

**Austin Peay State University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Thursday, November 10, 2016**  
**University Center, UC 307**  
**3:00pm**  
**Called Meeting**  
**Minutes**

**Call to order** – Senate President Tucker Brown

**Recognition of Guests:** Rebecca Corvey, Raj Dakshinamurthy, Jack Deibert, Nancy Gibson, Amy Hamlin, Christine Mathenge, Dennis Pearson, Michele Robertson, Jeff Thompson, Mickey Wadia, and Lauren Wells

**Roll call of Senators** – Senate Secretary Christina Chester-Fangman

Absent Senators: Lisa Barron, Penny Brown, Benita Bruster, Kenisha Burke, John Byrd, Linda Darnell, Lesley Davidson, Brian Hock, Justin Oelgoetz, Raman Sahi, Ken Shipley, David Snyder, Cameron Sutt, and Timothy Wesley

**Approval of today’s agenda – Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve today’s agenda**

**Old Business**

- Annual Faculty Evaluation and Review Policy (Action Item) = There was a Task Force that worked on this, then it went to the chairs, then deans, and also before Exec; if, as a Senate, we are willing to approve it but would like to add the caveat that we don’t want it we can put that forward; “I’m not trying to influence you, I just want to make sure that everyone understands;”
  - Question: What if there are still some things that haven’t been fleshed out yet?  
Answer: Go ahead and bring it up so we can get it in the minutes and then we can put it forward.  
Comment: I did ask about it but there is no outcome from it yet, so I’m worried about voting on it.  
Answer: We can pass along any of those concerns.

**motion made and seconded to approve; discussion:**

- Concerns:
  - Who sets criteria and how do we ensure they are evaluated fairly? Could we add a statement that the criteria will be set by faculty?
  - What about making changes to the form? Form uses examples and can be changed, but it needs to keep the 5-point scale structure.
  - What if chair is of lower rank than senior faculty member being evaluated?
  - If form is malleable with examples, why on the second page, second bullet, does it say for the form to be revised or replaced the changes will be done with input from the Faculty Senate?
  - What is the problem that this form is trying to solve? We have the RTP process and post-tenure. What is the missing piece?
  - This process could be punitive or to lead to abolishing tenure.
  - Could we include some type of language that this form will not be used retroactively for personnel sanctions without going before Faculty Senate?
  - Under the section on the appeals process, Policy 5:027 does not apply to performance reviews.
  - When will this be implemented? In the spring?

- Comment: It should be noted that several concessions have been made to this to the benefit of the faculty.

**motion made, seconded, and passed to approve with recommendations discussed (voting per secret ballot; 34 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstentions)**

- Faculty Workload Policy (Action Item) = This contains changes to the previously existing workload policy; motion made and seconded to approve; discussion:
  - Concerns:
    - Art Studio policy = three hours of a class for TLCs but with our new degrees the students earned two credit hours for three hours of class; the art studio policy was deleted and not officially approved; we are just trying to get back to 3 to 3;
    - What about a class size smaller than 60 students? It looks like 2 to 1 credit and I would like more. And there is no change to thesis hours?
    - On page 7 of 13, the tabs need to be adjusted to make sure it doesn't look like the Rad Tech section is under Nursing, and it should read "medical laboratory science" as opposed to rad tech.
    - Comment: Also, on bullet point #10 under "Graduate Instruction," the table needs to be fixed to move the numbers to line up correctly.
    - Workload calculation = how is it adjusted for ARC?
    - Rounding for raw total? What is the logic behind that? It says the "nearest integer or integer plus one half"?
    - Use of adjuncts to cover this (getting qualified ones, using too many, loss of control, no committee work, etc.)

**motion made, seconded, and passed to table with changes until the meeting next week;**

- Research Misconduct Policy (Action Item) = The big change with this policy is that the people doing the investigation will not be chosen at random; Senator Bruster was recently on this committee and was going to talk about it; an investigation starts with the Committee on Research and Scholarly Misconduct; this group is drawn from the general faculty population and there were problems because an issue happened over the summer and the Committee had to meet; the Provost didn't want a random selection process; **motion made and seconded to approve;** discussion:
  - Comment: It is probably in our best interest to have as stringent a policy as possible.
  - Comment: Yes, it played out pretty rough.
  - Question: On the page where it refers to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO), it would go first to that person and then go to the Committee?  
Answer: Yes.
  - Question: What was wrong with the two committees?  
A: It was a flawed selection policy.  
Q: So, the standing committee is still there?  
A: Yes, it goes to the ROI and if an investigation is needed it goes to the full Committee.

**motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, one abstention)**

- Copyright Policy (Action Item) = This is a copy over policy and this replacement is more streamlined with less detailed content; **motion made and seconded to approve; no discussion; motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Adoption of Textbooks and Ancillary Course Materials Policy (Action Item) = This is a copy over policy; **motion made and seconded to approve;** discussion:

- a motion was made to strike the sentence on page 1 that reads: “Because new additions of existing textbooks typically result in additional costs to students, the adoption of a new edition shall follow the same process as the adoption of a new textbooks;”  
**motion made, seconded, and passed to approve with the sentence struck; (none opposed, no abstentions)**
- Conflict of Interest Policy (Action Item) = This is all brand new and relates to conflicts of interest regarding our local board; **motion made and seconded to approve; no discussion; motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions)**
- TUFS Guns on Campus Resolution (Action Item) = This resolution is against students having guns on campus; this is just up or down vote with no discussion; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (one opposed, one abstention)**
- TUFS LIU Resolution (Action Item) = This is in support of the faculty at Long Island University in their contract dispute from earlier this year; this is just an up or down with no discussion; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions)**

**Motion made, seconded, and passed to adjourn at 4:16pm**

Senator Rennerfeldt announced that President White and Elliott Herzlich have walk-on roles in the upcoming performances of *Anything Goes* and are great; please come to see one of the shows if you can!