

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate

Minutes
Meeting of Thursday, February 22, 2007
University Center, UC 303

Preliminary Information

The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:30 p.m. by Senate Vice-President Dr. Tim Winters.

The roll call of senators was conducted by Senate Secretary Perdew.

Senators Baker, Black, Dyer, Eaves, Foote, Gotcher, Griffy, Hatch, Hayes, Hodge, Lane, Major, Martin, Myers, Pirkle, Pitts, Robison, Said, Schiller, Schlanger, Snyder, Vandergriff, and Rayburn were absent.

A motion to amend the meeting's agenda to remove Grievance Committee Member Qualifications from new business was unanimously approved. The executive committee requested this action and is in communication with the administration regarding this issue.

The amended agenda was unanimously approved.

The minutes for the meeting of January 25, 2007, were unanimously approved, after the senate was informed of one correction.

Remarks

University President Dr. Sherry Hoppe

President Hoppe first pointed out that some information in an *All State* article was incorrectly described. The figure of five should have been 25 in a sentence giving the increase in fulltime faculty over a certain number of years.

President Hoppe then mentioned that the governor's budget includes \$37 million in more funding for higher education. These monies will be distributed according to a gap methodology with the gap being the difference between formula funding and actual funding. APSU will receive \$1.6 million.

Employees will receive a 1% salary increase and 2% bonus. About one third of the 1% raise will come from the increase in funds to APSU with the rest of the raise and the bonus to be funded by state.

The budget also includes \$10 million for free tuition to community colleges for students with a score of 19 on the ACT. President Hoppe believes APSU will probably suffer a decrease in enrollment due to this.

Other items in the budget include \$3.8 million for need-based financial aid and \$8 million to ensure diversity after the end of the Geier settlement's provisions.

The governor's capital outlay includes \$86 million for five projects at UT and TBR institutions. No funding for APSU involving the Trahern building is on it. There are \$51 million for projects not on the funding list. President Hoppe stated that some wish to stop this practice of providing funds for projects not on the funding list to those with political clout. It may be 2010-2011 or later before APSU receives money for Trahern.

President Hoppe also stated that there is a bill proposing that tuition increases be tied to the consumer price index. Currently there is the desire to keep tuition increases around 7%.

President Hoppe mentioned APSU will participate in TBR's University Day at the Legislative Plaza. APSU will feature Tamara Flaherty, who was the first to earn the online M.S. in nursing at APSU, and the chemistry department.

Provost Dr. Bruce Speck

Provost Speck had no remarks and offered to take questions. There were none.

Senate President Dr. John Foote

Sen. Foote was not in attendance due to an injury.

New Business

Faculty Handbook Issues (E-Dossier and Policy on Academic Tenure 5:060), Dr. Mickey Wadia and Michael Becraft

(This agenda item was placed before reports so Sen. Wadia could depart for a conference.)

These proposed changes or clarifications were put before the senate for its input and senators were asked to disseminate this information to their fellow faculty members. Action on these proposed policy changes will be taken during the special meeting on policies in April (date TBD).

No. 1: *A period of approved leave of absence shall be excluded from the requisite period for completion of the probationary period unless the President of the University specified in writing prior to the leave of absence that it shall be included in the probationary period. **No accomplishments attained during an excluded leave may be considered in retention, tenure, and promotion processes.** Leaves of absence may not be granted retroactively. A faculty member may apply for a maximum of two (2) extensions in one-year increments so long as the total probationary period does not exceed six years. Requests for a second extension follow the same procedure and are subject to the same considerations as the original extension (p. 21 of 5:060)*

Mr. Becraft spoke about this item. He said a faculty member may ask that the leave be either included or excluded from the probationary period, at the time of the request for leave. This proposed change in policy states that if the leave is excluded from the probationary period then any accomplishments during the leave will not be counted in the retention, tenure, promotion (RTP) process. Mr. Becraft stated that APSU's policy is more flexible than TBR's. APSU also has a "stop the clock" provision to put the probationary period on hold.

During discussion, Sen. Haralson asked what would happen if a faculty member found out during their "excluded" leave that a proposal to present at a conference had been accepted.

Mr. Becraft stated the presentation could be included if the faculty member had written the proposal before the leave. However, an article written during "excluded" leave could not be included.

Sen. Winters asked if a case had arisen that led to this suggested change.

Mr. Becraft said he was not at liberty to say if it came up due to a particular faculty member's case.

Dr. Evans asked about the time of the probationary period with regard to leaves.

Mr. Becraft stated it is still a period of six years "on the clock" (i.e., omitting any time of leave excluded from the probationary period).

In response to a question from President Hoppe, Mr. Becraft said a "stop the clock" on the probationary period can still be done while a faculty member performs some of their university commitments.

No. 2: *Procedural Issue:* The Deans of the colleges should be given authority to request that an e-dossier be unlocked. The Dean shall only give permission to unlock an e-dossier for a faculty member within that college.

Mr. Becraft stated that currently the policy does not indicate anyone who may unlock the e-dossier if needed, and that he has had to do so in the past. The policy should be revised to give this authority to deans.

Sen. Steele asked why not give the authority to the department chair.

Mr. Becraft stated that he believes the dean is the appropriate level for this decision and also the dean would be outside departmental meetings regarding RTP.

No. 3: *Clarification:* When is an e-dossier considered incomplete? An incomplete e-dossier is one that is declared by the dept. committee (before the vote takes place) to be missing materials or one that includes incorrect materials or whatever---one that, in

essence, does not comply with content and order requirements (see definition on p. 11 of 39, 5:060).

Sen. Wadia said the question about when and by whom is a dossier considered incomplete has arisen several times. That is the reason for this clarification of the policy. There were no questions regarding this item.

No. 4: It is the primary responsibility of the faculty member under review to make sure that his/her e-dossier is well organized, up to date, and accurate.

Sen. Wadia stated that currently the policy states that it is chair's responsibility to do this. However, Sen. Wadia said it has not occurred in practice. Many of the chairs say they have no time to do this and believe it is the faculty member's responsibility. On the other hand, this revision would limit some of the role held by the chair. This policy does state that a faculty member should seek advice from senior faculty members to get the dossier prepared correctly. So it still provides for guidance.

Sen. Deibert stated he believed the chair should still have this responsibility.

Sen. Winters said any mistake in the dossier would be caught during the departmental meeting anyway.

Sen. Deibert pointed out that the turn around time is short at that point in the RTP process and said someone should check the dossier before it goes to the department's committee.

Sen. Winters said he believed the window of time should be extended to give more time if corrections are required at the departmental level of review. Also Sen. Winters stated he did not believe it was the responsibility of the chair to ensure the correctness of a faculty member's dossier, and pointed out that we faculty members require similar responsibility in our students.

Sen. Reagan stated that it is the role of a mentor to help with dossier preparation.

Mr. Becraft stated this revision came up because in all parts of the policy it says the faculty member is responsible for their dossier except this one place where it says it is the chair's duty.

Sen. Blake commented that if something is wrong with a dossier and the chair is still indicated as being responsible the chair and university could potentially become liable in some cases.

No. 5A: We need to revisit this section of text: *Faculty in departments with untenured department chairs (or untenured interim chairs) will have no Chair's report in their dossiers* (p. 14 of 39 in 5:060).

Sen. Wadia stated that the untenured chairs should be able to write reports.

Mr. Becraft said currently there are four untenured chairs. All of them asked for the opportunity to write a chair's report, and three of the four wanted this to be a requirement of untenured chairs.

Mr. Becraft commented that this part of the policy was implemented to protect an untenured chair from having to review someone who might later review them.

Senators Reagan and Wadia stated that is a risk they have to take.

Senator Reagan also mentioned a similar provision might be made if a dean was untenured.

No. 5B: If (a departmental level recommendation is negative, and the faculty member being reviewed has an untenured chair or if) a departmental level recommendation is negative and the chair is being reviewed, the faculty member shall not have a chair's report and shall have the right to appeal to the college Dean for consideration at the college level.

[The portion about untenured chair would have to be changed in this section also.]

Mr. Becraft recommended that a faculty member have the right to make an appeal in such a case.

No. 6: Clarification: Faculty members negotiating and receiving credit for prior service must seek tenure in the 6th year (prior service plus APSU service) of employment.

Mr. Becraft said this statement is already in policy 5:060 on p. 23, but there are still questions about it. So he wished to clarify by recodifying it.

Sen. Ziegler asked about reception of prior service being in the e-dossier.

Mr. Becraft said it should be so the department is informed.

Sen. Prescott said currently faculty are not informed about a person receiving prior service and only find out when that faculty member goes up early for promotion or tenure.

No. 7: Question: As part of the packet in an e-dossier, shouldn't a faculty member also provide APSU 1000 evaluations as well as all non-narrative student evaluations of teaching instruction in Study Abroad programs that are conducted during summer sessions or winter intersession?

Sen. Wadia said these issues have been contentious and addressed the APSU evaluations first. Currently policy states all evaluations should be in the dossier. Sen. Wadia said

some faculty are adamantly opposed to including APSU 1000 evaluations. However, the Faculty Handbook Committee is in agreement that APSU 1000 evaluations should be included. Those who are opposed say the evaluation relates more to the course than the instructor. However, Sen. Wadia said the responses to the evaluation's questions about the course are influenced by how well it is instructed.

During discussion, Sen. Deibert mentioned that APSU 1000 evaluations use a different form than other courses.

Sen. Blake said he heard it is because APSU 1000 is a specialized course and that the evaluation was intended to mainly assess the course. Sen. Blake agrees that these evaluations should be in dossier.

Sen. Haralson asked if the form to evaluate APSU 1000 was approved and by whom. Provost Speck responded he believed there was an approval process but would have to check into it.

Sen. Steele said he included his APSU 1000 evaluations in his dossier, but pointed out the syllabus was standardized which limited the role of faculty in course construction. Senators Wadia and Winters said the teaching methods are still left up to faculty, however.

Sen. Wadia stated the Faculty Handbook Committee was not in agreement regarding the inclusion of non-narrative evaluations of study abroad programs in the dossier. Sen. Wadia also said a faculty member left out one set of evaluations because of a serious problem during a study abroad program but left the others in.

Sen. Winters said they should be included.

Sen. Wadia pointed out that normally there are no evaluations during summer sessions which is an argument against including them.

Sen. Deibert stated if study abroad evaluations are included then evaluations should be conducted and included for the summer sessions too.

Dr. Evans pointed out that all Fort Campbell terms have evaluations.

Reports

TBR Subcouncil

Senator Griffy

Sen. Griffy was not in attendance but had emailed there was nothing urgent to report.

Academic Council

Senator Ziegler

Sen. Ziegler said academic council would meet the following week.

Deans Council

Senator Haralson

Sen. Haralson mentioned that the following items were among those discussed in deans council: By July 1st all faculty member must receive their checks by direct deposit; Dr. McQueen stated the classification of students may be changed to be brought in line with other universities to Freshman 1-29, Sophomore 30-59, Juniors 60-89, and Seniors 90+ credit hours, respectively.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

Misconduct in Research and other Scholarly Activity (Policy 99:013), Dr. Jack Deibert

Sen. Deibert stated that the recommended changes are on the Faculty Senate website. (The italicized material below is from the website.)

Numbers refer to places marked on the copy of current policy for change suggestions. Words marked in red [see website for color] are new words added to the policy.

1.

“The membership shall consist of five tenured faculty with the following distribution: two from the College of Science and Mathematics and College of Arts and Letters, one member from each other two colleges of the University, and one member at large.”

Reason for change: Currently, the policy dictates that four members serve on the committee. The number of committee members must be an odd number to avoid tie voting. There are no provisions in the current policy to resolve tie votes.

2.

“The population from which the Investigative Panel shall be drawn shall consist of all full-time tenured employees except: 1) the President, 2) those reporting directly to the President or Provost, 3) chairs of the departments of the complainant and respondent, 4) the complainant and respondent, 5) members of the Inquiry Committee, 6) any employee determined by the Inquiry Committee to be directly involved in the alleged misconduct or deemed to have a obvious conflict of interest with complainant, respondent, or Inquiry Committee members. The Inquiry Committee will provide a written explanation to the respondent, complainant, and Provost concerning employees to be excluded from the selection population because conflict of interest.”

Reason for change: The policy needs to be very clear on who is eligible to be in the pool of candidates for the Investigative Panel. Members of the Inquiry Committee cannot challenge names drawn during the selection process, they can only decide challenges. Therefore the initial pool must not include people with obvious conflict of interest. If the pool contains members that have obvious conflicts of interest or have personal relationship with someone involved in the alleged misconduct, these people could end up on the Investigative Panel.

Concerning item 4, it's obvious that the complainant and respondent should not be in the pool. Concerning item 6, there are many obvious faculty members that should not be included in the selection pool, such as: a) spouses and significant others of the complainant, respondent, and Inquiry Committee, b) anyone directly involved in the activities of the alleged misconduct.

3.

“The method and procedures used for the random selection method shall be determined by the Inquiry Committee and reported to the Provost, complainant, and respondent before holding a selection meeting. The Provost will provide the committee with a list of all possible faculty members eligible to serve on the Panel. The Provost will arrange a selection meeting where the drawing and challenging of panel members will take place. Present at the selection process will be only the members of the Inquiry Committee, the respondent, and a representative of Academic Affairs. The meeting shall take place even if any of these persons are absent. The selection meeting is the only opportunity selected panel members can be challenged.”

Reason for change: *The policy needs to clarify who can challenge selected panel members. To be sure Panel members are free of any conflict of interest, both the respondent and the complainant need to be able to challenge the selected Panel members. However, having both the respondent and the complainant in the same room during the selection and challenging process may set-up adversarial environment. A representative of Academic Affairs is suggested to serve as a proxy for the complainant. There also needs to be a provision for the selection process to proceed in the case that a respondent, or other person, refuses to attend the selection meeting.*

4.

“Two additional names will be drawn to serve as unofficial alternates who will not attend Panel meetings and whose names will be held in reserve by Inquiry Committee to be appointed to the Panel only if necessary to replace any of the original four Panel members.”

Reason for change: *The selection meeting takes a long time to set-up and it's difficult to arrange a time everyone can meet. Drawing two more names and going through the challenge process takes only a few additional minutes and prevents the need to hold another meeting if someone cannot server on the Panel.*

5.

“All names selected during the random selection method are open to challenge only by the respondent and the representative of Academic Affairs who must state the reason for any challenge. Each name challenged for the Panel will be voted on by the Inquiry Committee with a secret written ballot with the acceptance or rejection of a selected Panel member to be determined by a majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the selected Panel member shall be rejected.”

Reason for change: *The policy needs to clarify who can challenge selected panel members and how challenges will be decided.*

Sen. Deibert summarized the items as follows:

1. An odd number of members are needed on the committee so there are no ties.
2. Only tenured faculty members will be on the committee. Some people are excluded from serving for various reasons.
3. This states who can be in the meeting.
4. States that alternates should be chosen.
5. Regarding challenging a person's selection, only the respondent and the complainant's representative from academic affairs may do so.

Sen. Winters stated that these items should also be disseminated before the policy meeting in April.

Faculty Professional Development Leave (Policy 2:006), Michael Becraft

The recommend changes to this policy are on the web. The major change is italicized below. Again, action will be taken during the April meeting.

For units with faculty on 12-month contracts or schedules that do not coincide with the standard spring semester (e.g. Austin Peay Center at Fort Campbell, Library), the Provost may authorize a leave that coincides with either part or all of the spring semester.

Mr. Becraft stated that current policy says all leaves must be in the spring semester. This suggested change will apply to faculty in the library or at Ft. Campbell.

Sen. Prescott said a main campus faculty member gets leave all semester and asked how much leave a Ft. Campbell faculty member receives.

Sen. Blake also asked about a Ft. Campbell faculty member receiving more than just one eight-week term off, and also enquired if the faculty member could teach four classes in one term, rather than being required to do three in one term and one in another as had been suggested at one point by Provost Speck.

Mr. Becraft said a Ft. Campbell faculty member can receive two terms of leave but the dates must overlap with some of the main campus spring semester (e.g., spring I and spring II). Also, the faculty member may complete ½ of their load by teaching four courses in one term if it is not disruptive for the department. Mr. Becraft further stated that there is no way to fully equate this issue between main campus and Ft. Campbell.

Sen. Blake then moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned near 4:00 p.m.

Patrick Perdew
Faculty Senate Secretary