; and (1) Y=7. After some discussion, Rardin called for the question.

VOTE # 7 21 yes 3 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

A vote was taken on Motion 00-01/10-01.

VOTE # 8 5 yes 19 no 0 abstain The motion failed.

Simon moved and Yaukey seconded to abolish EOA at the department level. Discussion followed. Moore tried to give further history for this motion.

There was a call for the question, which was seconded.

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

A vote was taken to abolish EOA at the department level.

VOTE # 10 12 yes 12 no 0 abstain The motion failed.

Motion 00-01/10-02 - The Committee asks that the Faculty Senate recommend: (a) the following motion language for section 4.5.4.3.3: Nomination will be made by the committee to the dean of the college. The committee will nominate all acceptable candidates to fill the position. The committee may or may not submit these in ranked order of preference. The dean will send the committee’s recommendation, along with the dean’s...and (b) the following language for section 4.1.3.1(a): Reviewing the credentials of all applicants for new or vacant positions including special faculty appointments, interviewing selected candidates, and recommending to the chair all acceptable candidates to fill the position...

VOTE # 11 23 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

Motion 00-01/10-03 - The Committee asks that the Faculty Senate vote on approving the language of sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 (Teaching Portfolio and Post-tenure Review sections).

Butts recommended that a vote be taken on each section of the proposal. Discussion ensued on Motion 00-01/10-03A, which deals with teaching portfolios (section 4.3.1). Butts wanted clarification on the proposed wording before voting. He wanted to know for whom the portfolio was developed and who has access to the portfolios. If the portfolios are going to be used for
both summative and formative purposes, that should probably be defined. Anderson responded that at a minimum, because of the language in the Post-tenure review section, portfolios are used as a part of PTR and then departments can use them for other things if they want. Anderson also noted that the requirements for a teaching portfolio came from an ad-hoc committee formed in response to Administrative Memorandum 338. Allen asked if the teaching portfolio was mandated by PTR. Anderson replied that it is on this campus, but that not all of the other UNC campuses required it. Allen responded the process seemed quite cumbersome, detailed and would not indicate to anyone her methodology for teaching.

After some discussion, the motion regarding section 4.3.1 (Motion 00-01/10-03A) was voted on as amended.

Motion 00-01/10-03A - (Teaching Portfolio requirements will be published under Post-tenure review guidelines, which will be housed in the Office of Academic Affairs and not in the Faculty Handbook.) Appalachian State University recognizes the primary importance of teaching in its mission statement, and is committed to a teaching evaluation process that assesses teaching quality and contributes to the improvement of teaching and learning in a collegial atmosphere. Student evaluations and peer classroom observations are two essential components of teaching evaluation, but an accurate, fair, and constructive teaching evaluation process requires additional indicators of teaching performance. Thus, Appalachian State University expects all faculty to compile a teaching portfolio that would include: (a) A statement of teaching philosophy, general teaching goals and objectives, and future teaching plans; (b) a vita; and (c) annual reports of the faculty member since their last review. A teaching portfolio will serve both summative and formative purposes.

   VOTE # 12 23 yes 0 no 1 abstain The motion passed.

Discussion followed on Motion 00-01/10-03B, which deals with Peer Classroom Observations, especially concerning the idea of harmonizing the post-tenure review cycle with the peer review cycle. A vote was taken on the motion as amended.

Motion 00-01/10-03B  4.3.2 PEER CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS
4.3.2.1 Peer classroom observations are to be conducted each year for all probationary (those faculty without tenure) and part-time faculty members, as well as teaching assistants. Further, peer classroom observations are to be conducted in at least one class every five years for all tenured faculty. The five year cycle began in the 1996-97 academic year.

4.3.2.2 Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations
   4.3.2.2.1 Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observations by peers in at least two (2) courses (when possible) for all probationary and part-time faculty and in all classes taught by teaching assistants.
   4.3.2.2.2 All departments must conform to the following guidelines with respect to this process:
(a) Direct classroom observations by peers must take place at a minimum before each personnel decision involving a probationary faculty member.
(b) Peer observation teams must consist of at least two members.
(c) The term peer is to be defined by each individual department.
(d) Peer observation teams will conduct direct classroom observations using a written instrument approved by the department.

(e) Peer observation teams must prepare written statements of their assessments and recommendations.

(f) Written statements of assessments and recommendations prepared by peer observation teams must be conveyed to the observed faculty members in a timely manner.

(g) A copy of the written statement prepared by the peer observation team must be presented to the chair of the department in which the respective faculty member is employed.

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

Discussion followed on Motion 00-01/10-03C concerning whether the requirements for post-tenure review be placed in the Handbook or to leave it out of the Handbook, with policies being accessible from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Motion 00-01/10-03C  4.3.3 POST-TENURE REVIEW

4.3.3.1 All teaching faculty with tenure must undergo a post-tenure review process every five years. Appalachian State University's policy governing post-tenure review is set forth in Appendix F. The Board of Governors adopted the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review at its meeting on May 16, 1997. A copy of that report (as well as Administrative Memorandum Number 371 regarding Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, which contains guidelines for performance of post-tenure reviews) is available from the Office of Academic Affairs. Post-tenure review is defined as a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality.

VOTE # 14  17 yes  4 no  2 abstain  The motion passed.

Weitz commended Anderson and Moore for their long-term commitment to revisions of the Faculty Handbook.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. FACULTY/STAFF LOUNGE REPORT

Anderson reported for Barber regarding the status of the lounge. Anderson commented that the Senate has asked the Ad-hoc Committee on the Faculty/Staff Lounge to come up by-laws for the governance and use of the existing lounge and the new lounge. Anderson noted that the Committee would probably not come up with by-laws until the January meeting.

B. STATUS OF PAST MOTIONS

Weitz reported that she would give a report at the next meeting.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. FACULTY CONCERNS

1. EOA policy. Gravett recommended sending back to the Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Handbook Changes the policy regarding EOAs to better reflect the Senate's concerns and to bring it back at the November meeting.

2. Summer School possible schedule changes. Weitz asked senators if they had had a
chance to email Parker regarding the possible summer school schedule change to a four-day class week. Weitz asked Parker if the Summer School Advisory Council was going to move forward with the change. Parker responded that no change will be made for Summer 2001 since the Council did not have time to look at all the implications and ramifications of the change. The Council will continue to study it throughout the year.

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE # 15 23 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore, Secretary

FACULTY PRESENT AND VOTING SHEET
October 9, 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>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</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>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>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Patricia</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</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>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson, William</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</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>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber, Bill</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett, Kevin</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortz, Jeff</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butts, Jeff</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Kathleen</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craib, Mitchell</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</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>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson, Bill</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Debra</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Jerry</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gates, Paul
Gravett, Sandie
Jamrozy, Ute
Koch, Andrew
Long, Betty
McKinney, Harold
Moore, Michael
Muir, Ken
Rardin, Patrick
Simon, Steve
Truett, Carol
Weitz, Gayle
Yaukey, Margaret

| VOTE 1: Approve September 11 minutes as amended |
| VOTE 2: Motion to table FS 00-01/10-04 |
| VOTE 3: Motion to table FS 00-01/10-05 |
| VOTE 4: Committee on Committees university committees recommendations |
| VOTE 5: Motion to table FS 00-01/10-01 |
| VOTE 6: Motion to rescind VOTE 5 |
| VOTE 7: Call for the question |
| VOTE 8: Motion FS 00-01/10-01 |
| VOTE 9: Call for the question |
| VOTE 10: Motion to abolish EOAs at the department level |
| VOTE 11: Motion FS 00-01/10-02 |
| VOTE 12: Motion FS 00-01/10-03A |
| VOTE 13: Motion FS 00-01/10-03B |
| VOTE 14: Motion FS 00-01/10-03C |
| VOTE 15: Adjournment |

VISITORS: Linda Bennett, Arts and Sciences; Mike Coston, Bookstore; Judith Domer, Graduate School; Brandon Frye, HPC graduate student; Bill Harbinson, Music; Ming Land, Fine and Applied Arts; Clinton Parker, Academic Affairs; Peter Petschauer, History; Amanda Privette, SGA; Jeff Tew, SGA; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs

attachment #1

WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE REPORT
Faculty Senate Welfare of Students Committee met on Monday, August 28 at 3:30 pm. Senators in attendance were R. Abbott, P. Allen, K. Campbell, and P. Rardin.

There were two visitors: Ryan Bolick, vice chair of Student Government Association, and Jeff Tew, Director of Academic Affairs, Student Government Association. The focus of the meeting was the textbook rental program at Appalachian State University. Ryan Bolick and Jeff Tew presented their reasons for keeping the textbook rental program. The committee discussed the merits of their reasons with them. The committee gave Jeff Tew a copy of the committee’s agenda for the current academic year. The meeting ended at 4:40 pm.

The committee requested and received a copy of the policy of textbook rental program from Mr. Michael Coston, director of the bookstore at Appalachian.

The committee sent Jeff Tew a copy of a survey component of the Retention Management System from USAGROUP Noel-Levitz.

Jeff Tew informed the committee in writing of the Student Government Associations agenda for the current academic year.

The Welfare of Students Committee met on Monday, September 18 at 3:30 pm. Senators in attendance were: R. Abbott, K. Campbell, and P. Rardin. The committee discussed how to proceed on the textbook rental program. The committee decided not to survey faculty or students on the merits or demerits of the program. The committee stipulated that the preliminary report of the Council of Chairs Textbook Rental Subcommittee of Appalachian State University, April 6, 2000, determine the facts of the matter. The committee decided to forward the following questions to Mr. Coston, director of Bookstore at Appalachian. The questions are:

- What would the impact on the bookstore be if we did away with the rental text program?
- Would it be possible to create a used book section which would ameliorate the impact of getting rid of the rental text program?
- How many instructors currently have their students buy books outside of the rental text program?

The meeting ended at 4:35 pm.