

**Austin Peay State University  
Faculty Senate  
Meeting of Thursday, September 23, 2010  
University Center, UC 307  
3:00pm**

**Call to order** – Senate President David Major

Recognition of Guests: Mickey Wadia, Karen Sorenson, Ryan Forsythe, Harriet McQueen

**Roll call of Senators** – Secretary Mercy Cannon – Absent Senators: Bonnington, Butler, Deitrich, Ellison, Frentzos, Gray, Griffy, Meisch, O'Connor, Rocheleau, Smith-Francis.

**Motion to accept today's agenda approved.**

**Motion to approve minutes for meeting of August 26, 2010 approved.**

**Remarks**

1. Senate President – David Major

- Discussions of budget underway at various levels. Hall is determined to make a strategic case for salary raises. Please contribute to him any information
- Denley taking list of faculty lines for approval to TBR. The numbers of adjuncts and students mean that this proposal is likely to be met with positive results.
- Denley & Major looked at potential spaces for new offices, new classrooms. Space is a concern as we grow.
- Griffy will have much to report next meeting.
- Senate Vice President Deibert: Mid-term elections are coming up. Two seats are open in Humanities and one in Social Sciences. Voting has moved up because the terms are replacements & thus quite short. New senators would begin serving at the October meeting.

2. University President – Dr. Tim Hall (not present, attending TBR meeting)

3. Provost – Dr. Tristan Denley (not present, attending TBR meeting)

4. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

- Dean's Council – Senator Bill Rayburn
  - Bookstore has now put in textbook rentals, typically half price, due back after exams. Some digital books are offered at 25-50% of regular price.
  - Significant growth in evening classes. APSU not as heavily involved in RODP, but has fully developed online courses of its own. Dickson Center now has 99 enrolled, 60% over last Fall. 60% of students are non-traditional; 50% are full-time students.
  - Credentials – faculty credentials being gathered on particular classes; teachers of record must be associated with classes, as per SACS.
  - Grad program 50% increase since 2005, new GA allocation process. Nov. 10, 9 am – 1pm event to encourage APSU undergrads to apply for grad school.
  - The Graduate Council constitution will be reworked.
  - Dr. Dennis estimates about a 35% success rate for grants. Goal: submit \$20 million of grant requests.

- International Programs proposal being considered.
- A100 guidelines still under discussion. History core requirement can serve as a reading-intensive course, approved by Provost.
- D2L will be updating between Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms. We now have Jump software, comparable to SPSS.
- Grad Finale, Oct. 11 & 12.
- Academic Council – Senator Fred Matthews
  - Revisions to programs in Computer Science and Technology—two courses deleted, one added. One course deleted from Database Administrations.
  - A100 – AC voted to approve new guidelines. Students with ACT under 14 (or comparable SAT/Compass scores) in English, math, and/or writing will be denied admission.
- TBR Faculty Sub-council – Senator Loretta Griffy (not present, attending TBR meeting)

### **Old Business**

- Update on Academic Red, Policy 2:018 – Senator Bruce Myers
  - Charged with reviewing Policy 2:018. The group – Myers, Nelson, Sorenson, Gray, De Young
  - The major points of concern are uploaded to the Senate website.
  - First, the restrictive policy regarding faculty families accompanying the study abroad program.
  - Second, the problems regarding student code of conduct and application/enforcement of that policy abroad.
  - Motion to send the policy recommendations forward to Deans' & Academic Council.
  - Discussion: The fewer words, the better, so that loopholes aren't exploited. We open difficulties for faculty if we insist that they adhere to rigid lists of behaviors.
  - Myers—we are not rewriting the policy, but suggested modifications. Expression of concern about adopting this language, even though that isn't the intent of the committee's suggestions.
  - Wadia: is there a way to hear from Dr. Sorenson about this policy?
  - Discussion: Anytime something happens abroad, there is the potential for individual faculty member to be held personally responsible – an issue worth considering.
  - Clarification: listing is bad because it allows for problematic interpretations? Yes, definitions of such things as “lewdness” are hard to clarify. Then, the issue becomes what is the faculty's role in enforcing or policing behavior—beyond common sense? Protecting faculty from liability isn't going to happen in this policy; it seems that liability is a separate issue.
  - Motion to postpone, second. Discussion: move to end of agenda, but if Sorenson doesn't arrive we should continue to address this.
- Discussion points for Tennessee Senate Education committee – President Major
  - Reminder to email President Major if senators think of any discussion points.
  - Would like to gather suggestions in the next couple weeks.

### **New Business**

- Handbook Committee, Policy 5:061 – Dr. Mickey Wadia
  - Regarding the chart posted on Senate website: A problem has arisen – the interpretation of the policy regarding when faculty can go up for promotion. The

language does seem to allow for various interpretations. The completion of the time frame (3 years for associate; 5 years for full) needs to be clarified.

- The normal sequencing is coming up for associate in the spring of one's third year (application), since the rank doesn't apply until the next semester.
- Clarification needed because colleges are asking different things of their faculty—waiting until 3 years are completed versus going up in the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year; there needs to be consistency.
- Steve Ryan – suggested that language read, “Application for promotion to associate professor may occur as early as the third year at rank of assistant professor.” Wants early promotion to be reserved for special cases of distinguished activity.
- Discussion: Yes, it is ambiguous & the wording should be changed.
- At a P&T meeting, a person with three years of experience & a solid record came up for associate. The committee was hesitant to promote because of precedent issues. Believes that the salary incentive in these budget times makes early promotion a good thing. Handbook Committee understands that this is an important issue for faculty, but it cannot be a consideration in terms of policy. Promotion must be based on merit.
- When you get promoted, when do you become “associate”? Answer: in the start of the next semester (Fall). RTP action is for the next contract, not the current one; thus, it makes sense that people go up during the third year.
- This has to do with when faculty member submits application – compares to having PhD in hand or not when applying for a job.
- Further discussion: Believes that the language is clear: promotion vs. application for promotion. Can see the ambiguity—has interpreted as finishing 6 semesters before applying for promotion. Believes that going up the third year is too early, and the language means that the committee wants to see three full years of experience to evaluate.
- Do most academic units interpret policy to mean that an assistant professor can apply for promotion during their third year review? Yes, the majority do.
- Can this be turned into an action item for the Handbook Committee to clarify & change the language? Wadia—wants the Senate to agree that it should be worked on by Handbook Committee.
- RASI committee – Senator Winters – Initial statement is brief, need not be specific. Statements of intent due October 1. The proposal will be refined with Griffy's & Haralson's help. Documents are on Senate website.
- Ombuds position – President Major
  - Proposal on Senate website.
  - Many universities have this position, and it might be useful for APSU faculty with individual problems not appropriate for the entire Faculty Senate to address.
  - Want an experienced, possibly post-retirement, faculty member.
  - Motion to approve proposal.
  - Discussion: should be a faculty member on post-retirement. Faculty Senate Presidents end up dealing with problems that, while revealing about issues on campus, are not within the purview of the President. Faculty has nowhere else to turn.
  - Proposal doesn't include who the Ombuds person would report to – will look at other universities.
  - Motion to take proposal to Provost approved.
- Nominations for Staff Award –President Major

- Please be thinking of nominations and share information with your colleagues and administrators. Criteria listed online.
- Admissions Standards Committee – Ryan Forsythe
  - Approved changes to admission criteria.
  - Deny admission to any student who reports ACT scores of 14 and below (and concordant SAT or COMPASS scores) in English, math, and/or writing. This is considered remedial.
  - TBR A-100 guidelines: Remedial & development courses eliminated; learning support courses are allowable to address deficiencies that aren't considered remedial. We cannot serve students who have ACT scores below 15; they must be dual enrolled at a community college to address deficiencies.
  - Students with ACT scores that low are retained and graduate at much lower rates.
  - Motion to accept.
  - Discussion: What was the lowest ACT scores in earlier years – in the single digits!
  - Why 15 as the cut-off? That is where TBR has determined as the line between remedial & development.
  - Is it arbitrary? Dr. McQueen states that the college readiness scores are correlated with statistical success rates.
  - Is there a committee that reviews applications to APSU? Yes, the committee will look at denied students to see if the entire picture supports their likely success. 2.75 high school GPA = conditional. ACT below 15 will be denied admission, regardless of GPA. If these students went to a community college for remediation, how many hours would they need before they could transfer? Not a consideration, since students who fix the problem can be reconsidered for admission.
  - Concern: are we eliminating enhanced sections? No, we are not.
  - How many students would this affect? In 2009, we had 139; in 2010, 115 students.
  - Motion to accept the new admissions scores. Three opposed, motion approved. Students have to address remedial requirements.
- Resuming postponed discussion of Policy on International Educational Programs 2:018:
  - Problems with specificity for the list of unacceptable behaviors. Wants to end the statement at “curriculum of the program,”
  - Motion as a friendly amendment to language of proposal.
  - Motion for another friendly amendment: suggest we keep the last sentence.
  - Discussion: Would the issue of liability and legal action fall under university's legal umbrella? This isn't addressed by the policy under consideration now.
  - If we are performing our job to the best of our ability, then we should be protected. The focus is on student—not faculty—behavior.
  - What was the rationale for including specific language? Taken from student code of conduct. This code allows for a clear route of appeal and discipline.
  - Variety of programs at APSU, trying to accommodate all types of issues.
  - Motion to retain last sentence approved.
  - Motion to strike language between “curriculum of the program” to “individual or others”. Three opposed, motion carried.
  - Motion to submit report to next step of policy review with friendly amendments approved.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.**