At 3:17 p.m. on December 3, 2001, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 Greer Hall).

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

B. RESOLUTIONS UPDATE. Weitz updated the Senate on two motions passed by the Senate that have been acted upon by the Chancellor: 1) textbook rental program; 2) faculty evaluations of deans. The textbook rental program motion was not supported by the Chancellor because the Chancellor believes, after receiving input from various parties on campus, that the advantages of the textbook rental program outweigh the disadvantages. The faculty evaluations of deans motion was modified and approved by the Chancellor. The modification is that the last sentence in item #1 under Procedures was eliminated from the procedures. That section stated that, Deans will be required to sign a waiver that will allow the release of the results of the Reading Committee (described in item #4) and to release a summary report to the faculty in their colleges/school.

C. BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING. Weitz encouraged all senators to attend the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday, December 7. Weitz asked the following senators to attend the appropriate BOT subcommittee meetings: Simon - Academic Affairs, Petschauer - Business Affairs, Rardin - Student Development, and Abbott - University Advancement.

D. VOTING. Weitz noted that the written tallies from the last meeting did not equate with the hand count. Weitz asked senators to not change their votes after the hand count because the hand count is official. Weitz asked parliamentarian Gates to see whether further action was required.

II. VISITORS

III. MINUTES
Simon moved and Petschauer seconded to approve the November 12 minutes as written.

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

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. SUB-COMMITTEE ON EQUITY OFFICE
New draft of FS0102/09-02 - Motion Regarding Recommendations on Equity Office. Weitz reported that the sub-committee (Weitz, Koch, Marking, Rardin, Petschauer, and Woodworth) met twice (and over email) to look at the recommendations. Weitz noted that there was a new revision on pink paper (instead of what was attached to the agenda) for senators to review. Weitz noted in a preamble that what the sub-committee was trying to pursue was the best structure for this university at this point and time. It may not be perfect, but it is hoped that it will be better than what is currently in place. The recommendation is based on structure, not
Before the Equity Office was formed, there were three functions: 1) compliance; 2) education; and 3) investigation. Investigation and education was then placed in the Equity Office and compliance was separated out. The proposed motion puts compliance and education together, and separates out investigation. The new motion divides these functions into two offices: 1) The Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance Programs, with the function being education, equal opportunity, and compliance; and, 2) The Office of the University Ombuds, with the function of receiving and investigating complaints by any person affiliated with the University. Weitz noted that there is a concern with the name of this office. Ombud is not a bonafide word—ombudsman is. Some members of the sub-committee thought ombudsman a sexist term so they shortened it to ombuds. Weitz went on to say that because there was so much concern over investigations, the sub-committee wanted this office to be independent of all structures within the University.

Simon suggested calling the office the Disputes Resolution Center. Arnold asked, since this office will service faculty, staff, and students, why only tenured faculty are to serve as the Ombuds Officer. Koch replied that most disputes will probably involve faculty and it is a way to bring a faculty member back into the process. He added that Ohio University was used as the model program and that is what they use. Woodworth then noted that at Ohio University, there are two 1/2-time positions; one tenured faculty member and the other position is currently held by staff. The person she spoke to at Ohio University gave a compelling argument as to why it is important to have two positions. One argument was to help with a conflict of interest. Another was to have a broader representation of the university and another was to have someone to talk to about a case (due to the anonominity and confidentiality of a case). She then moved and Marking seconded to amend the motion so that Appalachian’s office have two 1/2-time positions; one tenured faculty member and one that could be held by a faculty member or staff person.

VOTE # 2  19 yes  2 no  0 abstain  The amendment passed.

Woodworth noted that at Ohio University, its Ombuds Office is not an office of record (no records are kept). Because it is not an office of record, it does not receive accusations of sexual harassment. Rardin asked if the office received criminal complaints. Weitz noted that she will find out if this is because of federal law, state law, or university mandate. Rardin noted that at Ohio University, its Ombuds Office receives informal complaints which helps keep anonominity. Durham asked if the proposed office would receive pay equity complaints. Weitz responded that it would—that the sub-committee left it open for the office to receive any complaint.

Discussion followed on the name of the proposed office. A handvote was taken on the three proposed names: 1) Ombudsman - 14 yes; 2) University Ombuds Officer - 2 yes; and 3) Dispute Resolution Officer - 7 yes. A vote was then taken on the proposed motion as amended.
Motion Regarding Recommendations on the Equity Office (and the Compliance Office):

Create two offices the Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance Programs and the Office of the University Ombudsman.

OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance Programs will consist of a Director and several staff, reporting to the Director of Human Resources. The purpose of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance Programs is:

1. To promote the University’s Equal Employment Opportunity program;
2. To educate the Appalachian State University community regarding issues of diversity and workplace harassment, and
3. To administer the University’s Compliance Program.

OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN

A. Structure and Selection

The Office of the University Ombudsman will consist of two Ombudsmen and secretarial staff. To ensure objectivity, the Office of the University Ombudsman would be independent of all existing structures, reporting to the Chancellor only on budget and administrative matters. The Ombudsmen will sit on the Administrative Cabinet. One Ombudsman will be a faculty member, the other Ombudsman will be a faculty member or a staff member. Both Ombudsmen serve in the position for three consecutive years (staggered terms). No one can serve more than two consecutive terms in the position. The position of Ombudsman will be considered a half-time, 12-month position. Full-time tenured faculty serving as an Ombudsman will receive an additional $6000 stipend for the summer appointment. The position of Ombudsman will be open to all full-time tenured faculty members and to all full-time vested staff members. Openings in the position will be announced and all interested candidates are invited to present a letter explaining their qualifications. The Ombudsmen will be chosen by the Office of the University Ombudsman Review Committee (OUORC).

The Office of the University Ombudsman Review Committee will be comprised of the Provost, the SGA President, The Chair of the Staff Council, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee, and the Director of Human Resources. In addition to selecting the Ombudsmen, the OUORC will make an annual review of the office and be responsible for addressing any complaints about the office and its functioning. The OUORC also may remove an Ombudsman based on performance criteria. To increase the staff in the Office of the University Ombudsman, an appeal must be made and granted by this committee, who will forward its
recommendation to the Chancellor.

B. Role and Responsibilities of the Ombudsman

The primary purpose of the Office of the University Ombudsman is to receive and to investigate complaints made by persons affiliated with the University. This includes administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The goal of the office will be to ensure that every member of the University community receives equitable and fair treatment within the University system. The Ombudsman will consider all sides of a question or complaint in an objective and impartial way, and will seek to resolve problems and concerns raised by members of the Appalachian community. The goal of this office is to provide an independent and confidential means for dispute resolution.

The duties of the Office of the University Ombudsman will be:

1) To receive complaints.

2) To confer with the grievant, and early in the process, inform all parties involved in the grievance that a complaint had been made. The Ombudsman will help all parties involved in the dispute determine their rights and options.

3) To investigate these complaints, the Ombudsman will have the right to access University records, reports, and other documents, but will neither keep identifying records nor assume a custodial role for formal documentation. Any working materials gathered by the Office of the University Ombudsman are to be destroyed when the case is either resolved or the case is moved outside the Office of the University Ombudsman. Anonymity will be maintained to the greatest extent possible. With very few exceptions, no action would be taken without first asking the grievant. (There are exceptions to the anonymity and confidentiality rule: If a person shares the intent to do harm to him or herself or another, this information may not remain confidential to the extent that there is a credible threat to one’s own or another’s well-being.)

4) To negotiate an informal resolution if feasible. In this role the Ombudsman will serve as facilitator. The Ombudsman will neither negotiate for any one party in a dispute nor force a solution on anyone.

5) To assist parties in setting up a mutually agreed upon facilitated discussion to resolve the matter, should either of the parties prefer facilitation. Should that be the case, the Ombudsman will make the initial contact with a mutually agreed upon third party who will facilitate the discussion. (Sources for facilitators could be the Hubbard Center, Counseling Center, members of the Counseling or Psychology Departments, Human Resources, etc. In special circumstances, the University would pay for an off-campus person.) The Ombudsman will not participate in the facilitated discussion.

6) If the efforts at facilitation fail and further action is pursued, the Ombudsman will direct the grievant to the appropriate university grievance process or administrative office. Personnel in the Office of the University Ombudsman are not permitted to testify at any formal proceedings.

To carry out these activities the Office of the University Ombudsman will require a modest budget for travel and training.
B. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

1. FS0102/12-01 - Motion Regarding Curriculum Change Process. Weitz noted that this motion has to do with the curriculum process—the process by which curricula are changed and approved. There seem to be differing opinions as to what the Faculty Handbook means by this. In practice and in history, program changes or where a program is to be housed have been viewed by the Provost as administrative decisions and therefore not subject to the curriculum process. However, some faculty feel that these decisions are curriculum changes in structure and therefore do need to go through the curriculum process. This motion is to clarify that indeed those type of changes should go through the process like all other changes. The rationale is that that is what the Handbook says and it does not compromise the Provost’s authority. Moore further clarified that this motion had been initiated because AP&P has not been involved in these kind of changes and it needs to be. A vote was taken on the motion as written.

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

2. FS0102/12-02 - Motion Regarding Part-time Faculty. Simon noted that Hall offered the motion and that there were visitors present who would like to contribute to the discussion. Hall reported that the motion is an attempt to bring two concerns together. One concern is the use of faculty salary money and the other is to address a concern with respect to the heavy use of part-time faculty. Durham noted that we cannot just create new positions to pay part-time faculty. McLaughlin noted that he was unclear what the motion was about—how the 101-1310 funds relates to decreasing the number of part-time faculty. Hall noted that there is not enough full-time faculty in some departments which increases the reliance upon part-time faculty. Koch added that after serving on the Workload Ad-hoc Committee, he became aware that part-time
faculty bring relief to overloaded departments.

Michael Krenn, chair of the History Department, then spoke to the Senate. Krenn noted that the History department relies heavily on part-time faculty to teach the service sections of history courses. He added that part-time faculty are a valuable part of his department, but in pay and benefits they are treated as second-class citizens. What Krenn would like the Senate or the University to address is how to make part-timers more appreciated on campus. He would like to see the University keep the best of our part-timers and provide them with adequate salaries and benefits. It is next to impossible to keep part-time faculty or recruit new ones to come to Boone with the low salaries that are offered. Krenn noted that he does not think that the History Department’s problems are going to be solved by hiring a few more full-time faculty. Moore suggested taking the tuition increase salary money for 2002-2003 and applying it towards workload issues involving part-time faculty.

McLaughlin noted that the Budget Committee is looking into the issue of 101-1310 lines as well and that it is a very complicated issue. Petschauer added that the Budget Committee would like to bring forth a motion after it does its research. Moore asked if the motion on the table would then be needed. Weitz asked what the Senate wanted to do with the issue of part-time faculty. Woodworth moved and Marking seconded to table the motion until the Senate hears the report from the Budget Committee.

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

Weitz asked what should be done with the part-time faculty issue. Woodworth asked if there was a senator who served on the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee. Weitz replied that Barber is the Senate’s liaison with the Committee. Weitz noted that she will contact that Committee. McKinney thanked Hall for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. Durham added that in the Fact Book one could find the 5-year history of every department’s full and part-time faculty. Arnold noted that part-time faculty are hired to try to deal with the workload issue, but if you look at departments who use the most part-time faculty, the full-time faculty are still teaching four classes. Moore then asked for the definition of the problem of part-time faculty--is it that there are too many, not appreciated, over-worked? The response was all of these. Roger Winsor then distributed to senators and reviewed copies of the figures from the Fact Book. Weitz asked if the Senate wanted to pursue part-time faculty issues in areas beyond the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee and the Workload Ad-hoc Committee. McLaughlin responded that it would be a good idea to hear from the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee before deciding. Weitz said she would contact the Committee and make a report at the January meeting.

C. WELFARE AND MORALE
REPORT:
1. Brief report by Arnold on the App House/NY Loft directors meeting that was held.
2. The committee is still working on the status of the Traffic and Safety Committee.
3. The committee has no new suggestions about the enforcement of "No Smoking" outside of buildings. We welcome any ideas about how to enforce the signs and information that already exist, for example, outside of Whitener Hall.
Arnold reported briefly on the meeting held on November 30 between past App House/NY Loft directors and the Off-Campus Advisory Board. He noted that it was a very productive meeting and that there were approximately 25 attendees, most of whom were former directors of the Loft and App House. A number of recommendations were made but he was not ready to go over those yet. Weitz asked if the recommendations were going to be handled through the Off-Campus Advisory Board or will they come before the Senate. Arnold responded that he thought they would be handled through the Board and Academic Affairs but that one of the recommendations made was that the Faculty Senate have a representative on that Board. Weitz asked Ward if the Senate could receive a report when the changes were finally made. Ward replied that he would keep the Senate abreast of the developments that occur. Weitz then asked how soon these changes would be in place. Ward responded that he was not certain, but that if the Senate needed an update on a specific recommendation, he would be happy to report on it.

D. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. FS0102/12-03 - Motion Regarding Archaeology and Natural Resources Concerns. Abbott reported that in response to the Senate’s November meeting, Whyte drafted the proposed motion. A vote was taken on the motion as written.

VOTE # 7  24 yes   0 no   0 abstain   The motion passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS0102/12-03 - Motion Regarding Archaeology and Natural Resources Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We recommend that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Deans and Chairs be informed in advance of any planned, university-sponsored land modification projects which may impact natural or cultural resources; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) qualified faculty members be called upon to evaluate the impacts and to express their concerns regarding threats to such resources and to play a role in mitigating the proposed impacts on those resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

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

Cultural Affairs Advisory Committee
Victoria Cox (FL&L) to replace Gary Nemcosky (Art).

Faculty Senate
Jeremy B. Fox (MGT) to replace Stella Anderson (MGT) beginning in January.

The committee needs to find individuals to serve on the following:
Cultural Affairs Advisory Committee
There is one additional vacancy on this committee. The faculty member can be from any area of the University.

Weitz noted that Nemcosky will be back on campus this spring and thus could resume his position on the Cultural Affairs Advisory Committee. It was suggested that Victoria Cox then
fill the additional vacancy on the Committee. A vote was taken on Fox replacing Anderson until the end of this Senate year and Cox to fill the additional vacancy on the Cultural Affairs Advisory Committee.

VOTE # 8  22 yes  1 no  1 abstain  The motion passed.

F. BUDGET COMMITTEE

1. Administrative Salaries Report. Millsaps noted that one of the charges to the Budget Committee was to look at raises for faculty versus raises for administrators. Millsaps went over the 2000-2001 BD-119 report and took a sample of 40 faculty and 30 administrators and calculated their annual percentage raise. The data is reflected in the report by the Budget Committee. Millsaps said he would do a sample and report on the current 2001-2002 BD-119 when it becomes available. It was noted that for 2001-2002, administrators received the $625 pay increase. Weitz noted that this comparison is a continued charge of the Budget Committee.

Budget Committee Report

Subject: Comparison of Faculty and Administrator Percentage Raises
Summary: Using a random number table and the BD 119 Salary Document for the period 2000-2001, a random sample of 40 continuing faculty and 30 administrators was selected and their percentage raise recorded. The sample average raise for the faculty was 5.24% and the sample average raise for the administrators was 5.62%. The null hypothesis of NO DIFFERENCE IN THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE RAISE could not be rejected with the chance of error present at 5%. (See below)

Both samples appear to be representative of the university as a whole: approximately 50% from Arts and Sciences with the remaining 50% roughly equally divided between the other four Colleges/Schools.

Action: Conduct a similar survey using the current 2001-2002 Budget Document. If statistically significant differences in average raise percentages are demonstrated in the samples, conduct a census of all faculty and administrators. Such a study could be completed sometime during the Spring 2002 term.

Respectfully submitted,
Steve Millsaps

Comparison of Percentage Raises for Faculty and Administrators
2000-2001 Academic Year

Data Source: BD 119
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size =</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Raise (%) =</td>
<td>5.24 [All faculty = 5.84%]</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High =</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low =</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation =</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question:
Is there a difference in the average percentage raise between faculty and administrators for the period 2000 to 2001?

Null Hypothesis:
There is no difference in the average % raise.
Alternative Hypothesis: There is a difference in the average % raise.

Null Hypothesis: u_f = u_a
Alternative Hypothesis: u_f <> u_a

where u_f = average % raise for faculty
u_a = average % raise for administrators

Level of Significance = 0.05  [5 % chance or error if null is rejected]
Decision Rule = Reject Null Hypothesis if sample t > t critical or sample t < -t critical
t critical = 2.00
Difference in Sample Means = 0.38
Standard Error = 0.46
Sample t = 0.83
Decision = Do not reject null hypothesis
Conclusion = No, based on this sample evidence, we cannot conclude that there is a difference in the average percentage raise between faculty and administrators for the period 2000 to 2001.

G. FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE
No report.

H. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON IMPROVING APPALACHIAN’S ATTRACTIVENESS
Truett noted that they will report at the January meeting.

I. AGENDA COMMITTEE
No report.

J. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
No report.

K. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON DPCs
No report.

L. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON WORKLOAD IMPLEMENTATION
No report.

**M. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON ATHLETIC STATEMENT**

No report.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Parking Deck.** Bush reported on the Traffic Management and Safety Committee. A random survey is being done regarding the parking deck. Results are expected in January. Koch asked if discussion has taken place regarding all the parking spaces that will displaced for the parking deck. Bush responded that is has not--that pricing the deck is the immediate concern.

**B. AppHouse/Loft.** Yaukey asked who will serve from the Senate as the liaison on the Off-Campus Advisory Board. Yaukey and Marking will serve alternating. Weitz noted that she will contact Mick Kreszock to let him know about Yaukey and Marking. Next year, Committee on Committees will need to make the recommendation.

**C. Whitener/Howard Street.** Moore asked about Whitener Hall being demolished and a new 2-lane street being established. Is this something the Traffic Management and Safety Committee needs to look into. Bush noted that Helm has said when it comes time to address that area, it will be discussed.

Woodworth added that the Welfare and Morale Committee has the Traffic Management and Safety Committee on its agenda for the January meeting.

At this time McKinney moved and Koch seconded that for faculty to work at Appalachian they need a place to park. Therefore, faculty should be provided with free parking. Discussion followed as to whether this includes faculty and staff. Bush noted that this has already been mentioned by the Traffic Management and Safety Committee and that Helm has stated that the state legislature has decided that all will pay. Abbott, as chair of the Campus Planning Committee, will check on this statement. Truett called for the question.

VOTE #9  8 yes  16 no  0 abstain  The motion was not carried.

Yaukey moved and Muir seconded to table the motion until the Campus Planning brings a report at the January meeting.

VOTE #10  21 yes  3 no  0 abstain  The motion carried.

Simon moved to adjourn and Marking seconded.
VOTE # 11  16 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore

<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>
</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>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROCKER, DEBORAH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL, KIM</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG, BETTY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY, HAROLD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUGHLIN, TOM</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLSAPS, STEVE</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MIKE</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIR, KEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETSCHAUER, PETER</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPE, JANICE</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARDIN, PATRICK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUETT, CAROL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITZ, GAYLE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS: Michael Krenn, History; Cheryl Lee, Family and Consumer Sciences; Ralph Lentz, History; David Phoenix, Management; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs; Nathan Winkler, student; Roger Winsor, Geography and Planning.

VOTE 1: Approve November 12 minutes as written
VOTE 2: amend motion FS0102/09-02 - Motion Regarding Recommendations on Equity Office (2 1/2-time positions)
VOTE 3: amend motion FS0102/09-02 (#6)
VOTE 4: FS0102/09-02 - Motion Regarding Recommendations on Equity Office
VOTE 5: FS0102/12-01 - Motion Regarding Curriculum Change Process
VOTE 6: Table FS0101/12-02 - Motion Regarding Part-time faculty
VOTE 7: FS0102/12-03 - Motion Regarding Archaeology and Natural Resources Concerns
VOTE 8: Committee on Committees recommendations
VOTE 9: Call for the question
VOTE 10: Table motion regarding free parking
VOTE 11: Adjourn
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