Call to order - Senate President Barry Jones
Recognition of Guests: President Alisa White and Rod Mills

Roll Call of Senators - Senate Secretary Gina Garber
Absent Senators: Tucker Brown, Kim Coggins, Doris Davenport, John Phillips, Nell Rayburn, Bettina Shank, Ken Shipley, David Snyder, Jennifer Thompson, and Timothy Wesley

Approval of today’s agenda – Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve amended agenda, adding the Faculty Senate Allocation Adjustment vote

Approval of minutes from October 26, 2017- Motion made, seconded and passed to approve meeting minutes from October 26, 2017

1. Remarks –
Senate President Barry Jones (5 minutes)

- Tami Fraley passed away Wednesday, November 29, 2017, at her residence. Many people on campus knew Tami and had great respect for her. Let’s have a moment of silence in Tami’s honor.

- There have been many issues with our international faculty that have been brought to my attention. These issues are range from getting and paying for VISAs to hiring attorneys for our faculty. There are no consistencies on how this is handled at the university. President White and Provost Gandy are looking at this seriously. We need to have procedures on how we hire and work with our international faculty. So there is a cost for the VISAs. We need to decide who pays for them, faculty or the university? There have been issues where the candidate pays for them. They also have had to hire their own immigration attorneys. President White is looking at other schools to partner with to get an attorney on retainer. They are also going to look into providing training for the Human Resources personnel, and create a point person, along with developing procedures to help our international faculty.

  - Q: Will this streamline appointments for new faculty?
  - A: Yes. All of this will all be handled better. Changes will be coming.
  - Comment: I am glad this is being taken care of for our faculty. Our department hired someone from Canada and they had problems. I’m glad that someone is taking it seriously.
  - Comment: There have been problems with our international students, too.

- There have been issues with staff and payroll. Some of you do not work with the staff side of the house. Recently, the University’s Payroll Office has moved to a bi-weekly system. Every other Friday they get a paycheck. An email was sent out about a month
ago saying staff members were going to get an extra check at Christmas. In reality, they were not getting an extra check. Many staff members began making plans with this money. However, another email was sent recanting the first email. They just said this information was a mistake. Payroll let staff members know that they could get the extra money, but it would have to be repaid back to the University. President White knows about this mistake and is giving a one-time adjustment to make up for it. She was afraid that faculty would be upset with this decision.

Q: Human Resources has made a mistakes with salaries and now with this notification to staff?
A: Again, President White is looking into the Human Resources issues.

Comment: If Human Resources made these mistakes, why should we trust them that they doing what is right now? If they have made errors in the past they probably are making them now.

Comment: Once we were no longer part of the TBR, we lost the ability to search the salary database.
Comment: Someone has to have a database of this information.
Comment: The salaries are in the Personnel Budget. A copy is kept in the Library for everyone to see. However, you need to know your FOAP numbers and your department information to find what you are looking for.

Q: Did any administrators have issues with their salaries?
A: The Provost has been very angry about the salaries and the mistakes that were made.

Comment: I have to say that this year Faculty Senate has been great! We are seeing real changes.
Comment: Our department has been going back in forth about hiring.

Q: Hiring faculty and who is paying for the fee?
A: Fees will be paid by the department.

Comment: The CIP code is wrong in some areas or needs to be changed. We have asked for this information. We believe that Human Resources is not capable of doing math.

Q: Have they addressed the Associate Professor and Professor rank with compression salaries?
A: They capped the years at 3, 5, and 10 years. They stop counting at 3 years for Assistant Professor, 5 years for Associate Professor, and 10 years for Full Professor. The concern was in the formula. We should get more as we have more years here. They took the formula out and you cannot find it on the website. Provost Gandy asked why they are not following the formula. He sees the problem and he’s trying to help.

Q: Can you check into the Instructor rank for pay deviation?
A: If you email this to me, I will look into it for you.

Technology Access Fee (TAF) proposals are being accepted until January 12, 2018. The TAF Proposal Submission Form can be found at this address: http://www.apsu.edu/taf-allocation-committee/taf-proposal-submission.php.

2. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

• Faculty White - Senator Perry Scanlan (20 minutes)
Thank you to all who participated on this Committee. Our full report is available on the Faculty Senate website http://www.apsu.edu/faculty-senate/documents/review/november/The_Faculty_White_Committee_Approved_Report.pdf. It shows that if you are a good teacher, or if you are popular with students, you can get a good score. However, you can be penalized if you are excellent in another area. Research and Committee work is not balanced. We have a 37.5 hour work week and we are given 11 hours a week of our time to service and other work areas. There is a big difference in our time compared to University of Maryland. People of color, women, etc. are being put on too many committees. There is a lack of support without time or resources. It is creating a barrier for faculty to work on scholarly activities. We think it is unacceptable to have to work in the summer. There are four recommendations:

1. Research requirements remain stable based on current tenure and promotion criteria, and should not be increased from current levels.

2. Faculty at the rank of instructor should not be required to produce research as part of the annual faculty evaluation, and should be evaluated using a similar but different evaluation form focused specifically on teaching effectiveness.

3. Faculty annual evaluations should use a flexible weighting model for Area I (50-80%), Area II (10-40%), and Area III (10-40%) as determined in consultation with the department chair and not limited by WLC.

4. Study the amount of service work done and consider creating an equitable system to require faculty to serve on committees.

   o Comment: Number 3 is the easiest recommendation to take to Provost Gandy. This needs to be added to policy on how we do our evaluations.
   o Comment: Well, it says it is up to the departments and a list of examples. I think the form already says this. The policy needs to be looked at for the same wording.
   o Comment: The issue came up where admin/exec duties can hinder your performance. Flexibility is needed within this form. Also, if everyone gets along, great, no problem, but if there are issues within a department there are going to be problems.
   o Comment: The form as it is now, says that.
   o Comment: I’ve seen multiple versions of this form. There needs to be one form. There have many forms from the same Academic Affairs office.
   o Comment: Can I get a motion to add this statement into to annual evaluation policy? Any further discussion?
   o Q: Did you look at dual impact for long-term? Some of this work will not result in publications or co-curricular work for students. Are chairs allowed to make a decision where this goes, Area I or Area II?
   o A: When you revisit the department’s RTP guidelines, you should have it in there or go talk to your dean.
   o Comment: Area I and Area II differ across campus. The evaluations are different, so what if we wrote up draft guidelines? Where does this fall?
   o Q: Is there is a way to bring this up to the dean or have an opportunity to go to a dean?
A: There is an appeal.

Is there a vote to recommend that we add number 3 this to the policy? Motion made, seconded, and passed

Comment: I have the master documents because I was on this task force. We have already brought it up and we knew there would be inequities. The Provost said it was okay to be flexible. Provost Gandy would be willing to accept change. You could go to the dean or whoever you needed to see. The FAER (Faculty Annual Evaluation Review) is happening this spring. We don’t normally change policy or sign off on a change mid-year. We can suggest number three, but we need to proceed with flexibility. Every time we think something is important we can’t always change things immediately.

Comment: They can use the same form. They do not have research expectations in this area. The other thing is that some people did get it written into the form. One of the concerns that could potentially be a problem is that based on how the year is going, faculty could shift the percentages around to benefit them. Not that people would do that, but it still is a possibility.

Comment: We do not have flexibility. It is at 0%.

Comment: Some of these are longer term projects. I think #4 is an important project for Faculty Senate to take on. We need to study the amount of service work done and consider creating an equitable system to require faculty to serve on committees. We have some faculty members on five committees and some on none. There is a problem with balance. We also have to have a way to look at this in the departmental level committees, task forces, and search committees. I think service is the issue more than research, and it is a particular issue for our minority representatives serving on committees.

Q: Is anyone volunteering to take this on?

Comment: A couple of years ago, President White asked the Faculty Executive Committee to survey the chairs of each standing committee to find out information about committee purpose, structure and size and if any restructuring was needed. It is complicated because of how many years you need to serve on some committees. Then you have some committees that meet only when needed.

Comment: What we are experiencing is not a problem with the standing committees, it’s with the departmental committees and task forces.

Faculty Senate Allocation Adjustment – Senate President Barry Jones

- We need to discuss and then vote on the allocation adjustment so we can provide President White with our feedback. Here are the options:

1. All raises
2. 75% raises | 25% new lines
3. 50% raises | 50% new lines
4. 25% raises | 75% new lines
5. All new lines

Q: Is this just faculty lines or both faculty and staff lines?
A: We are just providing feedback regarding faculty.

Comment: She promised three years. She wanted to get consensus from faculty. If there is no pool for hiring new faculty that doesn’t mean there is no pool is for raises. They could still hire faculty.

Comment: We are two years into getting to our target raises. If it is the will of the people, she would consider putting money other places.

Comment: The thing that gets me is that we’re giving money to the university from my family. This isn’t right. I move to go with number one.

Comment: Let’s get the raises while the money is there.

Q: What would happen if Faculty Senate said we wanted number 2?

A: The President and Provost are going to make this decision. We are providing a recommendation that is all.

Q: In terms of morale it may make no sense. We cannot improve graduate programs without new lines, and we need raises too.

Comment: There is no winning in what we vote for.

Q: We have been lobbying for more faculty governance. It is not like we do not want the responsibility. We are put in a tough position, but do we want to have a voice in this matter?

A: Yes, we need to provide the faculty’s position on this. Our input is important.

Remarks - University President - Dr. Alisa White (15 minutes)

- We shouldn’t be in that position, and you are not in that position. This can’t be your decision. When the Allocation Committee looks at what you want, it will help in making the decision. One person doesn’t make this decision. There wasn’t money in the past, which is why we got along so well, but now there is money. The Committee will look at a lot of data. Remember that there is no guarantee where the lines will go. You might vote for new faculty lines thinking you would get one, but it could end up in another department or college. I think things will look good for a while, but not for long. There is always a shift. Would you rather ask me questions about this? I’m not staying long. Do you have questions for me on this topic or anything else?

Q: Is it your decision or will the Allocation Committee will make it? There were Philosophy students who heard that faculty voted to have salaries instead of lines. This vote can turn against us if we vote for salaries.

A: Staff Senate is providing information for the Committee and others are too.

Comment: We don’t want to have this used against us.

A: We don’t have enough resources. We have winners and losers, and sometimes it shifts over time. For example, THEC is recommending 10 new buildings but ours wasn’t one of them. The bubble is going to burst, but I do not believe it will be like it was in 2008.

Q: There are real problems with Human Resources. Can you provide a timeline when the Human Resources issues will be addressed?

A: I would be happy to submit your question to Mitch Robinson

Anything else? Thank you.

We have a motion on the table. We can vote on the motion.
Q: Are we sitting here as senators or representatives from our departments? I went around and asked every one of them what they wanted.

A: We should vote as representatives of our constituted areas.

**Motion made, seconded, and passed to support number 1, all raises.**

We are running out of time to cover everything on the agenda. Can I get a motion to table the rest of the agenda items to the next meeting in January?

**Motion made, seconded, and passed to table the rest of the items on the agenda to our next meeting in January.**

- TBR Sub-council - Senator Benita Bruster (5 minutes)
- University Curriculum Committee - Senator Tony Morris (5 minutes)
- Deans’ Council - Senator Jane Semler (5 minutes)

**New Business**

- Policy 2:011 - Constitution of University Curriculum Meeting – (action item)
- Policy 2:051 - Faculty Appointments
- Policy 2:059 - Sponsored Research Incentive Program

**Adjournment 4:40 pm**