

APSU Faculty Senate
3:30, November 21, 2002
University Center, Room 303

Call to Order --3:40

Roll call of senators: *present* Elaine Berg; Kell Black; Rhonda Bryant; Elaine Busey; Michele Butts; Steve Clark; Sue Evans; Richard Gildrie; Sara Gotcher; Loretta Griffy; Ron Gupton; Thomas King; Barry Kitterman; Mark Michael; Robert Robison; Jordy Rocheleau; Adel Salama; Greg Steinberg; Tim Winters; Mary Lou Witherspoon; Faye Zeigler

Not present: Art Carpenter; Rebecca Glass; Lynette Henderson; Phil Kemmerly; Susan Koch; Vicky Langston; Bruce Myers; Miguel Ruiz-Avilez; Mohammed Waheeduzzaman

President Black recognized the faculty of Developmental Studies, and the president of our chapter of AAUP, Pete Stoddard.

1. Agenda approved
2. Oct. minutes approved as corrected. Suggestion made to announce that the minutes are available to the entire campus on the web page. The Secretary will try to remember to send out a memo each month to that effect.
3. Announcements and Comments

President Hoppe entertained questions:

Sen. Griffy--What happened at the presidents meeting concerning the General Education Core?

Pres. Hoppe—

Presidents approved the amendment that will allow a grade of D to be counted for core courses, but a task force will study that further

A proposal to split the core into a lower-division and upper-division core was withdrawn. Disciplinary Task Forces will soon be formed to look at the specific courses to go into the Gen Ed core.

VP Speck--

The Vice President is on a task force at TBR dealing with tenure and promotion. Among the issues being discussed is the issue of what constitutes a terminal degree. His committee was charged with establishing a workable policy so that there will be fewer exceptions to the terminal degree requirement. VP Speck will return to TBR on the 2nd and would like to receive any thoughts we might have on tenure/retention.

On hiring: The 34 positions recently allocated were initially based on enrollment data for the 15th day on main campus. When Ft. Campbell data were available, we looked at the whole data, and we looked at student credit hour production. We found that African American Studies was meeting 67% of its allocation. Physics and Chemistry were at 87% of their base. Other hiring was also re-examined. As a result, the previously approved positions in African American Studies and Physics were rescinded and new positions went to HHP and Sociology. The Chemistry position appears to be a special case, based on accreditation concerns, but this position is still up in the air.

Deans have been notified that they can begin forming committees, and pools of applicants can be released as soon as they are certified.

Pres. Hoppe—There are going to be different requirements for different departments when it comes to diversity, based on whether the department already has African American members. All departments must document direct contact with qualified African Americans unless such are already part of the applicant pool. Departments with no diversity will be required to document at a higher level than those with diversity.

VP Speck--Diversity goes beyond just numbers. If pools have African American candidates, we can move ahead. Units that have no diversity need to work a little harder to insure that we are doing everything possible to make sure we have an adequate pool..

On the issue of DSP:

(At this point in the meeting, AAUP member and Faculty Senator Richard Gildrie passed out a statement drafted by our campus AAUP chapter.)

A Resolution of the Austin Peay State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors: at the Fall General Meeting, 20 November 2002

According to AAUP standards, as embodied in the policies and procedures of both Austin Peay State University and the Tennessee Board of Regents, the primary responsibility for establishing curriculum and courses, including the method of instruction, rests with the faculty. Therefore, any committee or meeting formally charged with the responsibility of recommending fundamental changes in the Developmental Studies Program to the President of the University should be composed of a majority of faculty from the relevant curricular areas. Also, such proposed changes should be addressed within the already existing curriculum committees of the colleges and the Academic Council prior to any formal action by the President of the University.*

This resolution passed 26-0.

**This resolution is based on the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" (1966), which says, "The faculty has the primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." The "Statement" was jointly formulated by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and is the historical foundational document for current TBR and APSU policies and procedures.*

VP Speck--My goal as chief academic officer is to work with all constituencies on the campus. I don't want to get into a no-win battle. I have tried to act in good faith, be above board, so one concern I have is that I don't want to get into a contest with AAUP, faculty senate, or faculty. Perhaps this action by AAUP was not necessary, but there are competing interests. People in DSP are concerned with their jobs, and their futures. I'm not insensitive to that concern. We already didn't renew some DSP people who were not tenured. We are obligated to be fiscally responsible. I've tried to make sure that we could have some kind of common meeting ground. Kell and Barry came to talk to me, and we talked about ways to have a meeting of minds:

I think we have come up with a fairly reasonable way to deal with this: we will continue to meet on Tuesday as planned. We will add a faculty member to the committee (Thomas King). The other faculty members who will be voting will be Bonnie Hodges, Kell Black, Susan Calovini, Leon McQueen, and Aleeta Christian.

Administrators present will be VP Speck, Gerald Beavers, Jennifer Meningall, Diane Berty, Gaines Hunt, Jim Diehr, Stan Groppel.

None of these administrators can be considered computer gurus.

The purpose for Jennifer Meningall and Diane Berty being on the committee is that, should we make decisions to go further with computers, we need to consult with them. They probably are not predisposed to go down that path.

The best way to do whatever voting needs to take place is to let faculty members vote as one body, and let the other people separately. Totals can be presented separately to the president.

AAUP is concerned that the matter go through other committees on campus as well. Okay. But we are on a tight timeline, especially in regard to any option that will call for further use of computers.

People are going to this meeting on Tuesday in good faith. It is not a done deal. So there is no problem with the matter going to other committees. If we need to go to greater use of computers, we need to go to the technology board and other people, so we need to be aware of timing.

We are all in this together. Faculty does have a major interest in curriculum, but we also have to deal with issues of funding. We are trying to work together. However, if people are saying there is only going to be one decision that is acceptable, then people are going to be disappointed. We need to make a forthright, honest decision.

When the meeting takes place, all DSP faculty can be there for an hour. Other faculty can be there an hour. Then we will close the meeting off and make a decision.

Sen. Gildrie--We have a mild misunderstanding. This is not the opening shot of the French Revolution. Nothing in the AAUP document is saying what will be decided. Just that the primary responsibility rests with the faculty.

VP Speck--We don't have an adversarial relationship?

Sen Gildrie--No, we aren't fighting with anybody.

Meredith Gildrie--What we want to find out here is what the charge of the committee is. Is this committee to develop a proposal that takes the place of all other proposals? Will this committee make a decision not to send some proposals further?

VP Speck--No, we are trying to consider the proposals and come up with a delivery method: classroom, all computer, or a blend. The intention is to figure out what we do about delivery, so we can figure out the rest of it

Meredith Gildrie--Once the committee meets, and says that, based on the budget, we can only do a certain type of delivery, is that the final decision, or final suggestion on the delivery?

VP Speck--We were thinking we would make a suggestion to the president. This AAUP document says we need to go through other bodies. I'm not trying to circumvent anything, but the timing, the funding issues must be taken into consideration.

Sen Gildrie-- nobody is against any group of people meeting to talk about this issue. The problem is whether any meeting closes off other discussion prematurely. I can imagine that if there's an agreement that one option is the primary option, the one that looks the best, if the committee says that clearly, the process will be easy. The other levels will look at it quickly and we will have a legitimate discussion that ends up in something to go to the president's desk

VP Speck--Again, I want to point out that there is a problem if any group says there is only decision that will work.

Sen Gildrie--That can't be. We as a faculty must work with the proper attitude.

But any time we set up an ad hoc committee, people will say something has been rigged.

VP Speck--This is not a new issue, we have spent lots of time, there's been a lot of input.

Pres Hoppe-Let me explain why we put a task force in place to make some decisions. We have talked about this for a year and a half, have moved things around on the table. The proposals that came from the department used the same amount of money that we had before, but put the money in different places. We had to reduce our expenses by 500,000, not just move funds to different departments.

TBR and THEC have said they won't reduce our appropriations. Now they are hedging, but if we reduce funding for DSP, we are told we can use the money to increase quality needs in other departments. We can't just move the money to math without consideration for quality needs in other parts of the University.

The proposals that came back didn't respond to the charge. In February, we need to get classes out there. I appointed the task force, seeing that we probably asked DSP to do something that was impossible, to oversee their own restructuring.

Somebody outside of DSP has to listen to everything the experts in the discipline have to say, consider the money we have, the charge we have from TBR, and make a decision on how to marry that.

Kay Harrelson-- All the discussions we have had, every meeting, included talk of transfers, etc. We were never told that our proposals couldn't include transfers to math.

President Hoppe--We said that we would do our best to protect all faculty positions. Some people may be doing different jobs, working different hours. We will try to save the jobs. That could include transfers. This conversation could go to the task force.

Sen. Gupton--Both proposals shift money to other places. If that is a deficiency of one proposal, it's a deficiency with the other proposal, too.

Pres. Hoppe--Shifting positions would be considered to improve the quality of instruction across the university. For example, the advisement center could be reinstated--that sort of thing could be considered.

Pres. Black--One of the things we are here to do is to monitor protocol and policy. This is not the forum to discuss the content of the policies.

Sen. Gupton--There are important needs in math. If you are going to move somebody someplace useful, we have a place to put people.

Jeannie Randall--Will the meeting on Tuesday result in a third proposal?

VPAA Speck--The only thing we will look at is the method of delivery, not the question of a 3 hour course or a 5 hour course.

Jeannie Randall--We met the deadlines, and there has not been any response from the Vice President.

VPAA Speck--The next response is due on the first Monday in December.

Jeannie Randall--And that's on the timelines?

VPAA Speck--This is not an attempt to circumvent any proposals, but there is no question that the method of delivery will affect our decisions.

Pres. Hoppe--It's necessary to consider delivery and reorganization, but they don't have to be tied together. They are separate issues. Delivery will not decide organization, but it may influence it.

Sen Clark--Did you ever explore the possibility of plugging DSP faculty into the freshmen experience courses?

Pres Hoppe--Yes, several groups have made that proposal.

VPAA Speck (finishing his remarks)--There are two other things we have been working on: First, a position paper, with Kell Black and Richard Gildrie, on the role of faculty in faculty development. Secondly, we have a committee working on the liberal arts core that is getting ready to send a document University-wide. At the beginning of next semester, we will discuss that.

Thank you VPAA Speck.

Pres Black--

Announcements:

Dan Frederick has resigned, both from the executive committee and from the senate. So, taking his place on academic council will be Robbie Robison.

Rumor control:

Attendance will not be taken on Jan 2, which is our start-up day for spring semester.

Pres Hoppe--We want to make sure sufficient faculty are here to cover advising needs.

Pres Black--We need to see that someone will be here to serve students needs.

There are 2 policies that will come to senators electronically tomorrow. One, is travel. Jennifer Meningall would like to have our responses to the travel policy by the 25th of this month.

The second is from Joe Filippo's office, concerning faculty access to dossiers. This will be a first draft of this document.

Further thoughts:

One question that occurs to us as the Executive Committee: What is our role on campus? We will listen to anybody. People come to us with problems and concerns. We would like to bypass the rumor mill. 10 years ago the SACS team found that the major means of communications on our campus is gossip.

We can begin to put the issues out on the table for healthy dialogue. There is still concern that the DSP proposal may be a violation of policy. Could we speed up the process of looking at proposals? It's something to think about.

The DSP issue is difficult to talk about. It's easy to change the subject from delivery to academic freedom to salaries to job security. My own father, at the age of 60, lost his job at another university when a similar reorganization took place. We on the executive committee are well aware of how devastating this can be. We have no hidden agenda, but we are here to facilitate discussion, to see that all voices are heard fairly.

Reports

Sen King (on reorganization)

We have received numerous emails and other communications on the issue of reorganization, and they can be broken down into three groups. One group seems to think that whatever we do will be futile. A second group of emails come from people who have contacted our committee, but have asked for no help. A third group of emails have come from people who have a plan in place and think they are on track.

DSP has contacted me in all of the above ways. It is a very difficult problem. The meeting next Tuesday looked like it would involve locking 5 non-academic members and only 3 academic members into a room to make a proposal. DSP is most concerned that the committee will make decisions without their input. The problem as I saw it before noon today is, it seems as if five people will meet and decide something that affects others.

I would like to make the following motion:

I move that the Faculty Senate requests that no meetings be held which violate the due process of the reorganization policy, and/or which violate the spirit of the reorganization policy which was established to insure fairness to all concerned, AND that any meetings which are held for discussion of reorganizational issues have significant academic representation from the disciplines involved, specifically (for the November 26 meeting centering on changes in DSP) all DSP tenured faculty, the chair of language and literature, the chair of mathematics, the dean of COAL, the dean of COSM, and any administrators directly involved in the academic process here at APSU. Furthermore, said meeting of November 26 should seek consensus and not deny the right of persons to have original proposals continue through the evaluation process stated in the policy.

Pres Hoppe--I said we would lock the door, only because we have been talking about this for a year and half. I said it with a note of levity. I did not mean any disrespect to anyone. I don't know what the outcome of that meeting will be. We have to trust the fact that we now have a majority of faculty on the committee. Dr. Speck has responded to requests, has agreed that things will go through academic council, etc. It might be better not to put limitations on the committee. My problem is that the motion being made says that each proposal must go forward, because DSP's proposal has tied delivery and reorganization together.

These are two separate tracks--reorganization and delivery.

Kay Harrelson--No attempt has been made to make a compromise proposal.

Meredith Gildrie--We never had a clear understanding of what is wrong with the proposals.

Pres Black--In striving for consensus, we found the VPAA open. We asked for greater representation by faculty, and a division in the voting to reflect the position of faculty separately from the opinion of administration. He was open to that.

VPAA Speck--The meeting will look like this:

We meet. We talk about all the proposals. Part of the proposals we are looking at are the economic issues. At the end of the discussion, the committee will vote and send a recommendation forward.

Pres Hoppe--I want to be clear on this. An acceptable interpretation of the motion is that the delivery method will go forward to academic council, and the other concerns will go on forward through the reorganization process.

Sen. King's motion came to a vote with the following result:

13 in favor

1 opposed

4 abstentions

Report on Merit/Bonus Pay – **Sen Tim Winters**

The committee met for several hours and 4 things were made certain:

The name will be Merit/Bonus pay.

It will take the form of a single payment.

Unused funds cannot be carried forward.

The policy currently in place will not be used.

The committee is charged with creating a new policy, with discussion on how to evaluate the faculty, and who should do so. There is no consensus on either issue.

Several arguments have been made against merit pay—primarily because of the problems we currently have with funding travel fully. The senate committee dealing with Merit/Bonus Pay will continue to meet, and welcomes comments.

Sen Clark--After the committee comes up with policy, what next?

Pres. Hoppe--The next step will be open forums.

Sen Robison--Why was the old policy scrapped?

Pres Hoppe--Some of the language seemed not to be appropriate.

Sen Winters—This is a completely different method, and will not add money to existing salaries.

Pres Hoppe (in response to a question on the ceiling placed on full professors' salaries)-- Full professors are still eligible for raises on an annual basis. The administration needs to decide how to fund raises.

Sen Winters—Regarding our discussion of evaluation and who will do it. The current document is considered inadequate. Our general impression is that scholarship was the primary reason for merit pay in the past, and that may not always be where merit comes in. Teaching and service need to be considered as well.

Do we have a committee to evaluate, or use student evaluations? Is there a form to use, and if so, who fills it out? Thus, who makes the decisions—the chair alone? That would give the chair a lot of power. Should we form a committee? Are people on the committee eligible for Merit/Bonus pay?

Sen Michael-The whole thing must be completely transparent, and everybody should know what everyone is getting. Committees are necessary in order to recognize different teaching approaches, etc.

Sen Winters—By early January, we need a preliminary document.

Pete Stoddard—I suggest you look at a web site at Morehead State University that might be very useful.

New topic:

Sen Gildrie passed out the motion that he was charged with putting into proper language at the October meeting, concerning a post-tenure review policy. Motion was made to accept it. In the following discussion, which came up as a result of a concern expressed by Sen Bryant, the senate reached a consensus that this post-tenure review procedure would **not** require tenured faculty to maintain a dossier. The question of keeping a post-tenure dossier would remain up to the respective department, as is currently the case.

The proposal made by Sen Gildrie:

Purpose:

The purpose of a post-tenure review is to encourage individual tenured faculty members, in conjunction with their department or program chairs, to assess periodically the academic performance, aspirations, opportunities, and needs of tenured faculty members in light of the missions of their departments or programs and the university. The object is to enhance the intellectual and artistic climate for students and faculty. Hence, post-tenure review must be conducted so as to protect academic freedom and the quality of education consonant with standards found in Policy Documents & Reports of the American Association of University Professors and policies of the Tennessee Board of Regents. This policy is not a step toward the removal of tenure, a process described in APSU policy 5:010:VII, F, and the Faculty Handbook.

Procedures:

In essence, post-tenure review is an integral portion of the university's Faculty Development Plan (APSU policy 2:006). As such, the formal procedure is the "Annual Faculty Evaluation/Faculty Development Plan" as described in that policy and the Faculty Handbook. Use of this procedure is not intended to limit or discourage less formal practices within departments or the university designed to serve the same ends of mutual assistance and encouragement in maintaining and improving academic performance.

The motion passed 16-0.

Sec. Kitterman moved that all other reports be made via email, and that we go directly to the issue of when to hold our next meeting, scheduled for 12/19. Motion wasn't seconded but what the heck.

Pres Black asked not to meet in Dec. It was generally seen as the most popular statement all afternoon. Sen Winters pointed out that he needed feedback on the issue of Merit/Bonus Pay by early January. Pres Black agreed to post any policies proposed by Sen Winters'

committee on the web as soon as he receives them. Sen Berg will send out her report from Deans Council via email.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:30.
Next meeting will be January 30, 2003.