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

II. VISITORS
Dr. Harry Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity reporting on diversity:
Williams reported to senators that The Office of Diversity was extremely pleased with what was happening on campus. He gave a brief update on what was going on in the Office of Diversity. He noted that diversity at Appalachian was at an “all-time high as it relates to students.” He noted that 8.5% of students on campus are students from under-represented communities, which was the highest percentage ever. The Office of Diversity’s goal was to reach 10% by 2008. Dr. Williams said that he believed that Appalachian would exceed that goal. The number of under-represented faculty members was also at an all-time high at Appalachian, according to Williams. He pointed out that before the diversity plan was implemented there were 9 faculty members from under-represented communities employed at Appalachian and after implementation there were 21. Dr. Williams said that the Office of Diversity was “making good progress.” He concluded with a rundown on the numbers of people represented in various population categories on campus as: 503 African-American students, 161 Hispanic students, 159 Asian-Americans, 53 Native Americans, 284 in category of Other (two years ago ‘Other’ was 49), and 13,123 white students.

III. MINUTES –
The April 14, 2003 Minutes with 2002-2003 Annual Reports attached, were available online at: <http://www.facsen.appstate.edu/Minutes/april142003min.html> and were approved as corrected and amended.

Senator Moore moved and Senator Waring seconded to approve of the April 14, 2003 Minutes as amended.

VOTE 1 Motion to approve the April 14, 2003 Minutes (as amended)
15 YES 0 NO 2 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.
The September 15, 2003 Minutes were approved as amended with one wording change by Senator Anderson. The words “still favor” were to replace the word “opted”. Senator Anderson asked for clarification regarding the September discussion about budget allocations for the Provost search and the Chancellor search because it was unclear to her (at the time of the September meeting) that the figure of $200,000.00 had been allocated for both searches. Gates
explained that due to the uncertainty of the timetable at that time, exact budgetary figures may not have been clearly presented. Gates clarified details about the two search budget allocations within the context of the September discussion.

Senator Hall moved and Senator Muir seconded the approval of the September 15, 2003 Minutes (as amended).

VOTE 2 Motion to approve the September 15, 2003 Minutes (as amended)
16 YES 0 NO 2 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

IV. MOTIONS/RESOLUTIONS STATUS –Chair Gates noted that the status of Faculty Senate motions and resolutions are available on the Senate website and will be presented verbally to Senate as their recommendations are acted on.

Provost Peacock, addressing the resolution that the provost’s office must respond to Senate actions within 60 days, agreed to follow the guidelines of the resolution. He noted, however, that he has not yet discussed this or other resolutions recently passed with Chancellor Durham. Peacock, addressing the Senate resolution requiring the university to adopt a 9-hour load as standard across the university said that he has Tim Burwell looking at the implications of this resolution for meeting the university mission. Peacock related numerous issues of concern about the impact of such a policy change, which prompted Senator Bortz to ask whether it was illusory for faculty to believe that a 9-hour load across the university was possible, to which Peacock replied “yes.” Peacock then addressed the resolution that the Admissions Office is not to be making last minute additions of sections or classes. He noted that Admissions does not add sections, that only a college dean can add sections or classes. He cited problems in predicting exactly how many students will ultimately show up, and understood that many classes can’t under any circumstances have seats added. Peacock further said that some colleges have more money available to fund late student enrollment numbers than do others, so they may be able to add seats or sections. He said he will raise the issue with Cindy Wallace and with the deans to make sure everyone is on the same page.

Peacock then addressed the resolution on office hours. He said he had been reading in the Chronicle a number of differing perspectives about office hours, and that he had been receiving emails from non-Senate faculty opposed to reducing the present number of 10 required office hours per week. He said he was collecting office hours policies from other system schools as part of his education on the issue. He said he would not let this slide, but that it was not a straightforward issue to decide.

Peacock then began discussion of the Academic Affairs budget of $94,169,106, which he has had Tim Burwell study at length, and is sharing in detail with all deans and chairs, as well as the Senate. He was emphatic that certain expenses were forced to come off the top of the total university budget because of budget cutbacks. After deductions the academic budget came in at the $94 million figure. For instance, the state legislature pulled back $713,000 in receipted funds collected by our Summer Sessions office –an unusual, but system-wide legislative grab. This meant that Appalachian would not have enough Summer School money to honor signed teaching contracts. President Broad fought this legislative initiative with the result that ASU’s reversion
was reduced to $206,084, which had to be paid from the regular academic budget in order to honor faculty summer teaching contracts. This is the first time ever that summer school costs have been covered from the regular-year academic budget. Then came the unexpected costs of transition between chancellors wherein two chancellors have to be paid. This money also has come off the top. Finally, the mandated introduction of the Banner payroll system has cost $532,000, which, too, came off the top. The overall result was that $988,000 was taken from the Academic budget, which left $94 million. After this explanation Peacock discussed in detail the threatened and actual cuts imposed on Appalachian as part of the system wide reductions made at the beginning of the fiscal year. Those reductions amounted to $2.5 million total, and were met in part by returning faculty lines that had been granted for enrollment increases. Peacock turned over explanation of this to Tim Burwell who detailed how and why it had been necessary to use so many faculty lines to meet the mandated budget give-back. With various imposed budget cuts, Appalachian was facing this academic year funding at about 50-55% of the 101 operating budgets from three years ago. Since that was an impossible operating budget, and 29 of the 42 new enrollment positions had been used to meet the $2.5 million cut, the decision was made to raise operating budgets to at least 80% of what they were three years ago, and those monies came from some of the 13 new positions left standing.

Senator Gravett asked what were the plans being put in place to address ahead of time the impact of financial cuts. Burwell responded that a system was being set up to track over time the whole of the Academic Affairs budget, and that the results would be shared with deans and Senate. Peacock replied also that he was now trying to get information on how much of student fees support academic programs, and he indicated that past practice had put the dispensing of such money in the hands of non-academic authorities, which he thought not the best track to follow. Senator Koch noted that the trend for increasing student enrollments and mandating cutbacks paid from enrollment increase money meant that Appalachian was going to have to fundamentally change many of the ways in which it has always met its workload requirements. Peacock responded that he agreed and that such changes would mean larger classes, for instance; but he also said that we must look “seriously at how we do operate” across the whole campus. He said this does not mean we have to change wholesale, but it is certain that we can’t operate “exactly as we have [been doing]”. He noted that this situation has been influenced by the fact that over the last four years Appalachian has had to revert $8.5 million in permanent budget cuts to the state.

Senator Moore noted that last year Chancellor Borkowski committed a percentage of enrollment increase funds to support staff salary increases annually. Moore wanted to know if that cost would appear in the final budget figures. Peacock replied that those monies would be in the SPA lines and would not show up in this academic affairs budget. Senator Simon asked how we were going to be able to deal with space issues with this kind of budgeting, and Peacock replied that it would be difficult and that ASU has not fared well by the influence of Eva Kline’s 1998 space study. He mentioned talk in Chapel Hill about another bond referendum to support further physical plant expansion, and said that he would support such a position.

Senate took a short break.
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
VI.COMMITTEE REPORTS
Gates announced that he had appointed Senator Beth Cramer as Senate Parliamentarian. Gates requested a motion to approve two new senators-at-large, Sandie Gravett (Philosophy & Religion) and Martha McCaughey (Interdisciplinary Studies). Senator Arnold moved and Senator Hall seconded to appoint Gravett and McCaughey as senators-at-large.

VOTE 3 Motion to approve incoming and appointed senators McCaughey and Gravett (both serving at large)
19 YES 0 NO 2 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

Senator Yaukey made a quick comment about the need for representatives to serve on ITAC. Gates noted progress was being made but there were some issues remaining which he would address later in the meeting under ‘F., AP&P Appointments’ which was listed on the agenda.

VI.B. Report of the Faculty Senate Handbook Committee September 24, 2003
1. In response to a document prepared by the Council of Chairs recommending revisions in DPC procedure, the committee recommends that the Senate invite the chair of the Council of Chairs subcommittee that prepared the proposal, Dr. Vicki Martin, or another Council representative, to discuss the Council of Chairs’ proposal with Faculty Senate at its October 2003 meeting.
2. We recommend the following stylistic changes to the Faculty Handbook (bold denotes proposed substitutions for strike-through material or additions):
a. change Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Constitution to read: “All members of the Faculty, excluding emeriti faculty, adjunct faculty, and part-time faculty teaching fewer than six (6) hours per semester, have the right to hold faculty offices and to vote in faculty meetings and faculty elections and in departmental and college committees on which they serve except as noted in Article II, Section 3. [Will require faculty approval at the Fall 2003 General Faculty meeting.]
b. change 3.4.2.8.2 and 4.4.2.2. to read: “Fixed-term faculty appointments may be made. Appointments may be made to fixed-term faculty ranks with the title designations including, but not limited to, ‘lecturer,’ ‘artist-in-residence,’....”
c. change 3.4.2.8.3 to read: “Appointments may be for a fixed term of a semester or one, two, three, four or five years.”
d. change 3.9.1.3 by adding the following sentence at the paragraph’s end: “For the Committee’s composition see 3.9.2.5.”
3. In response to a document prepared by the Council of Chairs and attached herewith entitled “Recommendations for Modifying the Periodic Reopening Procedure of the Departmental Chair Position - 4.5.4.4.2 Faculty Handbook,” the committee recommends Senate adoption of the following text to substitute fully for the present text in section 4.5.4.4.2:
4.5.4.4.2 At that designated time, the dean will inform the faculty and the departmental chair that the periodic reopening of the position is taking place. The faculty of the department shall assemble, without the departmental chair, to discuss the future of the department and its leadership. Before this meeting is adjourned and while a quorum exists, departmental faculty (as
defined in Article II Section 3 of the Faculty Constitution) shall vote by secret ballot on whether to seek candidates for the position of departmental chair or to continue with the current departmental chair for an additional term of three years. A simple majority shall be required. The result of this vote (the number of yeas, nays, or abstentions) shall be communicated to the Dean of the College, and the dean will share the results with the departmental chair.

The Handbook Committee also recommends the following text to substitute for the existing text of 4.5.4.4.5:

“4.5.4.4.5. The department’s Equal Opportunity Associate (EOA) will convene and chair the meeting and conduct all balloting, prepare minutes of the meeting, and immediately inform the departmental faculty and the Dean of the College of the ballot results. Minutes of the meeting shall only record those faculty present and the ballot results and shall be sent to the Dean of the College. (If the EOA is absent, the faculty assembled will elect a temporary chair from among those assembled for the meeting.)”

The Handbook Committee is sympathetic with the Council of Chairs’ concern to enhance the personnel review process applying to departmental chairs. However, we think that the intent of the Senate when recommending this procedure was for it to be exclusively a faculty matter and not to be another aspect of a personnel review of a departmental chair, despite the realization that comments made at the meeting might well involve positive or negative evaluation of the departmental chair’s performance. The Faculty Handbook makes provision for regular and ongoing personnel review of departmental chairs by faculty and by deans (section 4.5.4.5.). The specific charge of this faculty meeting is to vote on whether the faculty desire the incumbent departmental chair to continue for another term. It is not to be a meeting where minutes are taken of what was said. The meeting minutes would only record those present and the results of the required secret ballot. It is a critical part of the process that makes periodic reopening of the chair position work.

The Handbook Committee believes that the Council of Chairs has made possible positive review of this procedure by Faculty Senate, and some clarifications recommended by the Council of Chairs have been incorporated into the substitute text, i.e. clarifying which faculty are eligible to vote, making sure the dean and departmental chairs are fully informed of the faculty action, and clarifying the nature of minutes of the meeting. In addition, the Handbook Committee is recommending that staff involvement in this procedure be eliminated (see existing texts of sections 4.5.4.4.2 and 4.5.4.4.5).

4. The Handbook Committee has received another communication from the Council of Chairs that requests expansion and clarification of the duties of the Council of Chairs in chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook. The Handbook Committee has rewritten the document in narrative form to conform with the other descriptors of various councils in that chapter. The text recommended for approval is as follows (in boldface):

7.5.7 Council of Chairs
The Council of Chairs is composed of all academic department chairpersons, the University Librarian, and the Assistant or Associate Dean of Music. The function of the council is to gather and exchange information on behalf of the chairs of the university and to report to and advise the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor on matters of concern to the council. The Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor must respond to the Council in a timely fashion. The Council shall have a Chairperson and a Secretary who shall be chosen in such manner and for such terms as specified by the Council. An Executive Committee of the Council of Chairs shall consist of the Chairperson and Secretary of the Council, representatives from each college, and from the Library and School of Music. The representatives shall be chosen in such manner and for such terms as specified by the Council. The Executive Committee shall meet prior to each Council meeting to set and publish the agenda. The Council shall operate under the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

Apparently, the Council of Chairs considers two items of considerable importance: 1. To properly identify members of the Council of Chairs and its basic operating procedures; 2. To require the Provost to respond to Council business with some explanation. In May, when this was originally written, even the Senate seldom got timely reports of administrative action on its recommendations. At our September 2003 meeting Senate passed a resolution that the Provost would respond to our business within 60 days. We hope the Acting Provost quickly accepts this resolution, and we hope this sets a precedent for the Council of Chairs.

5. The committee recommends to the Senate that it approve the text contained in the attachment “REVISED GRADUATE FACULTY FOR FACULTY HANDBOOK APPROVED BY GRADUATE COUNCIL 03-31-03” to substitute for the existing text in Article V of the Faculty Constitution. [*This will have to be submitted to the Spring term General Faculty meeting for the action of the faculty.*]

Explanation from Dean Domer:
“The Graduate Council unanimously approved the attached text at its March 31, 2003 meeting, and has requested the Faculty Senate review and approve it as well. The Graduate Council has noted the primary differences between the old and new versions to be: “1. Provision has been made for appointing administrators to the Graduate Faculty. 2. Provisions have been made for allowing clinical faculty to hold Associate Membership on the Graduate Faculty despite the fact that they may not be scholarly active. 3. The category ‘temporary membership’ has now been replaced with ‘Affiliate Membership.’ [and] it has been more fully defined, and provision has been made for appointments extending longer than a year. 4. The application process has been ‘streamlined’ to some extent to involve fewer written analyses as the applications proceed through the various levels for review.”

N.B. The changes in boldface have been made by the Handbook Committee and reviewed and accepted by Graduate Dean Judith Domer.

Respectfully Submitted by
Attachments to Handbook Committee Report.
I. Recommendations For Modifying the Periodic Reopening Procedure of the Departmental Chair Position - 4.5.4.2 Faculty Handbook

The Chair Review Subcommittee of the Council of Chairs recommends the following modifications of the fifth year Chair review process:

“1. To sponsor involvement of the Deans in the fifth year Chair Review process, allow the Dean to convene and charge the faculty discussion meeting.”

Handbook Committee Recommendation:
Insert the following text after the first sentence in 4.5.4.2: The Dean of the appropriate College will convene the fifth year Chair Review faculty discussion meeting and charge faculty with their responsibilities by outlining agreed upon criteria that faculty will utilize in their discussion. These criteria should be based on the specific Chair responsibilities outlined in 6.5.3 of the Faculty Handbook.

“2. To establish clear criteria on the categories of faculty who vote in the fifth year Chair Review discussion meetings, use language similar to that in Article II, Section 3 of the Faculty Constitution.”

Handbook Committee Recommendation:
Replace sentence 3 in section 4.5.4.2 with: "At the conclusion of this discussion, full time faculty (including those in the ranks of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor) shall vote...." Add this sentence at the end of 4.5.4.2: "These voting categories must be applied consistently across colleges."

“3. To provide meaningful feedback to the Chair, minutes of the fifth year Chair Review discussion meeting should be shared with the Chair by the Dean of the appropriate College.”

Handbook Committee Recommendation:
Add the following text at the end of 4.5.4.5: “For meaningful feedback, minutes of the fifth year Chair Review discussion meeting, identifying specific constructive remarks, praise and criticism without identifying specific speakers, must be shared with the Chair after the discussion meeting. The Dean of the appropriate College will convey this information to the Chair.”

“4. To ensure that Chairs receive vote counts from the fifth year Chair Review discussion consistently across colleges, the Dean of the appropriate College will share this information with Chairs.”

Handbook Committee Recommendation:
Insert the following as the last sentence in section 4.5.4.2: “The actual vote count derived from the fifth year Chair Review discussion on whether to seek candidates for the position of departmental chair or to continue with the current departmental chair for an additional three years must be shared with the Chair by the Dean of the appropriate College.”

“5. Deans should devise ways to make annual reviews work in tandem with the fifth year Chair Review process.”

Handbook Committee Recommendation:
Add this sentence at the end of 4.5.4.1: “Deans should devise ways to make the annual reviews work in tandem with the fifth year review process.”
Following is the full text of the Council of Chairs’ Minutes regarding the Council’s proposal on Chair review, which has been cut and pasted above.

Recommendations on Chair Review Process
Recommendation #1 to sponsor involvement of the Deans in the fifth year and subsequent Chair Reviews. A motion was made to accept recommendation #1 with new language stating that these criteria will be based on Chair responsibilities...and adding as the last sentence wording similar to: Upon completion of the charge, the faculty will continue the discussion meeting without the Dean present and at the conclusion of their discussion, the Dean will return to hear their report. The motion was seconded and passed with two "no" votes.
Recommendation #2 to establish clear criteria on the categories of faculty who vote in the fifth year and subsequent Chair Reviews.

A motion was made to accept recommendation #2 but new language was substituted stating that full time tenure track or full time faculty who have been employed at least two years shall vote. The motion was seconded and passed with one "no" vote and one abstention.

Recommendation #3 to provide meaningful feedback to the Chair through minutes of the fifth year and subsequent Chair Reviews from discussion meetings and sharing these minutes with the Chair through the Dean of the appropriate College.
A motion was made to accept recommendation #3. The motion was seconded and passed with one abstention.

Recommendation #4 to require the Dean of the appropriate College to share the actual vote count from the discussion meetings from the fifth year and subsequent Chair Reviews.

A motion was made to accept recommendation #4. The motion was seconded and passed with three abstentions.
Recommendation #5 to ask Deans to devise ways to make annual reviews work in tandem with the fifth year and subsequent Chair Reviews.

A motion was made to accept recommendation #4 [sic]. The motion was seconded and a friendly amendment added new language stating that Deans may substitute fifth year and subsequent three year Chair Reviews for the annual review scheduled during those periods. The motion passed unanimously.

REVISED GRADUATE FACULTY FOR FACULTY HANDBOOK APPROVED BY GRADUATE COUNCIL 03-31-03
BYLAWS FOR ARTICLE V
Graduate Faculty

Graduate Faculty appointments at Appalachian State University are intended to signify active involvement in one or more graduate programs. Thus, only faculty with Graduate Faculty appointments may teach graduate courses, mentor students as they develop their theses, dissertations and products of learning, direct independent studies, and advise students in developing their programs of study. There are three types of appointment to the Graduate Faculty, viz., Full Membership, Associate Membership and Affiliate Membership. Full Membership is reserved for those Graduate Faculty who meet all the criteria listed below, including having a record of sustained scholarly/creative activity looked upon favorably by peers outside of Appalachian State University and the region. Associate Membership is intended for individuals who are just beginning to build their scholarly/creative reputations and for individuals who wish to be involved in graduate education but who, for one reason or another, are minimally active as scholars. Those appointed to Affiliate Membership are primarily non-tenure track faculty, part- or full-time, who offer service courses for graduate students or who supervise students in internships, practica or the development of products of learning, as well as for faculty from other institutions who may be invited to serve on thesis or dissertation committees at Appalachian State.

A. Full Membership

Full Membership on the Graduate Faculty may be granted to tenured or tenure-track faculty who will participate in graduate teaching, advising or mentoring and who meet the following criteria. Full Members must:
1. possess the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.
2. be excellent to outstanding classroom instructors, capable of integrating, and applying, and imparting to students current knowledge/skills appropriate to one’s discipline.
3. provide active and sustained professional service to the university and to the regional and national/international organizations representing one’s discipline. Professional service includes participation on university committees, service on thesis/dissertation committees, taking leadership roles in professional organizations, providing service as manuscript reviewers for journal articles or professional books, accepting editorships, accepting requests for adjudications for performances or other creative activities, organizing and/or being asked to present or perform at regional/national/international venues, and service on boards or committees related to one’s professional discipline at the regional/national/international level.
4. be active and productive in scholarship/performance/creative endeavors with a sustained record of demonstrable creativity, integration and/or application of knowledge, methods and techniques in one’s discipline as evidenced by publications, adjudicated performances or other creative endeavors, and presentations to regional and national/international audiences of one’s professional peers. Peer-review at the regional and national/international level in the format appropriate to the discipline is crucial critical. Presentations at conferences are a critical component in the evaluation of scholarship but they are not sufficient as the sole evidence of peer-reviewed scholarly activity.

Full Membership may also be granted to individuals who become full-time administrators and
whose backgrounds up to the time of administrative appointment would have qualified them for Full Membership. It is anticipated that administrators, because of their heavy administrative responsibilities will have minimal participation in graduate programs, but they could bring much needed expertise to selected courses or to thesis or dissertation committees.

Full Membership on the Graduate Faculty permits one to teach graduate courses, supervise independent and/or individual studies, serve on or chair thesis, dissertation, product-of-learning or capstone research committees, supervise internships or practica, and serve on the Graduate Council.

Full Membership on the Graduate Faculty is usually granted for a five-year renewable term. Renewal at the Full Membership level requires sustained peer-reviewed scholarly/creative activity during the five years preceding the request for renewal as well as continued active participation in the graduate program, e.g., teaching, serving or thesis/dissertation committees, or supervision of internships/practica. Renewal can be granted for three years at the Full Membership level to faculty whose scholarly agendas have not been sustained over the previous five years but whose work-in-progress would suggest revitalized efforts with respect to this criterion for membership.

B. Associate Membership

Associate Membership on the Graduate Faculty is granted primarily to tenure-track faculty at the Assistant Professor level who have not yet met all the criteria for appointment at the Full Membership level. Criteria that must be met for selection at the Associate Membership level include:

1. possession of the terminal degree for the discipline.
2. indications of ability to teach well at the graduate level.
3. a willingness to provide service to the university and profession.
4. evidence that the individual shows considerable promise to mature into and become an established scholar/performer/artist with a regional/national/international reputation gained through peer-reviewed activities appropriate to the discipline.

Associate Membership is granted as a three-year appointment. This appointment carries with it the expectation that the individual will develop credentials for Full Membership during those three years. Reappointment at the Associate Membership level is possible for the individual who continues to show promise but who has not fully developed the credentials for Full Membership. In selected instances, Associate Membership may also be granted to individuals who, for one reason or another, limit their scholarly activity while emphasizing teaching and service. Included within this latter group are clinical faculty, particularly in the Reich College of Education, who are instructors on multiple-year fixed-term contracts.

Associate Membership on the Graduate Faculty permits one to teach graduate courses, supervise independent and/or individual studies, serve on or chair thesis, product-of-learning or capstone research committees, supervise internships or practica, and serve on the Graduate Council. Associate members of the Graduate Faculty may serve on, but not chair, dissertation committees.
C. Affiliate Membership
Affiliate Membership is reserved for individuals who are not tenured or tenure-track but who may teach part-time or full-time in an adjunct capacity, who may serve as supervisors of internship or practica experiences outside the university, or who may be asked to serve on thesis, dissertation, or product-of-learning committees because of their expertise in a particular area within the discipline.

Minimal criteria for appointment to Affiliate Membership include:
1. a master’s degree or terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. The individual must have had a minimum of 18 hours of graduate credit at the master’s level in the discipline in order to teach a graduate level course in that discipline.
2. evidence that the individual remains active in the discipline by virtue of appropriate employment, service and professional activity, such as editorships, serving on appropriate professional boards, participation in professional workshops, etc.

Individuals who are faculty members at another institution with graduate programs and who hold a Graduate Faculty appointment at that institution, providing the institution is fully accredited by the appropriate accrediting body, may be granted affiliate membership reciprocity at Appalachian State University.

Affiliate Membership appointments may be requested for an appropriate interval ranging from one semester to three years, and are renewable upon application and the submission of appropriate documentation at the end of each appointment period. Three-year appointments would be appropriate for those individuals who serve as long-term adjuncts in selected programs, whereas one-semester appointments would be appropriate for individuals called upon to teach or supervise only occasionally.

D. Application Process
The application process for Full and Associate Membership on the Graduate Faculty involves the following steps:
1. a candidate for Full or Associate Membership completes the Graduate Faculty application form which can be found at http://www.graduate.appstate.edu/pdf/facappguidelines.pdf and submits the form along with a complete curriculum vitae to the departmental chair.
2. the departmental chair forwards the application to the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), which acts upon it and submits a decision to the departmental chair.
3. the departmental chair checks the appropriate line on the application form, signs the form, and attaches a short memo outlining briefly the reasons for her/his concurrence or disagreement with the DPC decision, then forwards the memo and the application packet to the Dean of the College/School in which the department resides.
4. the Dean of the College/School checks the appropriate line on the application form, signs the form, and submits the packet to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Additional information from the Dean of the College/School to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research is welcome but is necessary only in cases where the Dean in whose college/school the applicant resides does not concur with the recommendations of the DPC and departmental chair.
5. the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research reviews all documentation and recommendations and makes an appointment.

The application process for Affiliate Membership on the Graduate Faculty involves the
Requests for appointment to Affiliate Membership do not require DPC action, unless otherwise specified by a particular department or dean. They will usually be initiated by a departmental chair in consultation with the Dean of the College/School in which the department resides. A memo from the departmental chair countersigned by the Dean of the College/School in which the candidate’s responsibilities with respect to graduate education at Appalachian State University are outlined, along with a recent complete curriculum vitae, should then forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research for review and appointment.

In regard of item number 1 in the report, Moore noted the committee recommended that Dr. Vicki Martin, be asked by Senate to elucidate the Council of Chairs proposal for disciplining wayward faculty members of DPC’s and search committees.

In regard of item number 2 of the report, Moore noted these were stylistic and grammatical changes to various sections of the Faculty Handbook. Gates asked for comments and then called for a vote.

VOTE 4 Motion to accept Faculty Handbook changes in #2 of the report
23 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

In regard of item number 3 of the report, Moore noted that the Council of Chairs was proposing to restructure aspects of the periodic reopening of the department chair policy. He said that the committee believed there to be some useful result from the Council of Chairs critique, which were reflected in the new language proposed for sections 4.5.4.4.2 and 4.5.4.4.5. The major part of the proposal involved the chair’s desire to fit the mandated periodic re-opening of the chair position, with its mandated faculty discussion of the department’s leadership, into the process of personnel evaluations of the chair. Moore noted that the committee felt that the regular annual conference reviews of chairs by deans and faculty should provide ample opportunity for evaluation, and that the whole purpose of the periodic re-opening policy was that it was to be exclusively a faculty matter once a dean had initiated the process. Because of this, it was not necessary to include it in any chair evaluation process. However, Moore noted that chairs had legitimate concerns that not all deans were being consistent in implementing the periodic re-opening policy, in that some would not share the results of a faculty vote with a chair. Finally, Moore noted that the committee was recommending that staff participation in the re-opening process be eliminated.

Since the proposal included a statement as to which faculty had the right to vote in the periodic re-opening process—i.e., only those faculty eligible to vote on personnel matters—discussion turned to questions of the roles of part-time faculty in university activities. Senator Arnold asked whether the intention was to include non-tenure track faculty in the voting on the periodic re-opening process. Moore responded that the proposal references the faculty constitution, which defines which faculty can vote in personnel matters, and that that is the only definition available. Arnold noted that the participation of non-tenure-track faculty in departmental decisions was a
contentious and major issue, and that unless it was better defined which faculty would participate in the periodic re-opening process, that he could not vote for the proposal. There was extended discussion of which faculty could or could not, and should or should not, participate in departmental and personnel decisions, which ended when Senator Yaukey called the question.

VOTE 5 Called for the question
15 YES 6 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The question passed.

VOTE 6 Motion to approve Faculty Handbook changes in text as written in #3 of the report
10 YES 4 NO 8 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

In regard of item 4 of the report, Moore noted that the Council of Chairs was requesting a rewriting of the description of its duties and operating procedures in chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook. He said that Council of Chairs seemed most concerned to have stated greater detail about its membership and operating procedures and to have timely response from the provost about the Council’s business.

VOTE 7 Motion to approve Faculty Handbook changes in #4 of the report (as amended)
21 YES 0 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

In regard of item 5 of the report, Moore said that the proposal had been passed by the Graduate Council and amended for style in consultation with Dean Domer. He said that it involved a considerable expansion and definition of the Graduate Faculty over the inadequate present description in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator Koch asked if the proposal indicated anywhere the teaching load for graduate faculty, and Moore responded that it did not. Senators Anderson and Koch raised concerns about whether the proposal adequately addressed the expectation of productive scholarship. Moore noted that the proposal seemed to define only the usual minimal requirements for full, associate, and affiliate graduate faculty status. Senator Bortz said that he thought the criteria for graduate faculty were farcical, and that departments or colleges should be making up the requirements for graduate faculty qualification.

Senator McGarry said that his department’s DPC had found that the criteria for graduate faculty membership were not particularly clear and that when his DPC had positively recommended faculty for full membership (and his chair had concurred) that the graduate school only allowed
Associate membership status. He believed that departmental DPC’s should be making the determination about who should have what graduate faculty status, but too often the recommending role it now has is disregarded by the graduate school. Senator Waring said that the proposal was “a major advance” over what exists at present, and that any attempt to “more tightly” define graduate faculty criteria would produce a number of departmental “explosions.” He concluded that only departments should define what is acceptable scholarship for their disciplines. Senator Staub expressed reservations that not all recommendations for graduate faculty status in section D involved the departmental DPC. Senator Rardin noted problems with definitions, such as that full graduate faculty membership included the requirement of “must” while associate and affiliate membership definitions were less clear-cut, saying only that the criteria “include.” He wanted a document that set out precise criteria and that defined the criteria clearly. Senator Waring said he would like more time to study the proposal in light of the concerns raised and hoped it would be sent back to committee or tabled. Senator Bortz said that departments have their own sets of criteria for tenure and that what is required in the proposal actually diminished the criteria established by departments. He said that old worn out statements of service being required were not appropriate to graduate faculty, and that only peer reviewed scholarship/creative activity should count for graduate faculty status. If anything, Bortz noted, the document should require departments to provide specific standards for research in their fields that will establish graduate faculty criteria.

Senator McKinney called the question.

VOTE 8 Called for the question
19 YES 1 NO 3 ABSTAIN
The question passed.

Discussion on the motion continued with some sentiment that the Handbook Committee do some revision and return it to the Senate. Moore noted that it was not the product of the Handbook committee and that Senators should either vote for or against the proposal that has been made by the Graduate Council and submitted to the Senate by Dean Domer. If the Senate votes it down, Moore said, it would become the responsibility of the Graduate Council and the graduate dean to deal with the issues as best they can. Gates said he would tell Dean Domer about the Senate’s reservations, and called for the vote on the motion.

VOTE 9 Motion to approve Faculty Handbook language changes in Graduate Faculty Bylaws
4 YES 15 NO 3 ABSTAIN
The motion failed.

VI.C. Campus Planning Committee Report to Faculty Senate
The Campus Planning Committee (Doug Waring, Tom Jamison, Kathy Simon) met with Vice Chancellor Jane Helm, Office of Business Affairs, in her office on Tuesday, September 30, 2003 at 2:30 p.m.
We discussed the following topics:
1. Follow up to last spring’s Forum in April: Ms. Helm said she had a member of her staff take notes during the forum and that each issue brought up that needed further attention was dealt with by her office subsequent to the forum.
2. We decided not to receive a committee-directed report on the status of major building projects during this meeting. Ms. Helm offered to give another Power Point presentation on campus planning and construction for faculty and staff as soon as it could be arranged. She preferred an October date. She wants to answer as many questions as she can to avoid misinformation.
3. In answering direct questions about the target dates of completing the student union and bookstore projects, Ms. Helm explained the extent of the actual construction problems created by original sub-contractors, the process of getting new sub-contractors, and how delayed the projects had become. Similarly, she explained how campus project costs increase if there are construction delays caused by the backlogs in decision-making or approval of plans at the state construction office and the state insurance office. She also mentioned problems and delays with the steam plant project (e.g., can’t shut off steam to cafeteria now). Will be done in “phases.” Projected completion date for bookstore and union is now 2005.
4. Problems associated with communication between Business Affairs and members of departments affected by each construction project (new building, renovation, etc.) were noted. (a) For those departments directly impacted by a project, Ms. Helm informed us that it is the intention of her office to form a small committee of representatives from a department to be consulted at each step of a project--beginning with the choice of architects. (At this point, Clyde Robbins, ODC, stepped in at her request to inform us when the Smith Wright renovation project would begin. Doug Waring was asked to serve on the dept. committee. Other names will be sent to Business affairs office by the Psychology Dept. chair.) Generally, Ms. Helm said that it is her policy that representatives from Business Affairs will come to speak with a department BEFORE a project begins.
(b) For those departments impacted indirectly by a construction project (e.g., water shut off, foot and street traffic patterns affected, noise, dust, etc.), Ms. Helm requests a contact person be designated for each area who will communicate problems to her office--rather than have numerous calls from several persons in the same place. Patrick Beville, ODC, stepped in to explain recent communication difficulties when unexpected events occur. i.e., having to immediately seal off a water line from Whitener Hall without prior notification to the occupants because the old Whitener drawings did not show line to be there; however, post notification and explanation were given.
5. Concerns of the committee regarding safety hazards for pedestrians all across campus as well as concerns about getting efficiently from one part of campus to another were met with a minimum of concern. Ms. Helm stressed individual responsibility and suggested walking slower and with more care. Many sidewalks have not been repaired because of lack of state money.
6. Ms. Helm explained briefly the vastness of problems associated with lack of infrastructure money. Three years ago ASU’s allocation was $3.5 million but in the past few years it has been only $200,000 per year. This impacts older buildings (plumbing, electrical problems, asbestos removal, etc.) and the campus itself (e.g., broken sewer lines, rust in water, etc.) and will eventually impact the newer buildings if the trend continues.
There being no other matters to discuss, the meeting was called to an end.  
Respectfully submitted, Kathy Simon, chair

VI.D. Agenda Committee-  
3. FS03-04/10-03-Resolution on Cooperation in Campus Planning-  
Building Committees do not have a productive relationship with the Office of Business Affairs. There are repeated failures of communication and planning between these committees and Business Affairs. These failures have adversely and unnecessarily affected the academic mission.

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost and Chancellor ensure that Business Affairs works effectively with the Building Committees so that reasonable planning and coordination of all activities can be assessed, and that those affected will know what is and will be happening at each stage of the building project. This requires that Building Committees be involved directly in all decisions about space usage and available funds.

The Campus Planning Committee will provide active oversight and assessment of how well the coordination of Business Affairs and the Building Committees is working and will report bi-monthly to the Faculty Senate.

Rationale

It is crucial that the incoming Chancellor have the legitimacy and trust that can be generated only through a process in which the faculty are engaged

There was a great deal of agitated discussion about the numerous problems and complaints of faculty at the perceived lack of willingness by Business Affairs to work cooperatively and equitably with faculty and departments affected by construction and budgetary issues. Few seemed to trust the “Shepherd” system implemented by vice-chancellor Helm to deal with ongoing problems, although Senator Marking noted that the system could work. Other senators noted concerns about the apparent haughtiness of some construction project managers who have been dismissive of faculty needs, with Senator Koch saying that some Business Affairs personnel just “don’t listen.”

Gates noted that an agenda committee motion addressed the points being made in discussion of the Campus Planning Committee report and called for that motion to be put on the floor in order to continue the discussion.

Senator McKinney said that for the six years he has been on the Senate that Business Affairs seemed usually to have more reasons why something couldn’t be done than why it could. He
noted the opposition of vice-chancellor Helm to the idea of a one-dollar parking fee assessed on people who enjoy sport and cultural events while using Appalachian parking facilities. He said that if Helm could not get behind a simple idea like the parking fee, then certainly she would not listen to more complicated construction project concerns of faculty. Senator Yaukey said that lots of time and money are being wasted because Business Affairs won’t do the proper planning and evaluation of needs, such as with the ventilation system in her building. Following suggested changes in the wording of the motion, the amended motion was read to the Senate by the secretary and Gates called for a vote.

FS03-04/10-03-Resolution on Cooperation in Campus Planning (as amended)- Academic departments have not had a productive relationship with the Office of Business Affairs. There have been repeated failures of communication and planning between these departments and Business Affairs. These failures have adversely and unnecessarily affected the academic mission.

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost and Chancellor ensure that Business Affairs works effectively with the affected departments so that reasonable planning and coordination of all building and renovation activities can be assessed, and that those affected will know what is and will be happening at each stage of the building project. This requires that academic departments be involved directly in all decisions about space usage and available funds.

The Campus Planning Committee will provide active oversight and assessment of how well the coordination of Business Affairs and the affected departments are working and will report bi-monthly to the Faculty Senate.

Rationale
It is crucial that the incoming Chancellor have the legitimacy and trust that can be generated only through a process in which the faculty are engaged.

VOTE 10 FS03-04/10-03 - Resolution on cooperation in campus planning
16 YES 0 NO 2 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

VI.D. Agenda Committee-
1.FS03-04/10-01-Motion Requesting an Open Chancellor Search-
The Faculty Senate requests that each constituent campus group -- the Dean's Council, the Council of Chairs, the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association and the Staff Council -- have an opportunity to meet separately with each of the 5-8 semi-finalist candidates during their on-campus interviews prior to the Search Committee sending their final recommendations to the President.
We also request that there be a forum for each candidate to meet with all members of the academy and the public. We understand and respect the need for candidates' names to be confidential and not released outside the Search Committee prior to scheduling these meetings.

Rationale
It is crucial that the incoming Chancellor have the legitimacy and trust that can be generated only through a process in which the faculty are engaged.

Gates noted that he and Council of Chairs chair, Lorin Baumhover, had been cooperating on how to influence the Trustees’ Chancellor Search Committee to hold open interviews on campus with final candidates. Gates said that the motion reflects the spirit of what they had been discussing in the Council of Chairs and we have been discussing the Senate. All discussion centered on the necessity for the chancellor’s search process to be an open one. Gates called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE 11 FS03-04/10-01 Resolution requesting an open chancellor search
18 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

2. FS03-04/10-02-Resolution on the Academic Budget-
Academic Affairs has borne the brunt of budget cuts totaling 10.88% over the last several years, which have reached the point of negatively affecting the academic mission of the university. Since the academic mission is the central purpose of the university, it is important that other areas of the university that have been less affected by the budget cuts be called upon to provide more support for that mission.

Rationale
It is detrimental to the functioning of the university that academics suffer the lion's share of reductions in the state budget appropriation. Other campus units which are less dependent on state funds, and therefore hurt less by legislative cuts, should share the costs of fulfilling the academic mission of the university.

There was much discussion that centered on the need to discover where and how student fees are being used in support of academic activities and whether these and other fees now being collected might be more clearly defined for academic purposes. In these times of budgetary crisis, all areas of the university that can should help out the academic mission of the university. Gates called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE 12 FS03-04/10-02 Resolution on the academic budget
The motion passed.

4. FS03-04/10-04-Motion on a Joint Committee on DPC Reform-
The Council of Chairs has indicated an interest in forming a joint committee to work out policy on DPC reform. The Faculty Senate supports this plan and requests that the Chair appoint the Vice-Chair and one additional senator to this committee.
Gates introduced the motion by saying this is concerned to make headway on DPC reform and that the committee had been suggested by the Council of Chairs to work out details of a proposal. Senator Koch said that he had attended the Council of Chairs meeting and that Lorin Baumhover had asked for chair volunteers to participate on the joint committee suggested by Koch. Gates called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE 13 FS03-04/10-04 Motion requesting a Joint Committee on DPC Reform
18 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed

5. FS03-04/10-05-Resolution on Computer Modem Pool-
The Faculty Senate calls on Academic Computing to maintain the modem pool for off-campus dial-up users at existing levels.

Rationale
The cost of modems is minimal, and maintenance of the pool at existing levels would not be costly in terms of either hardware or labor. If the stated policy of Academic Computing to not replace each of the small battery of modems as it fails goes into effect, access to dial-up service from off campus will slowly erode until it is no longer operational.

Gates introduced the motion and expressed concern that with present policies the modem pool that allows off-campus faculty access to the internet (so-called SLIP accounts) will deteriorate and eventually wipe out internet access for faculty that depend upon it. There was considerable discussion and concerns that some few still use SLIP access, but that many others maintain their own access through local ISP’s. There were concerns about maintenance costs, but in the end the motion was returned to committee for further study.

F. Committee on Committees

Gates said that at present there is no functioning Committee on Committees and that he has been trying himself to fill that need for the present. To get this committee together Gates said he would have to re-assign senators to new committees, because there are vacancies on university committees that have to be filled by the Committee on Committees. Gates noted that the Academic Policies and Procedures committee needed faculty representatives immediately and that he had the acceptance for service of Mike Dotson (Business), Gayle Weitz (F & AA), and Diana Queueley-Beard (Education). Gates said he hopes soon to find a member representing Arts and Sciences and is working with Dean Aeschleman to that end. Gates requested approval of the three present nominees.
VOTE 14 Motion to approve AP&P appointments
17 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

2. FS03-04/10-06- Motion Regarding Patent & Copyright Committee/Technology Transfer Committee
The motion to merge the Patent & Copyright Committee responsibilities with the newly created Technology Transfer Committee was introduced by Gates who called for discussion and then a vote.

VOTE 15 FS03-04/10-06 Motion regarding Patent & Copyright Committee/ Technology Transfer Committee
16 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

New Business:
Senator Gravett requested the Handbook committee examine section 4.5.4.4.4 to clarify the procedures pertaining to selection of internal or external searches for department chairs. Does the recommendation to the dean for an external search require only a simple majority of the voting faculty?

There was a motion to adjourn that was seconded.

VOTE 16 Adjourn the October 13, 2003 meeting.
11 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Moore,
Secretary
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